REFLECTIVE PRACTICE IN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION: WHY ACTIVE LEARNING IS NOT ENOUGH

Anna Krulatz
Faculty of Teacher and Interpreter Education, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Abstract: *This paper presents the process and the outcomes of an action research project aimed at examining and improving pedagogical practices in a Norwegian in-service English teacher course through the use of the Reflective Teaching Model (Hart, Najee-ullah, & Schultz, 2004). The project was conducted in a constructivist-based classroom and consisted of the following steps: initial reflection, plan for action, action, and repeated reflection (Elliot, 1991). Course activities and student papers were included in the analysis. The improved, post-evaluation teaching approach, while still based in constructivist views of learning (Biggs, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978), utilized various scaffolding techniques (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) and an experiential pedagogical approach referred to as the Loop Input (Woodward, 1988, 2003). The outcomes suggested that reflective teaching practice in higher education can lead to improved classroom methodologies as well as increased critical thinking and attainment of course objectives among students.*

Keywords: reflective teaching model, action research, English teacher education, pedagogical practice

Introduction

No one course can prepare future teachers for all the challenges that they may face in their classrooms. Thus, one of the primary goals of teacher education programs is to nurture autonomous and self-directed teachers who constantly reflect on their teaching practice, evaluate their assumptions about teaching, and base changes and innovations in their teaching on effective and meaningful decisions.

Teacher educators can promote reflective teaching (Schon, 1983) through modeling in their own courses. The Reflective Teaching Model (RTM: Hart, Najee-ullah, & Schultz, 2004), originally implemented in mathematics and science teacher education, fosters ongoing observation and evaluation, thus encouraging teachers to identify and examine their own teaching practices and beliefs in order to implement changes that lead to improved learning. The model consists of a plan–teach–debrief sequence, during which lessons are first prepared and delivered, and then followed by focused reflection directed at increasing teacher awareness of pedagogical decisions and their effectiveness. The RTM stresses both shared authority between teachers and teacher educators and the importance of collaboration among teachers, as both teachers and teacher educators are seen as active participants in learning and teaching.

Loop input (Woodward, 2003), a type of experiential learning that promotes deep reflection about teaching and learning processes, can be integrated with the RTM to prompt teachers to examine and transform their teaching practices. It consists of both the process and content of learning (Woodward, 2003, p. 301). Through loop input, teacher education students learn how to create and execute pedagogical practices by participating in activities that exemplify these practices and at the same time utilize course content. According to Woodward (2003), students can "learn more deeply as a result of [the]

reverberation between process and content" (p. 303) through using loop input. Decompression time, which corresponds to RTM's debriefing stage (where students engage in analysis and reflection of the instructional method that they have just participated in), is a crucial element of loop input (Woodward, 2003, p. 303).

As an applied linguist working with pre-service and in-service ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers, and a former ESL and EFL teacher myself, I have always attempted to minimize lecture and optimize active learning in my courses. Nevertheless, I noticed that although I used loop input (Woodward, 2003), group work, discussions, and workshops in my EFL endorsement classes, my students struggled with the final course assignment that involved the development of an original, grade-appropriate EFL lesson and reflection. Even though we covered theories of language acquisition, methods and approaches to language teaching, input, output, interaction, social, and individual factors in language learning, multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1995), and Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Karthwohl, 1956), my students complained that they were dissatisfied with their work. I also noticed that while most of the lessons they designed followed a logical sequence (warm-up, new material, follow-up), the students did not demonstrate a mastery of the course objectives. Rather, the lesson plans were based on common-sense beliefs about teaching and learning, such as, "I use this activity because it is fun for my students." These factors prompted me to ask, "What am I doing wrong?" As a result, I conducted an action research project that utilized elements of RTM to undertake a formative assessment of my students and myself in an effort to improve my classroom practices. Through active reflection, the project described here aimed to identify the gaps in my students' learning and to inspire changes to my teaching.

Literature Review

RTM and Teacher Education

Teacher training programs tend to be evaluated using student learning outcome data, standardized observations, and surveys (Worrell, Braceck, Dwyer, Geisinger, Marx, Noell, & Pianta, 2014). While these forms of assessment constitute valid and reliable sources of evidence and a foundation for judging the quality of teacher education, they may not provide teacher trainers with sufficient qualitative details about the merits of their individual practices. This information can be supplied through ongoing formative assessment and reflection using models such as RTM.

