

Pre-Service Management Teachers' Competence in Lesson Plan Preparation During Teaching Practicum at a Public University in Ghana

Richard Opoku^{1*} Daniel Amadiok²

1. Department of Business and Social Sciences Education, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana
2. Department of Mathematics & ICT, St. Joseph's College of Education, Bechem, Ghana

* E-mail of the corresponding author: danielamadiok@gmail.com

Abstract

Pre-service teacher development places a strong emphasis on lesson planning, particularly during practicum. Thus, this study examined pre-service teachers' competency in lesson plan preparation during their teaching practicum at a public university in Ghana. A convergent parallel mixed-method design was adopted, with data collected from 120 pre-service management teachers through the census technique. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were used to analyze the quantitative data, whereas content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data. The findings revealed that pre-service management teachers demonstrated competence in identifying and utilizing teaching resources. Additionally, they exhibited competency in designing student assessment strategies. However, they showed limited competence in demonstrating knowledge of subject content and pedagogy, setting clear instructional objectives, and designing coherent and well-structured instruction. The study suggests that a larger percentage of assessment marks should be given to lesson plan preparation to encourage students to take it more seriously and improve their skills. Second, lecturers should place increased emphasis on lesson planning during their methods of teaching courses to strengthen students' understanding and skills. Finally, supervisors are encouraged to actively support and challenge pre-service teachers to develop original lesson plans rather than relying on previously developed ones. These measures are expected to enhance students' interest, independence, and overall competence in lesson planning. This study significantly contributes to practice, policy, and curriculum development.

Keywords: Lesson plan, Pre-service teachers, Teaching practicum, Public university, Ghana

DOI: 10.7176/JEP/17-5-06

Publication date: May 30th 2026

1. Introduction

Lesson plans are of immense importance when it comes to teaching and learning. A lesson plan is a document that shows what happens in a particular timeframe in the classroom during instructional delivery (Whitton et al. 2016). It is a written description of how learning is attained in the classroom. The plan helps teachers to have a framework for carrying their students to certain learning destinations (Vdovina & Gaibisso, 2013). It connects the requirements of the curriculum and a textbook with what is to be taught in the classroom. Thus, preparing a lesson plan helps pre-service teachers to organize their activities, construct their goals, and get feedback from their supervisors. Lesson planning is a crucial skill that pre-service teachers should gain during their training.

The essence of training teachers is to equip them with the relevant competencies to effectively implement the school curriculum (Lumadi & Acquah, 2014). Teachers' impact factors in the classroom, such as teaching methods, teacher expectations, classroom organizations, and use of classroom resources, underscore their effectiveness obtained through training (Fernandez, 2006). Consequently, effective training leads to effective teaching, which brings about the desired learning outcomes (Kyriacou, 1999).

Effective planning for teaching brings the best out of the teachers in the classroom. It leads to the achievement of educational objectives. The planning process begins by thinking of what the learners need to understand, know, or be able to do by the end of the teaching session (Greece et al., 2018). It is the first step in the classroom teaching process (Asfaw, 2002). Available literature shows that lesson planning is very necessary for effective teaching. Ruznyak and Walton (2011) suggest that lesson planning guidelines and templates should be provided to teachers to scaffold their lesson planning.

Despite its importance, several studies (Mahmood & Iqbal, 2018; Abas, 2016; Ruys, 2012; Mutton et al., 2011;

Gaffor & Umerfarooque, 2010) highlight pre-service teachers' incompetence in preparing effective lesson plans after completing methods of teaching courses. Student teachers lack experience in planning and organizing teaching activities. Lack of a well-defined lesson plan in teaching may result in a more problematic environment for a teacher and consequently less beneficial learning (Nilsson, 2009). The literature reveals that pre-service teachers find planning their lessons very difficult and time-consuming (Sahin-Taskin, 2017). However, all the studies criticizing pre-service teachers' incompetencies in preparing lesson plans failed to specifically highlight the areas of competency they lack.

As a result, this current study sought to investigate pre-service teachers' competencies in preparing lesson plans based on the Danielson (2013) framework. Specifically, the study sought to (1) assess pre-service teachers' knowledge of content and pedagogy in lesson planning, (2) ascertain pre-service teachers' competence in setting instructional outcomes, (3) find out pre-service teachers' competence in choosing the appropriate teaching and learning resources in the lesson planning, (4) explore pre-service teachers' competence in designing coherent instructions in lesson planning, and (5) find out pre-service teachers' competence in designing student assessment in lesson planning.