To date, RTM has been primarily implemented to help teachers and teacher trainees reflect on their own teaching practice (e.g., Hart et al., 2004; Weinburgh, Hart, & Carriere, 2007; Weinburgh, Smith, & Clark, 2008). However, teacher educators' chief goal is to support teachers and teacher trainees in developing teaching expertise. To do so, they have a responsibility to continue to learn and to reflect on their own teaching. As modeling is a common pedagogical component of teacher education programs, teacher educators can engage in the RTM model in order to promote reflection and learning for themselves and the pre- and in-service teachers enrolled in their courses.

Good Teaching

In order to deliver instruction that addresses the needs of teachers and teacher trainees, teacher educators need to ask themselves, "What constitutes good teaching?" Samples and Copeland (2013) and Bain (2004) postulate universal teaching principles that abide in all

academic disciplines: being knowledgeable, creating opportunities for critical thinking, placing high expectations on students, providing feedback, promoting active learning, and engaging in continuous self-assessment aimed at improving teaching practices. These principles can be used as a starting point in evaluating one's own teaching practice.

Constructivist approaches to teaching that are based on the belief that learning occurs as a result of an active construction and reconstruction of reality and is dependent on variables such as prior knowledge (schemata) and beliefs about the world (Bruner, 1961; von Glasersfeld, 1995; Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978), are considered superior to traditional, teacher-centered approaches based in positivism (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Prince & Felder, 2006). The main characteristics of a constructivist classroom include linking the content of instruction to students' prior knowledge, providing appropriate scaffolding, promoting collaborative tasks, and guiding students in the attainment of independent learning (Fosnot, 1996; Prince & Felder, 2006).

Active learning, which conforms to constructivist theories of teaching, can be defined as student-focused learning that is engaging, interactive, and cognitively demanding. The use of active learning tasks, such as posing challenging questions or comparing, contrasting, and integrating ideas, leads to increased learning motivation and allows students to take responsibility for their own learning as they make decisions regarding how to conduct the task at hand (Blumenfeld, Soloway, Marx, Krajcik, Guzdial, & Palincsar, 1991). The use of active learning tasks also is positively related to improved critical thinking (Astin, 1993; Shim & Walczak, 2012).

Research on effective teaching additionally suggests that instructional activities that engage students in problem solving and activate higher-order thinking skills are positively correlated with learning outcomes (e.g., Hake, 1998; Jakee, 2011). Similarly, inductive instructional approaches, such as inquiry learning, problem- and project-based learning, just-in-time teaching, discovery procedures, and task-based instruction, "[have been] found to be at least equal to, and in general more effective than, traditional deductive methods for achieving a broad range of learning outcomes" (Prince & Felder, 2006, p. 123).

Finally, good teaching should be guided by clear goals and objectives that place a range of cognitive demands on learners. Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956) helps teachers to set clear learning goals for students, as well as, to develop and deliver appropriate instruction. In addition, the taxonomy enables instructors to create valid assessment tools and helps learners to develop appropriate and effective learning strategies.

Exploratory Action Research Project

Context and Objectives

In reflecting on their teaching, instructors can scrutinize syllabi, course objectives, assignments, lectures, activities, and methods of assessment. RTM, with its sequence of plan-teach-debrief, provides a useful formative assessment framework for teacher education program analysis while at the same time enabling teacher educators to model reflective teaching practices to teachers and teacher trainees.

This reflective action research project was conducted in an in-service EFL endorsement course for Norwegian EFL elementary school teachers. The objectives of the project were to reflect on and

improve teaching practice while modeling reflective teaching. The course in which the action research was conducted was rooted in constructivist approaches to teaching and learning (Bruner, 1961; von Glasersfeld, 1995; Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978), and the project focused on examining the effectiveness of explicit and implicit learning, active, and experiential learning. The course curriculum included the following topics: foundations of first and second language acquisition, approaches to language teaching, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2013), Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956), multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1995), and designing teaching materials, resources, and activities.

As the final course project, the participants were asked to deliver a grade-level appropriate lesson plan and reflection paper. Students completed two drafts of this assignment during the course of the semester. The first draft was submitted before I undertook the analysis of course activities and implemented changes to my teaching practice. The second draft was submitted at the end of the semester after I had implemented changes to the course.