The study is significant because the findings are very valuable for university stakeholders' decision-making, review of assessment for pre-service teachers, redesigning of lesson planning competency, and enlightening learners on lesson plan preparation. The study is valuable to lecturers, supervisors, and teacher education curriculum developers. This study reveals insights for the training of pre-service teachers.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teaching Practicum

Teaching practicum is an experiential learning, field-based learning, or work-based learning where preservice teachers engage in real-world teaching (Yan & He, 2010). It provides them the opportunity to work with real students. In addition, supervisors and mentors observed them and helped them to develop their professional skills in terms of lesson preparation, instructional delivery, and classroom management. Practicum bridges the gap between theory and practice. Additionally, it provides the opportunity for pre-service teachers to develop their teaching competence (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). It gives pre-service teachers the real classroom experience, which is an important part of teacher education. They learn from experts in the field by watching them before attempting to teach. This helps them to bridge the gap between the course, methods of teaching, and practical implementation (Thaanyane & Jita, 2025).

2.2 Concept of Lesson Planning

Lesson planning is the principal step of teaching and learning employed in the class (Asfaw, 2002). The planning process provides the avenue for teachers to use the appropriate educational goals to diagnose issues and needs in teaching and learning. Planning in the teaching-learning context includes everything the teacher does before the actual class teaching. A lesson plan shows how a teacher puts the curriculum into practice (Duncan & Met, 2010). It is a written description of the learning process indicating what has been learned, how, when, and where learning takes place, and how learning is evaluated (Fallahi, 2019). Having a curriculum and a lesson plan creates a lively and active atmosphere in the class.

Lesson plans are developed to suit learning situations. Gagne's nine events of instruction, the Herbartian approach (traditional approach), Bloom's approach, Madeline Hunter's approach, Slavin's lesson structure, etc., are some examples of lesson plan development approaches. Some institutions teach their learners to use any of the approaches or pick the essential components of all the approaches mentioned above. However, the essential components of a lesson plan are topic, objective(s), review of previous relevant knowledge, teaching/learning resources, introduction, presentation (teacher-learner activities), closure, evaluation, pre-lesson preparation, and the remarks column (Tamakloe et al., 2005).

The qualities of a lesson plan could be determined from its features. Stender (2017) suggested that the functional features of the lesson plan can be used to judge the quality of the lessons planned. The functional features of the lesson plan are the adaptability of the lesson, the coherence of the lesson, and its potentialities for the cognitive activation of students.

There are different formats of lesson plans. Several studies maintained that whatever format a lesson plan takes, it should describe the objectives; the topic or subject matter; the lesson materials; the lesson procedure, which includes an introduction, development of the lesson, generalization, application, and conclusion; and student evaluation. Based on this, Newton and Newton (2009) divided the lesson plan format into objectives setting,

exposition, and plenary. Coletta and Norris-Bauer (2008) distinguished two main lesson plan formats. These are the prose form and the tabular form (vertical/horizontal). The distinction of these formats is merely based on design or structure.

The standards-based lesson plan benchmarks components of the traditional lesson plan against standards. Standards are what students should know (content) and can do (process). Content standards define what is to be taught and what kind of performance is expected. Planning standards-based lessons requires the teacher to align student work expectations and classroom assessments to the standards and the learning objectives of the lesson and to establish criteria to judge student attainment of the standard. Learning objectives, aligned with standards, must be stated in terms of measurable student behavior, and assessment must measure the student achievement of the skills and knowledge defined by the learning objectives and the standards.

Danielson (2013) developed a framework for teaching. He divided the complex activity of teaching into twenty-two components clustered into four domains: (1) planning and preparation, (2) the classroom environment, (3) instruction, and (4) professional responsibilities. This study focused on the first domain since it sought to investigate pre-service teachers' competencies in the preparation of lesson plans. The planning and preparation domain comprises knowledge of content and pedagogy, setting instructional outcomes, knowledge of teaching and learning resources, designing coherent instruction, and student assessment.

2.3 Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

It deals with the teachers' knowledge of content, prerequisite relationships, and content pedagogy. Here, the teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the subject area. The teacher demonstrates an understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and their link to necessary cognitive structures that ensure student understanding. The teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches. Shulman (1986) defines pedagogical content knowledge as knowledge of the subject matter and the dimensions of it for teaching. The category of pedagogical content knowledge includes topics taught in one's subject area, useful forms of representation of ideas, analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations. Pedagogical content knowledge also includes understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult, and the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring with them to the learning of frequently taught topics and lessons.

2.4 Setting Instructional Outcomes

It covers value, sequence, alignment, clarity, balance, and suitability for diverse learners. It means all outcomes represent high-level learning in a discipline. They are clear, written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent both coordination and integration. Outcomes are differentiated in whatever way is needed for individual students. Wang (1980) viewed adaptive instruction as using alternative instructional strategies and resources to meet the learning needs of individual students. Adaptive instruction involves (1) taking into account different abilities, experiences, interests, and socio-economic backgrounds of children when planning and implementing a lesson, and (2) providing a range of alternative learning environments to accommodate the wide range of student needs (Wang, 1980). Wang pointed out that adaptive instruction requires that alternate means of instruction are matched to students based on knowledge about each individual's background, talents, interests, and past performance.

2.5 Knowledge of Teaching and Learning Resources

Teaching and learning resources (TLRs), also known as teaching aids, are essential in the teaching and learning process (Njoroge, 2019; Frimpong, 2021). They are the resources used to extend content knowledge in the classroom. These resources can be used in schools or communities by teachers to enhance learning. Resources like expert talks in the areas being taught can extend knowledge acquisition. Teaching and learning resources constitute an alternative way of sending instructions to learners. These channels of disseminating instructions appeal to the senses, which increases learner motivation and inspiration in the teaching and learning process, and also helps them learn better. Adjei et al. (2015) undertook a descriptive survey design to examine the teaching and learning resources used in teaching business management. The study revealed that with TLRs, learners have the opportunity to feel and manipulate the concepts being taught. This enables them to achieve knowledge and productive understanding. The study confirmed that the resources make learning easy and interactive and enhance classroom participation. Teachers can use several teaching and learning resources in the classroom at the same time to engage learners. These materials can be in the form of visual, audio, or audiovisual aids (Njoroge, 2019). Examples of visual aids are flannel boards, bulletin boards, objects, models, pictures, charts, maps, flash cards, chalkboards, overhead projectors, and slides, which appeal to the visual sense. Gramophones, radios, and

tape recorders are audio-visuals that appeal to the hearing senses, while film projectors, televisions, and film strips constitute audio-visuals, and they appeal to both hearing and sight senses. Teachers' knowledge of TLRs can aid their competency in lesson plan preparation.

2.6 Designing Coherent Instruction

It deals with teachers' ability to organize learning activities, learning materials, instructional materials, instructional groups, lessons, and unit structure. Cohesive decision-making promises a clearly structured lesson where teacher decisions in the individual parts of the lesson planning areas connect and fit into the whole lesson (Stender, 2017). Panasuk and Todd (2005) use the term "logical flow" when referring to the coherence of the lesson. A lesson is well-structured if all parts of the lesson are aligned with clearly defined lesson objectives. Aligning student work expectations and classroom assessments to the standards and the learning objectives of the lesson defines the coherence of the lesson plan.

2.7 Student Assessment

Any kind of assessment that is used to improve student learning and to make informed instructional decisions is called a formative assessment. Assessment is formative when the assessment information is used to alter the student's performance gap (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Formative assessment diagnoses students' difficulties and provides constructive feedback. We understand from these conceptualizations that formative assessment coexists with formative feedback. Hattie and Timperley (2007) conceptualized feedback as information provided regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding. Feedback fills a gap between what is understood and what is aimed to be understood through affective processes (increased effort, motivation, or engagement) and cognitive processes (Sadler, 1989). Formative feedback guides and challenge the learner's thinking (Pellegrino et al., 2001). Formative assessment and formative feedback are powerful means for meeting goals for high performance and high equity of student outcomes and for providing students with knowledge and skills for lifelong learning. Formative assessment and formative feedback help teachers meet diverse students' needs through differentiation and adaptation of teaching to raise levels of student achievement and to achieve greater equity of student outcomes. Formative assessment and feedback provide students with an opportunity to enter into dialogue with their peers and the teacher about their formative activities and discuss their learning needs (Hyatt, 2005).

3. Methods

3.1 The Study's Design and Data Collection

The pragmatist research philosophy was the foundation for this study, as the research strategy was both qualitative and quantitative (Collis & Hussey, 2009). A convergent parallel mixed-methods design was used to collect data from pre-service management teachers at a public university in Ghana. The study used this design to get an in-depth understanding of the research problem. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed in two independent strands at the same time. This was done by prioritizing the methods equally, keeping the data independent, mixing the results during the overall interpretation, and looking out for convergence, divergence, contradictions, or relationships of the two sources of data (Morse, 1991). It is worth noting that the quantitative data provided insight into pre-service management teachers' behavior in teaching practicum when they were assessed, whereas the qualitative data provided insights into their lesson plan preparation during teaching practicum after the lesson plan had been vetted and critiqued by their supervisors. The researchers triangulated by directly comparing the quantitative statistical results and qualitative findings.

The population for the study was Level 300 pre-service teachers of the 2018/2019 academic year at the university. The level 300 pre-service management teachers were considered because they had gone through on-campus teaching practice. According to the student records management information system unit of the university, the level 300 pre-service management teachers numbered one hundred and twenty (120) for the 2018/2019 academic year. The census method was used as the study's sampling technique. The census included pre-service management teachers who had undergone on-campus teaching practice in the 2018/2019 academic year.