Because this project aimed at changing my own teaching practices and improving student learning, an action research design was used. Action research seeks solutions to a specific local problem, is typically cyclical and reflective in nature, requires the active participation of the researcher, and leads to change. The action reflection cycle usually consists of the following steps: reflection on a problem or a question, making a plan of action, taking action to execute the plan, and repeated reflection (Elliot, 1991). In this project, I integrated the action reflection cycle with the RTM plan-teach-debrief sequence. The first step in the cycle consisted of the analysis and evaluation of students' first drafts of mandatory course work (reflection on a problem or a question), followed by an examination of my own teaching practices (debriefing and making a plan of action). I then revised my lesson plans and implemented changes in my teaching (taking action to execute the plan), and finally evaluated the students' second drafts of mandatory coursework (repeated reflection/debriefing). I provide a detailed account of each of the stages next.

Reflection

Course assignments. The first step in this action research project consisted of an evaluation of students' first drafts of mandatory coursework. Due to institutional constraints, summative assessment in the course in which this project was undertaken is restricted to a final paper (lesson plan and reflection) and an individual oral exam. Therefore, I conducted ongoing formative assessment to identify strengths and weaknesses in my teaching and introduce changes as needed. I usually used the checklist of the best teaching practices provided in Samples and Copeland (2013; adapted from Wankat & Oreovicz, 1993). Even though I believed that my instruction fulfilled most of the "good teaching" criteria (Samples & Copeland, 2013, p. 183), I decided to engage in a more detailed reflection process as I noticed that my students were not achieving the following course outcomes:

- Describe theories underlying various second and foreign language teaching methodologies.
- Identify variables that affect the process of second and foreign language acquisition.
- Apply theoretical knowledge to activity and lesson development and planning.
- Design age- and proficiency-level appropriate English teaching

materials, activities, activity plans, and assessment tools.

Assessment of first drafts. The first drafts were evaluated using an assignment rubric (Appendix A). Most of the teachers in this course used the "What? How? and Why?" template to design their lessons focused on the reading of a story book. I did not impose the use of the template and my informal analysis lead me to believe that the template was not a systematic approach supported by theoretical underpinnings but rather, a commonly used template for lesson planning in Norway. Table 1 presents a short excerpt from one student's first draft.

Table 1
Excerpt From a Student's First Draft

Time	What to Do	How to Do It	Why I Do It
7 minutes	Clarify the task (write alternative story ending) and criteria.	Talk to the class, and hand out the criteria on paper. See if anyone has any questions regarding the task.	To give the needed information both in writing and orally.
15 minutes	Pair them up.	Working with a partner.	To give them the opportunity to communicate and collaborate.

Based on the analysis of the lesson plans, the following challenges were identified:

- Lessons were teacher-centered (e.g., teachers stated the lesson goals) versus student-centered (e.g., brainstorming with students to activate their schemata).
- No content and language objectives were stated.
- Students were typically told to read aloud and explain unknown words in the core activity.
- Whole class discussion was the most common activity in the follow-up stage.
- Students were asked to draw their favorite character from the book or design a front page of a wordbook rather than being engaged in activities that focused on language development.
- Scaffolding was minimal and usually provided through drawings/pictures, body language, and a word bank.
- There was no explicit mention of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1995), and only linguistic, visual-spatial, and intrapersonal intelligences were accommodated.
- Justifications for the selection of specific activities were weak and intuitive, typically based on personal beliefs rather than relevant theory or research.

In sum, the teachers struggled to make links with language learners' background knowledge; create learner-centered activities that engaged all eight intelligences (Gardner, 1995); select activities that were linked to the learning objectives; provide sufficient scaffolding or assistance in completing tasks; ensure a balance between explicit focus on language forms and functions; and develop communicative competence. They also

were unable to use theory or current research findings to justify their pedagogical choices. These conclusions prompted me to undertake a close examination of my own teaching and to adjust my practices.

Plan of Action

Assessment of instructional practices. The second step in the research cycle consisted of the evaluation of my teaching practice. Course activities from the first half of the semester, amounting to nine hours of instruction, were examined. I performed a detailed analysis of the types of activities that I used in my lectures, classifying each as either implicit, explicit deductive, or explicit inductive. I also identified each activity as either an experiential learning or loop input activity (see Table 2).