Secondary data was used for the study. It is data that has been collected by individuals or agencies for a research study. It is far cheaper to collect secondary data because the time and budget involved in searching secondary sources are much less than needed to complete primary data collection. Secondary sources of information can yield more accurate data than that obtained through primary research because data from government or international agencies yield more accurate results than custom-designed ones. Data for this study were sourced

from vetted lesson notes and Teaching Practice Assessment Form A of pre-service management teachers who had undergone on-campus teaching practice for the 2018/2019 academic year. The Center for Teacher Professional Development (CTPD) at the university keeps records of the Assessment Form As and the lesson notes. The assessment form A had the items rated on a five-point Likert scale and coded as 5 (very good), 4 (good), 3 (satisfactory), 2 (unsatisfactory), and 1 (poor)..

Ethical clearance with reference, UCCIRB/CES/2019/15, was granted by the Institutional Review Board of the university. An introductory letter was then sought from the Head of the Department of Business and Social Sciences Education (DOBSSE) to seek permission from the Centre for Teacher Professional Development (CTPD) to collect data in the form of vetted lesson notes and results from the Teaching Practice Assessment Form A of the Bachelor of Education Management students who embarked on on-campus teaching practice in the 2018/2019 academic year. Two photocopies of their lesson plans and Assessment Form A sheets were taken. Areas on the sheet required based on the research objectives were coded and grouped. An average of two of their results was taken with the help of a research assistant from the Centre for Teacher Professional Development (CTPD). The collection of data began on 7th August 2019 and ended on 10th September 2019 within twenty (20) working days.

3.2 Data Processing and Analysis

The data were processed and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The application is used by various researchers for complex statistical data analysis. It helps researchers to identify trends, develop predictive models, and draw informed conclusions (Foley 2018). The data were first coded, items were grouped based on the research objectives, and then the averages were computed. The items' means and standard deviations, and the constructs' means and standard deviations obtained, provided the basis for conclusions. An overall mean (construct mean) above 3.0 indicates that pre-service management teachers possess competence in the various components of lesson plan preparation. The qualitative data were analyzed using content analysis. Content analysis is a research method used to identify patterns in recorded communication. To conduct content analysis, data is systematically collected from a set of texts in books, newspapers, magazines, speeches, interviews, web content, social media posts, photographs, and films. Content analysis can be quantitative, that is, focused on counting and measuring, or qualitative, that is, focused on interpreting and understanding.

5. Results and Discussions

5.1 Pre-service Management Teachers' Competence in Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

This section solves research objective 1, which sought to assess pre-service teachers' knowledge of content and pedagogy in lesson planning. Pre-service management teachers were assessed in the areas of subject and pedagogical knowledge, introduction to the lesson, summaries of core points, and mastery of subject matter as directed by the Danielson framework for teaching. The results obtained are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Pre-Service Management Teachers' Competence in Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

Areas	Mean (M)	SD
Summary of core points	3.80	0.44
Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge	3.70	0.53
Mastery of Subject Matter	3.83	0.56
Lesson Introduction	3.53	0.62
Mean of Means/Average SD	3.70	0.54

Source: Field Data (2019); Scale $M \geq 3.0$ (competent); $M \leq 3.0$ (not competent)

The results in Table 1 show that pre-service teachers were able to summarize core points for all activities (Mean =3.80). Also, a mean of 3.70 for the subject and pedagogical knowledge implies that pre-service teachers' subject knowledge was logical, linked to objectives, and provided activities that engage students. With a mastery of subject knowledge, having a mean of 3.8, it means pre-service teachers exhibited command of subject matter, gave precise information, exuded confidence, and cited lots of examples that were related to the content of students' experiences. Lesson introduction with a mean of 3.53 shows that pre-service teachers introduced the lesson by reviewing relevant previous knowledge, linking it up with the new topic, which stimulates interest, and

sharing lesson objectives with the students. The overall mean (construct mean) of 3.70, which is above 3.0, indicates that pre-service management teachers possess knowledge of content and pedagogy. This finding is grounded in literature, as Triastuti (2020) found that pre-service teachers had a good overall test score average of the knowledge base in teaching. However, 100 (83%) photocopies of the lesson plans examined were seen as not sufficiently depicting the requirement for good pedagogical content knowledge when matched with a summary of core points, subject, and pedagogical knowledge, mastery of subject matter, and introduction to the lesson. Evidence gathered from the lesson introduction in their lesson plans is presented as follows:

The teacher begins the lesson by narrating a story about his brother. He then asks the students to describe what his brother looks like. The teacher then reviews the students' previous knowledge.

Another pre-service management teacher in her introduction wrote: to introduce the lesson, the teacher invites a resource person, Mr. Mensah, a staff member of the Ghana Revenue Authority, to read the total amount of taxes generated per region. The teacher then reviews previous knowledge.

From the evidence above, the pre-service management teacher's introduction was not appropriate since it did not relate to reviewing students' relevant previous knowledge and linking it to the topic for the lesson. Also, in using a resource person, the teacher must first review relevant previous knowledge. Some remarks made under the summary of core points in the lesson plan are seen as follows:

A pre-service management teacher wrote a core point about the business society which were not related to the lesson objectives of business and its environment. Here, the pre-service teacher's summary of core points for all the activities was not related to the main concepts or to the lesson objectives.

It is observed that there is a contrast in the findings from the qualitative and quantitative analysis; it, therefore, appears that pre-service management teachers are not competent in pedagogical content knowledge in lesson planning. This finding is well-grounded in literature, as writers such as Manyarara (2018) indicated that pre-service teachers lack the understanding of deploying different pedagogic approaches to meet the learning needs of the subject and are unable to address lesson objectives. Pinamang and Penrose (2017), in their study, found that pre-service teachers had a low level of pedagogical content knowledge in lesson planning. Moreover, Triastuti (2020) found that despite the overall good test score average of the pre-service teachers' knowledge base of teaching and the generally positive self-rating perceptions, the pre-service teachers' limited and descriptive reflections did not sufficiently depict their actual implementation of the teacher knowledge base of teaching in their microteaching practices. This implies that pre-service management teachers were not able to develop pedagogical content knowledge in their actual implementation in the lesson planning. Also, it implies that the lecturer did not achieve the objective of pre-service teachers grasping the skill of pedagogical content knowledge during the methods of the teaching course. A few studies (Halim et al., 2010) had a different finding: that pre-service teachers were able to develop pedagogical content knowledge. Findings from this study strongly support that pre-service management teachers are not competent in pedagogical content knowledge.

4.1 Pre-service Management Teachers' Competence in Setting Instructional Outcomes.

This section addresses research objective two, which determines whether pre-service management teachers are competent or not in setting instructional outcomes in lesson planning during teaching practicum. The results obtained are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Pre-Service Management Teachers' Competencies in Setting Instructional Outcomes

Areas	Mean (M)	SD
Lesson objectives	3.808	.47271

Source: Field Data, 2019; Scale: $M \geq 3.0$ (competent); $M \leq 3.0$ (not competent)

The overall mean of 3.808, which is above 3.0 in Table 2, indicated that pre-service management teachers possessed competence in setting instructional outcomes to lesson objectives. This mean implied that pre-service management teachers stated specific, relevant, measurable, and achievable objectives that are linked to classroom activities.

On the other hand, from the qualitative and quantitative content analysis, it was observed that out of the 120 vetted lesson notes critiqued, 93 (77.5%) photocopies examined were seen not to sufficiently depict the requirement for setting instructional outcomes. Evidence gathered from their lesson plans is presented as follows:

For example, a pre-service management teacher wrote: by the end of the lesson, the student will be able to explain the sources of government revenue to the country.

Another pre-service management teacher also wrote that by the end of the lesson, the student will be able to identify the roles of a manager in a business.

Also, a pre-service management teacher wrote that, by the end of the lesson, the student will be able to identify business stakeholders as lesson objectives, just to mention a few.

Appropriately, based on the criteria of the teaching practice assessment A, the teacher must state specific, relevant, measurable, and achievable objectives that are linked to classroom activities. It could be observed that there is a contrast in the findings obtained from the quantitative analysis and those of the qualitative data analysis. It, therefore, appears that pre-service management teachers are not competent in setting instructional outcomes. This finding is well-grounded in literature, as Gaffor and Umerfarooque (2010) in their study found that pre-service teachers have challenges in specifying instructional outcomes during lesson planning. Also, Jones and Vermette (2011) in their study were able to identify specific challenges pre-service teachers face in planning. The challenges indicated that pre-service teachers' planning is hindered by a lack of effective use of basic planning strategies, such as articulating lesson objectives. Furthermore, Manyarara (2012) indicated that pre-service teachers cannot address lesson objectives in their lesson plans. Moreover, Gülten (2013) found in their study that pre-service teachers demonstrated weaknesses in writing their objectives when planning their lessons. This implies that pre-service management teachers are not able to achieve their lesson objectives during teaching practicum, making them not competent in their lesson planning. The findings from this study strongly support the position that pre-service management teachers are not competent in setting instructional outcomes.