Table 2
Analysis of Course Activities

Session Topic	Activity	Activity Type	Delivery Method
SIOP model	SIOP components: instant expert/jigsaw	Explicit inductive: students 'assemble' the model in a collaborative task	Loop input: instant expert is modeled using course content
Communicative language teaching	Venn diagram: compare and contrast foods you like and dislike	Implicit: students model the activity	Experiential learning: language task appropriate for elementary school learners
Teaching grammar	Guided lecture notes	Explicit deductive: students complete lecture notes while listening to the lecture	N/A

The results confirmed that I practiced "good teaching" (Samples & Copeland, 2013, p. 183). I found that I used a lot of tasks that reflected my belief in the superiority of constructivist approaches to learning, such as collaborative loop input and experiential learning tasks. The majority of the activities also were cognitively demanding, as they engaged students in analyzing, creating, comparing, and explaining, which are associated with high cognitive demands (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956). In addition, I noticed that I preferred explicit inductive or implicit tasks. Instead of introducing a topic and lecturing on general principles, I engaged my students in tasks in which they analyzed the materials and arrived at conclusions independently. For example, they read and presented new information using a graphic organizer, became topic experts, and then taught new information to their classmates. Other times, they experienced language tasks by actively participating in them. On the rare occasions when I chose to lecture, I provided students with guided notes to engage them with the material (Larwin & Larwin, 2013).

Pedagogical Practice: Scaffolding and the Loop Input

The analysis above seemed to suggest that my teaching practices conformed to my beliefs about good teaching. However, a closer look at the delivery of several experiential and loop input activities revealed that I provided my students with limited scaffolding and opportunities to debrief and reflect on their own learning process. Table 3 provides examples of the activity analysis procedure that I used for an in-depth reflection on my teaching.

Table 3
Analysis of Experiential and Loop Input Activities

Activity	Teaching Phase 1	Teaching Phase 2	Debriefing	Scaffolding
SIOP components: instant expert / jigsaw (loop input)	Group work to become experts on an assigned SIOP component	New groups and reciprocal teaching	N/A	N/A
Venn diagram: compare and contrast (experiential learning)	Write a list of foods you like and dislike	Compare your list with a partner; find similarities and differences	N/A	Graphic organizer, but no modeling about how to use it
Bingo: key terms (loop input)	Make bingo cards using key terms	Play bingo using cards from Step 1	N/A	Minimal: an example of a bingo card
Student generated questions about a text (loop input)	Write skinny and fat questions about a text on some aspect of teaching theory	Students answer each other's questions	N/A	Teacher models one skinny and one fat question

As I analyzed each activity, I noticed that students had several opportunities to engage in active learning. The activities were engaging, interactive, and cognitively demanding. Nevertheless, I expected my students to complete challenging tasks outside of their zones of proximal development (ZPD: Vygotsky, 1978) independently, and I almost never provided them with the chance to reflect explicitly on the learning process in class. I realized that I had become so focused on implementing inductive and implicit teaching that I ignored the possible benefits of explicit instruction.

Action

Pedagogical practice: Combining deductive and inductive learning. Based on my analysis, I identified the following areas of weakness in my teaching:

- Over-reliance on inductive and implicit teaching methods.

- Lack of reflection/deconstruction in experiential learning and loop input activities.
- Minimal scaffolding during student-centered activities.

As a result of my intense focus on using learner-centered teaching methods, I overlooked the importance of explicit learning processes. Explicit teaching is not limited to lecturing, which I use sporadically, but also can be implemented by intentionally drawing students' attention to content. For example, students can be asked to figure out rules or to reflect on a task they have completed (Prince & Felder, 2006). In teaching methods such as loop input or experiential learning, this means that participants should have an opportunity to suspend their participation in the activity being modeled in order to analyze it (Woodward, 1988, 2003). Finally, the results of my teaching reflection suggested that I used insufficient scaffolding, assuming that my students were able to act as experts and create ZPD for each other without external help from the instructor.

To address these weaknesses, I implemented revised teaching practices in the second half of the semester. I did not abandon active learning practices for the sake of lecturing, but I set a goal for myself to help students make explicit links between the content of the course and real-life applications (e.g., their classrooms: Blumenfeld et al., 1991). In addition to stating the learning objectives at the beginning of each class, I also drew students' attention to the objectives throughout the lesson (Bloom et al., 1956; Echevarría et al., 2013). Whenever an activity or a teaching method was modeled, we also took time to debrief and reflect (Woodward, 1988, 2003). Moreover, I added various scaffolding techniques to create learning conditions that enabled students to develop with support from their peers and myself (Bruner, 1961). I used task modeling and clear examples, and asked cognitively demanding questions. I modeled and encouraged the use of various graphic organizers as well as physical and verbal tools to help students recall prior knowledge (Echevarría et al., 2013).

Finally, I invited my students to participate in the creation of an improved lesson-planning template. I asked them to consolidate the major findings from applied linguistics, language learning and teaching, and second language acquisition theories to create an enhanced tool for their lesson planning. They were explicitly instructed to include the principles of communicative language teaching, content-based instruction, Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences (1995), SIOP model (Echevarría, et al., 2013), and Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956). This engaged them in critical thinking and helped them apply the core course concepts in their own classrooms.

The majority of the students initially followed the "What?, How?, Why?" template when planning lessons for their final course project. As we engaged in a discussion about good teaching practices and effective lesson planning, as well as undertook a summary of the key concepts covered in the course, the participants suggested that we add "When?" to the template. The revised template reflected the EFL/ESL lesson-planning framework proposed by Brinton and Holten (1997) consisting of the following stages: *into* which focuses on activating students' schemata; *through* which is the core component of the lesson and where students learn new language and content; and *beyond* in which students apply learned skills, content, and language to new contexts. In particular, I was impressed with their suggestion to include this addition to the lesson-planning template as, while I had followed the model in my delivery of the course, it was

not until I added the deconstruction step to my implicit modeling that my students noticed and acknowledged this practice as valuable and relevant.

Repeated Reflection

Assessment of second drafts. Following the implementation of modified instruction, the students submitted their second drafts of the assignment, which were compared to their first drafts and evaluated using the assignment rubric (Appendix A). Overall, the second drafts exhibited greater conscious planning and better integration of course concepts. The lesson plans followed the template students had generated during the collaborative activity. The lesson plans also included detailed content and language objectives to guide each lesson. Most of the objectives were written using Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956), and the students' applied theoretical concepts and practical skills learned during the course to justify their pedagogical choices. Table 4 illustrates these improvements.

Table 4
Excerpt from a Student's Second Draft

When	What to Do	How to Do It	Why I Do It
Into 15 minutes	Activating schemata and introducing the task and criteria (write alternative story ending).	In small groups, students arrange pictures in chronological order and recreate the story.	To activate background information (retell the story).
Through 25 minutes	Write alternative story ending.	Students select story elements (who, what, where) and rewrite the story ending in small groups.	To provide opportunities for collaborative learning (interpersonal intelligence), output, interaction and negotiation of meaning.

Overall, the main improvements noted in the second drafts can be summarized as follows:

- Lesson plans were organized logically and followed a detailed template.
- Content and language learning objectives were stated.
- Student-centered activities were present as well as teacher-centered learning activities.
- Teaching activities and strategies that had been modeled in the course were present in the lesson plans (e.g., instant expert, mind maps, making predictions).
- There was increased use of authentic materials and prompts.
- There were explicit and implicit references to different intelligences.
- Students manifested reasoning based on language teaching theory and methodology, increased their use of professional terminology, and provided in-depth reflections.

- Students correctly applied the following key concepts: building background, increasing motivation, activating schemata, providing meaningful input, enhancing metacognitive skills, reflecting on the learning process, developing predicting skills, and using collaborative learning strategies.

The repeated reflection, which consisted of a detailed analysis of the second drafts, concluded this action research project. However, as I continue to reflect on my teaching practice, I believe that the findings presented here apply to all my courses.

Action research has serious limitations. Without the implementation of direct measures, it is impossible to determine to what extent other variables affected the results. Factors such as instruction time, student attitudes, and feedback on the first drafts likely also played a role in facilitating student development. Nevertheless, it seems that, at least locally, ongoing assessment of teaching methods and continued reflective practice can positively impact student success.

Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to report on an action research project conducted in an EFL endorsement course aimed at improving pedagogical practices in the course. Shim and Walczak (2012) argued that in order to teach critical thinking skills effectively, college instructors needed to develop their ability to "organize the class presentations, formulate and ask challenging questions in class, give clear explanations about abstract concepts, and encourage students to apply course concepts" (p. 25). The project presented here involved reflecting on my own teaching practice (Hart et al., 2004) in order to identify the characteristics of course activities that can increase students' critical thinking and thus improve the attainment of course objectives. The findings suggested that more cognitively demanding tasks, in particular tasks that require analysis and reflection (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956), consistent with the decompression stage in the input loop (Woodward, 1988, 2003), increased students' abilities to apply learned knowledge to new tasks. In addition, inviting students to participate in the creation of a detailed, explicit paradigm to guide their lesson planning resulted in most students being able to create a logically sequenced lesson based in applied linguistics theory.

Research on effective teaching in higher education has identified several approaches as effective in promoting students' learning and cognitive growth. In particular, inductive, learner-centered teaching activities, such as collaborative tasks that engage higher order thinking skills, have been deemed effective (Bain, 2004; Samples & Copeland, 2013; Shim & Walczak, 2012). My pre-intervention teaching methods were based in constructivism, and I fostered active, collaborative learning in my classes. Nevertheless, I realized that I needed to make some modifications if I wanted my students to achieve the course objectives. My findings lead me to conclude that a one-size instructional approach does not fit all students' needs. Each class is comprised of individuals with varying needs and learning styles, and thus, needs to be planned accordingly. While overall, it is important to engage students in active learning tasks, it is crucial for teacher educators to conduct ongoing formative assessment of student attainment as well as their own teaching in order to implement pedagogical practices that are best suited for their classrooms.

References

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York, NY: Longman.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education, 32*(3), 1-18. doi:10.1007/BF00138871

Bloom, B., Englehart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W., & Karthwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain.* New York, NY: Longman.

Blumenfeld, P., Soloway, E., Marx, R., Krajcik, J., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3), 369-398. doi: 10.1080/00461520.1991.9653139

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brinton, D. M., & Holten, C. (1997). Into, through, and beyond: A framework to develop content-based material. *English Teaching Forum, 35*(4), 10-22.

Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, *31*(1), 21-32.

Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners. The SIOP model (4th Edition).* Boston, MA, & New York, NY: Pearson.

Elliot, J. (1991). *Action research for educational change.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Fosnot, C. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspective, and practice* (pp. 8-23). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Hake, R. (1998). Interactive engagement vs. traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. *American Journal of Physics*, *66*(1), 64-74. doi:10.1119/1.18809

Hart, L. C., Najee-ullah, D., & Schultz, K. (2004). The reflective teaching model (RTM): A professional development model for in-service mathematics teachers. In R. Rubenstein (Ed.), *Perspectives on the teaching of mathematics* (pp. 207-218). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Jakee, K. (2011). Overhauling technical handouts for active student participation: A model for

improving lecture efficiency and increasing attendance. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*(1), 98-108.

Larwin, K. H., & Larwin, D. A. (2013). The impact of guided notes on post-secondary student achievement: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 25*(1), 47-58.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Prince, M. J., & Felder, R. M. (2006). Inductive teaching and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research base. *Journal of Engineering Education, 95*(2), 123-138. doi: 10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00884.x

Samples, J. W., & Copeland, S. E. (2013). The universality of good teaching: A study of descriptors across disciplines. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 25*(2), 176-188.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Shim, W., & Walczak, K. (2012). The impact of faculty teaching practices on the development of students' critical skills. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 24*(1), 16-30.

von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning.* London, England: Falmer Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wankat, P. C., & Oreovicz, F. S. (1993). *Teaching engineering.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Weinburgh, M. H., Hart, L., & Carriere, J. (2007). A new perspective on integrating math and science: The Decatur elementary math/science project. In D. F. Berlin, & A. L. White (Eds.), *Global issues, challenges, and opportunities to advance science and mathematics education* (pp. 21-38). Columbus: OH: International Consortium for Research in Science and Mathematics Education.