4.2 Pre-service Management Teacher's Competence in Knowledge of Teaching Resources.

This section addresses research objective three, which determines whether pre-service management teachers possessed competence or not in the knowledge of resources in lesson planning during teaching practicum. The results obtained are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Pre-Service Management Competencies in the Knowledge of Teaching Resources

Areas	Mean (M)	SD
TLRs	3.53	0.51748

Source: Field Data, 2019; Scale: $M \geq 3.0$ (competent); $M \leq 3.0$ (not competent)

From Table 3, a mean of 3.53, which is above 3.0, indicates that pre-service management teachers possessed the competence in knowledge of the use of teaching and learning resources in teaching. This implies that pre-service management teachers stated appropriate and varied teaching and learning materials and indicated when to use them at every stage of the lesson.

From the qualitative and quantitative content analysis, it was observed that out of the 120 vetted lesson notes critiqued, 112 (93%) of the vetted lesson plans were seen to be sufficiently depicting the requirement for great knowledge in teaching resources when matched with teaching and learning resources items in the Assessment Form A sheet. Evidence of this assertion is presented as follows:

For example, a pre-service management teacher wrote: a cardboard showing a diagram of the various levels of management in a business was displayed on the board to guide students to identify the levels of management in business.

Another pre-service management teacher wrote that students are allowed to bring out their views after a group discussion on three (3) elements of directing in business.

Another one wrote that students were asked to make a presentation on the process of organizing in business.

It was observed that there is an agreement in the results obtained from both the quantitative and qualitative analyses of data. It, therefore, appears that pre-service management teachers are competent in the knowledge of teaching resources. This finding is well-grounded in literature, as Grise-Owens et al. (2018) in their study indicated that pre-service teachers were competent in knowledge of resources. This implies that pre-service management teachers had a grasp of the skills and knowledge of resources in their lesson planning during teaching practice. From the literature and this study, it can be stated that pre-service management teachers are

competent in the use of resources.

4.3 Pre-service Management Competence in Designing a Coherent Instruction

This section answers research objective four, which sought to determine whether pre-service management teachers possessed the required competence in designing coherent instruction in lesson planning during teaching practicum at the university or not. The results obtained are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Pre-Service Management Competencies in Designing a Coherent Instruction

Areas	Mean (M)	SD
Use of Teaching and Learning Resources	3.583	0.54362
Presentation-Teaching and Learning Activities	3.675	0.47034

Source: Field Data, 2019; Scale: $M \geq 3.0$ (competent); $M \leq 3.0$ (not competent)

From Table 4, an overall mean of 3.675, which is above 3.0, demonstrates that pre-service management teachers possessed the required competence in designing coherent instruction in a specific subject area. This means that pre-service management teachers used appropriate teaching and learning resources, linking them to students' previous knowledge and lesson objectives at key stages of the lesson. Moreover, it also means that pre-service management teachers organized teaching and learning activities sequentially and logically, used varied pedagogical skills, and maintained a balance between teacher and student activities. On the other hand, from the qualitative and quantitative content analysis, it was observed that out of the 120 vetted lesson plans critiqued, 91 (76%) of the lesson plans were seen as not sufficiently depicting the requirements for great knowledge in teaching resources when matched with teaching and learning resources items in the Assessment Form A sheet. Evidence of this assertion is shown as follows:

A pre-service management teacher wrote: "The teacher thanks students for providing answers and procedures to the questions. The teacher also shares the lesson objectives with the students.

Another teacher also wrote: using the question-and-answer method, the teacher asks students a question based on their previous knowledge and introduction as a teaching and learning activity.

It is seen that the pre-service management teachers did not provide varied/teacher-learner activities that were logical, sequenced, and direct student learning, with approximate time indicated. The findings from the qualitative analysis did not agree with those of the quantitative analysis. It, therefore, appears that pre-service management teachers are not competent in designing coherent instruction. This finding is well-grounded in literature, as writers such as Gaffor and Umerfarooque (2010), in their study, indicated that pre-service teachers had challenges in sequencing their lessons during lesson planning. Also, Bozaslan et al. (2012), in their study, found that pre-service teachers were not able to sequence their lesson activities. This implies that pre-service management teachers did not organize their lesson activities coherently during their lesson planning. From the literature and this study, it can be concluded that pre-service management teachers are not competent in designing coherent instruction in their lesson planning.

4.4 Pre-service Management Competence in Designing Student Assessment

This section achieves research objective five, which sought to determine whether pre-service management teachers possessed the required competence in designing student assessment in lesson planning or not during the teaching practicum. The results obtained are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Pre-service Management competence in designing student assessment

Areas	Mean (M)	SD
Assessment of student learning	3.61	0.2423

Source: Field Data, 2019; Scale: $M \geq 3.0$ (competent); $M \leq 3.0$ (not competent)

The mean of 3.61 in Table 5, which is above 3.0, shows that pre-service management teachers possessed the required competence in designing assessments of student learning. This also means that pre-service management teachers used a variety of assessment techniques, such as written exercises and assignments, to determine learner understanding. The findings also indicate that assessments are appropriate and timely; he/she encouraged students' self-assessment and application of learning. From the qualitative and quantitative content analysis, it

was observed that out of the 120 vetted lesson notes critiqued, 117 (97.5%) lesson plans by pre-service management demonstrated great skill in designing student assessment. Evidence from their lesson plans is presented as follows:

A pre-service Management teacher wrote: The teacher uses class contributions on features of a co-operative society in class as a form of assessing students.