Weinburgh, M., Smith, K., & Clark, J. (2008). Using the reflective teaching model in a year-long professional development: A case study of a second year urban elementary teacher. *Electronic Journal of Science Education, 12*(2), 22-40.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology*, *17*(2), 89-100. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

Woodward, T. (1988). Loop-input: A new strategy for trainers. *System*, *16*(1), 23-28. doi:10.1016/0346-251X(88)90006-1

Woodward, T. (2003). Loop input. *The ELT Journal, 57*(3), 301-304. doi:10.1093/elt/57.3.301

Worrell, F., Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., & Pianta, R. (2014). *Assessing and evaluating teacher preparation programs.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Appendix A

Course Assignment and Grading Rubric

Learning goals

You will be able to:

- Select and adapt grade level appropriate instructional materials for your students
- Write grade level appropriate language learning objectives
- Select and prepare activities that promote the specified language learning objectives
- Design a lesson plan following the INTO-THROUGH-BEYOND model. Your lesson plan must include at least one communicative activity and a grammar point (which can be taught implicitly or explicitly)
- Develop writing skills associated with writing an academic text in English

Components of the assignment

The assignment consists of a lesson plan and an essay in which you reflect on your pedagogical choices and the delivery of the lesson.

Lesson plan: Your lesson should focus on a story book and be planned for about 90 minutes of instruction time. You can assume that it is one of the lessons in a sequence – if so, briefly explain what your students already know and what will happen next. Select the following components of your lesson:

a) Topic
b) Lesson objectives including language (i.e. grammatical/functional structure such as subject-verb agreement, tense, aspect, greetings, apologies). Remember that the language and the activities you select have to be grade-level appropriate – consult the relevant objectives for English language learning in the national curriculum if necessary.
c) Activities
d) Materials

You have to use the Into-Through-Beyond design. State the time you predict for each activity. Create and include supplementary materials whenever possible (e.g., handouts, power points, materials to be used on a Smartboard), and list the ones you cannot include (e.g. a link to a video, a book or a game you would be using). You can adapt materials that you have already used with your students or that are available to you as a part of the course package provided by the school. Be creative!

Essay: Write a 2-3 page essay in which you justify the choice of objectives, materials, and activities for your lesson. In your paper, make at least three references to the required course readings. Your paper should have the following sections (1-2 paragraphs each):

a) An introduction - a brief description of your lesson (topic/theme, objectives, strategies)
b) Objectives – What objectives did you select for your lesson? (i.e. What do you want your students to be able to do? Are you teaching the language point implicitly or explicitly? Why?)
c) Into – What activities did you select for the Into stage and why?
d) Through – What activities did you select for the Through stage and why?
e) Beyond – What activities did you select for the Beyond stage and why?
f) Reflection – Reflect on the teaching of this lesson. Were you able to engage your students? Were the activities easy/difficult to implement? Did you meet the objectives? What would you do differently next time you teach this lesson?
g) Conclusion – a summary of the main points and a closing statement
h) A list of references – list all sources you have referred to in your text. Please remember to use correct in-text citations as well.

Grading Rubric

Criterion	Points (0-3)	Comments
Lesson plan		
The lesson is centered around a story		
Lesson objectives are stated and are measurable (do NOT use verbs such as 'know' or 'understand'; refer to Bloom's taxonomy for appropriate verbs)		
The objectives include specific language goals, and these include vocabulary and a grammar point		
All activities are grade-level appropriate		
The lesson plan follows the INTO-THROUGH-BEYOND model		
The lesson plan includes at least three SIOP components		
All supplementary materials are either included (whenever possible) or described		
Time predicted for each activity is stated		
Essay content		
The essay contains a brief description/overview of the lesson		
Each of the sections of the lesson (Into, Through, and Beyond) and the selected activities are described and justified		
The essay contains a detailed reflection on pedagogical choices and the implementation of the lesson		
The main points are summarized in a conclusion		
There are at least three references to the required readings		
Essay format		
The essay is logically divided into paragraphs (sections)		
The formatting is consistent (font size and style, margins, page numbering)		
The essay is written using grammatically correct, academic English, including correct punctuation and capitalization		

Author

Anna Krulatz, PhD, is an Associate Professor of English in the Department of Teacher Education at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Social and Educational Sciences where she works with pre- and in-service English teachers. Her main interests include second language teaching methodology with focus on interlanguage pragmatics, content-based instruction, multilingualism, and teacher education. Anna can be reached at: anna.m.krulatz@ntnu.no