Also, another pre-service Management teacher wrote that the teacher uses a group presentation as a form of assessment of students in a class.

Moreover, a pre-service teacher wrote: " Students were assessed based on the lesson objectives, which are appropriate for assessing students.

It could be observed that there is an agreement in the results obtained from the quantitative data analysis and the qualitative data analysis. This finding is well-grounded in literature, as writers such as Haghghi Irani et al. (2020) indicated that pre-service teachers have improved knowledge in student assessment. This implies that pre-service management teachers were able to design an appropriate student assessment during their lesson planning. From the literature and this study, it can be concluded that pre-service management teachers are not competent in designing student assessments in their lesson planning.

5. Conclusion

The study shows that pre-service management teachers were competent in knowledge of teaching resources and designing student assessments but were not competent in knowledge of content and pedagogy, setting instructional outcomes, and designing coherent instructions. The Centre for Teacher Professional Development (CTPD) at the university should make knowledge of content and pedagogy, instructional outcomes, and designing coherent instruction in lesson planning a major priority in teaching practice since its pre-service management was not competent in those areas. Also, the Center for Teacher Professional Development (CTPD) at the university should review its assessment for pre-service teachers by allocating a large percentage of marks to lesson planning preparation to promote competence in that regard. Lecturers should pay more attention to lesson planning preparation during the methods of the teaching course. This will help more students to develop an interest in lesson planning. Supervisors, in their capacity as instructional leaders, should take on the challenge and desire to encourage pre-service management teachers in preparing lesson plans on their own without copying from old lesson plans. Pre-service teachers should be counselled on lesson planning preparation by supervisors on the need to see lesson planning preparation as a necessity in teaching and not as a burden. The study has a limitation that its findings cannot be generalized beyond the university and the department under which the study was undertaken. The study is limited to level 300 pre-service management teachers. The study relied on secondary data from the institution, so the researchers might not know of errors in it.

References

- Abas, C. M. (2016). Difficulties in Field-Based Observation among Pre-Service Teachers: Implications to Practice Teaching. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 5(2), 101-112
- Adjei, M. H., Baffoe, R. S., Ansah, C. A. C. A., & Baffoe, M. S. (2015). The impact of teaching learning resources on teaching business. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(12).
- Asfaw, A. (2002). Analysis of lesson plans: The case of English teaching in Kafa Zone [Unpublished thesis]. Addis Ababa University.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74.
- Bozaslan, H., Genç, G., Kaya, A., & Merter, F. (2012). An investigation of the relationships between teachers' competency with lesson planning, designing learning environments and materials, and their socio-cultural characteristics. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 5(4), 433–453.
- Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(1), 153–224.
- Coletta, A. J., & Norris-Bauer, N. (2008). Lesson planning and pre-service teachers: A model for implementing research-based instructional strategies. William Paterson University.

- Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2009). *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument* (2013 ed.). The Danielson Group.
- Duncan, G., & Met, M. (2010). *STARTALK: From paper to practice*. National Foreign Language Center.
- Fallahi, A., Ebtekar, F., Nemat-Shahrbabaki, B., & Moradi, L. (2019). Barriers of health education from the perspective of school health trainers: A qualitative study. *Health Education and Health Promotion*, 7(1), 41–48.
- Fernandez, M. L., & Robinson, M. (2006). Prospective teachers' perspectives on microteaching lesson study. *Education*, 127(2).
- Foley, B. C. (2018). *Telling the truth: The theory and practice of documentary fiction*. Cornell University Press.
- Frimpong, S. O. (2021). The role of teaching and learning materials and interaction as a tool to quality early childhood education in Agona East District of the Central Region of Ghana. *African Educational Research Journal*, 9(1), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.91.20.112>
- Gaffor, K. A., & Umerfarooque, M. (2010). *Ways To Improve Lesson Planning: A Student Teacher Perspective*. All India Association for Educational Research, Chitradurga, Karnataka. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27163.87840>
- Greece, J. A., DeJong, W., Gorenstein Schonfeld, J., Sun, M., & McGrath, D. (2018). Practice-based teaching and public health training. *Pedagogy in Health Promotion*, 5(1), 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2373379918760929>
- Grise-Owens, E., Miller, J. J., Escobar-Ratliff, L., & George, N. (2018). Teaching Note-Teaching self-care and wellness as a professional practice skill. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 54(1), 180–186.
- Gülten, A. Z. (2013). Am I planning well? Teacher trainees' voices on lesson planning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1409–1413.
- Haghighi Irani, F., Chalak, A., & Heidari Tabriz, H. (2020). Assessing pre-service teachers' professional identity construction. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Halim, L., Meerah, T. S. M., & Buang, N. A. (2010). Developing pre-service science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge through action research. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 507–511.
- Hyatt, D. F. (2005). “Yes, a very good point!”: A critical genre analysis of feedback commentaries. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(3), 339–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510500122222>
- Jones, J. L., Jones, K. A., & Vermette, P. J. (2011). Planning learning experiences in the inclusive classroom. *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, 2(7).
- Kyriacou, C., & Stephens, P. (1999). Student teachers' concerns during teaching practice. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 13(1), 18–31.
- Lumadi, M. W., & Acquah, B. Y. S. (2014). Assessment of trainee teachers' effectiveness. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20), 2853–2860.
- Mahmood, N. & Iqbal, Z. (2018). Challenges Faced by Prospective Teachers during Teaching Practice: Connecting Theory to Practice. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 40 (2), 113-136
- Manyarara, B. C. (2018). Lesson planning for teacher effectiveness. *Namibia CPD Journal for Educators*, 76–87.
- Miller, M. (2008). Problem-based conversations in teacher development. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 77–98.
- Moradi, M. (2019). Teacher's Attitudes Towards the Effects of Lesson Plan on Classroom Management: A Case Study of Sufi Sahab Zakur High School. *American International Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(2), 112–120.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to Qualitative & Quantitative Methodological Triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40, 120-123. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-199103000-00014>
- Mutton, T., Hagger, H., & Burn, K. (2011). Learning to plan, planning to learn: The Developing Expertise of Beginning Teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 17(4), 399–

416. [10.1080/13540602.2011.580516](https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.580516)
- Newton, D. P., & Newton, L. D. (2009). Knowledge development at the time of use: A problem-based approach to lesson planning in primary teacher training in a low knowledge, low skill context. *Educational Studies*, 35(3), 311–321. [10.1080/03055690802648119](https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690802648119)
- Nilsson, P. (2009). From Lesson Plan to New Comprehension: Exploring Student Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Learning about Teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 239–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760802553048>
- Panasuk, R. M., & Todd, J. (2005). Effectiveness of lesson planning. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 32(3).
- Njoroge, K. N. (2019). Effects of teaching and learning resources in lower primary school children in the Eastern Zone of Nakuru Municipality. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.36348/sjhss.2019.v04i12.004>
- Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Knowing what students know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment*. National Academy Press.
- Pinamang, I., & Cofie, P. O. (2017). Pre-service teachers' content knowledge. *African Journal of Educational Studies in Mathematics and Sciences*, 13, 63–70.
- Rusznayak, L., & Walton, E. (2011). Lesson planning guidelines for student teachers: A scaffold for the development of pedagogical content knowledge. *Education as Change*, 15(2), 271–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2011.619141>
- Ruys, I., Van Keer, H., & Aelterman, A. (2012). Examining pre-service teacher competence in lesson planning pertaining to collaborative learning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 44(3), 349–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2012.675355>
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119–144.
- Sahin-Taskin, C. (2017). Exploring Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions of Lesson Planning in Primary Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(12), 57–63.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14
- Stender, A., Brückmann, M., & Neumann, K. (2017). Transformation of topic-specific professional knowledge into personal pedagogical content knowledge through lesson planning. *International Journal of Science Education*, 39(12), 1690–1714. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1351645>
- Tamakloe, E.K., Amedahe, F.K. and Atta, E.T. (2005) *Principles and Methods of Teaching*. Ghana Universities Press, Accra.
- Thaanyane, M., & Jita, T. (2025). The impact of teaching practice on preservice teachers' professional development in the Lesotho context. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 23(1), 292–299. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.0025>
- Triastuti, A. (2020). ASSESSING ENGLISH PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE BASE OF TEACHING: LINKING KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-PORTRAYAL. *TEFLIN Journal*, 31(1), 108–138. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i1/108-138>.
- Vdovina, E. (2013). Developing Critical Thinking in the English Language Classroom: A Lesson Plan. *ELTA Journal*, 1, 54–68.
- Wang, M. C. (1980). Adaptive instruction: Building on diversity Theory Into Practice, 19(2), 122–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848009542885>
- Whitton, D., Barker, K. L., Nosworthy, M., Humphries, J., & Sinclair, C. (2016). *Learning for teaching: Teaching for learning*. Cengage Learning.
- Yan, C., & He, C. (2010). Transforming the Existing Model of Teaching Practicum: A Study of Chinese EFL Student Teachers' Perceptions. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 36(1), 57–73.