Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in TEYL Lesson Plans and Microteaching Presentations

Mustafa Akın Güngör & Müzeyyen Nazlı Güngör

Gazi University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Pedagogical reasoning enables student-teachers to better understand their own teaching practices, analyse what, why and how they teach, and become aware of their teaching practices. This case study aims to understand student- teachers' decisions and the pedagogical reasoning behind these decisions in lesson plans in an English language pre-service education programme. Three third-year English language student-teachers enrolled in a pedagogical content knowledge course "Teaching English to Young Learners" (TEYL) participated in this study. We collected qualitative data from lesson plans, reflection notes on these performances and plans, and interviews with student-teachers in the TEYL course. We used Shulman's model of pedagogical reasoning and action as a conceptual model to explore the complexity of learning to teach English to young learners. Data were analysed iteratively through content and thematic analysis. The results indicated that student-teachers made decisions mainly in the transformation and instruction stages, and that their pedagogical reasoning emerged from the theory of TEYL and their assumptions about the characteristics of very young and young learners. More opportunities should be provided to increase their self-consciousness, self-knowledge and sense of agency through reflective tasks, action research projects and teaching practice. The study has implications for student-teachers who need guidance and motivation to prepare reflective lesson plans and for teacher educators who need to raise student-teachers' awareness about decision making and pedagogical reasoning.

Keywords: pedagogical reasoning, lesson planning, student-teachers, English, microteaching, TEYL

Introduction

Lesson planning has always been a fundamental competence for student-teachers (STs) around the world. It has been stated as a target competence for STs to gain in methodology courses such as teaching English to young

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022 **177**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

learners (TEYL), practicum in Turkey (CoHE, 2018) and in P-12 teacher education programme accreditation in the US (Pang, 2016). In these programmes, quality teaching has been related to teachers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and planning a lesson and implementing instruction appear as two vital competences for STs to master (Liyanage & Bartlett, 2010). Lesson planning has also been viewed as a notable characteristic of expert teachers (Farrell, 2013; Tsui, 2009).

At pre-service level, planning lessons and microteaching are offered within methodology courses. STs are assessed based on their preparation and readiness in lesson plans and performances in micro teachings. From this perspective, it is widely accepted that STs can best reflect their teaching skills and competences in lesson plans and micro teachings (Pang, 2016). Through enriched reasoned and reflected teaching experiences in these courses (Nilsson, 2009), STs may be aware of their knowledge needs, and build bridges between theory and practice meaningfully. Similarly, Zeichner (1995) argues that taking STs' attention to certain aspects of their teaching via reflection and reasoning was necessary for increasing their awareness and developing critical eye in the future.

Decision making and pedagogical reasoning are main concepts in teachers' lesson planning and effective teaching (Loughran, 2019; Pang, 2016). Teachers make approximately ten decisions per hour during their instruction (Asghari et al., 2021). The quality of these decisions affect their effective teaching strategies and lesson delivery. There are various factors shaping teachers' decisions: students' background, age, emotions, interests and needs, the nature of the lesson, duration, teaching materials, objectives, and the syllabus (Boadu et al., 2020). As a result of these factors, we make decisions and be aware of contextual limitations and tensions, make adaptations, evaluate effective strategies, and then prefer appropriate techniques. Freeman (1989) considers teaching as a decision making process in which teachers observe, try to understand, reach answers and employ appropriate strategies in their classes.

For Shulman (1987), these decision making steps establish pedagogical reasoning. Pedagogical reasoning has been considered an essential component for STs to develop professionally and intellectually (Nilsson, 2009; Pang, 2016). Decision making and pedagogical reasoning take time, require critical analysis of their teaching moments, involve a process with dynamics; therefore, exploring the reasons behind these decisions helps teacher educators understand what they do and why they do it in instruction giving, and STs become more empowered to search for new ways of qualifying their teaching. Teaching consists of a cyclical process of reasoning and transformation (Shulman, 1987). This cycle starts with comprehension and continues subsequently in order of transformation, instruction, evaluation, reflection, and new comprehension (Shulman, 1987, p. 14). In this model, a teacher starts with comprehension in which they first endeavour to understand the subject matter, the functions and notions of the topic, real

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022

178

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

contexts in which the target structures can be applied, and the aims of their teaching. Next, through critical analysis of materials for communication purposes, the teacher goes into a critical interpretation of the subject matter, pedagogy, and context either by using analogies, metaphors, or examples, or by using realia or authentic tasks to represent the learning content most effectively. In this way, the teacher makes sure that the target content is clear to students regardless of their diverse learning styles. Then, the teacher is engaged in managing the classroom, explaining, interacting with students, discussing and providing effective teaching. This is the instruction stage in which they enact the observable performance with appropriate practical teaching strategies. Following instruction is evaluation which includes monitoring of learning during teaching, formal testing to give feedback to students, and reconsidering materials, the lesson delivery of the teacher, and the lesson, which leads to reflection at the same time. In the reflection stage, the teacher reflects on his actions and recaptures the important moments, emotions, strengths and/or weaknesses of the lesson to derive new understandings regarding their preferences made in the planning and instruction stages. As a result of the reflection, the teacher achieves new insights into their teaching through experience.

The role of pedagogical reasoning and decision making in lesson plans has captured the attention of various scholars in the teacher education field (Asghari et al., 2021; Cheng et al., 2014; Nilsson, 2009). Liyanage and Bartlett (2010) attempted to address the problem of STs' lesson planning by establishing their own model that included their deliberate metacognitive structuring of a lesson both in planning and review phases. Their study confirmed positive shifts in STs' holistic thinking and a student-centeredness in the critical perspectives they took in both planning and review. Similarly, Cheng et al. (2014) focused on STs to understand whether and how they developed their pedagogical understanding and made development during the teacher education programme. The integration of pedagogical understanding with the teaching contexts, integration of feedback from educators and their focus of concern may be the causes for STs' differences in pedagogical understanding. Their study suggests teacher educators enhance STs' sense of agency with an awareness of individual beliefs and theories about learning and teaching. Nilsson (2009) explored the critical incidents which influence STs' pedagogical reasoning in learning to teach with their concerns and needs. As a result, it was found that incidents which were related to classroom management and students' attitudes and learning were the mostly stated factors which affected their pedagogical reasoning. Kavanagh et al. (2020) aimed to understand to what extent and in what ways teacher educators mediated novice teachers' opportunities to engage in pedagogical reasoning. Their results indicated that teacher educators supported novice teachers in representing, decomposing and approximating teaching in practice-based teacher education, which

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022   **179**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

valued pedagogical reasoning. Novice teachers were also the focus of Asghari et al.'s (2021) study in which they aimed to identify the novice English teachers' decisions and the pedagogical reasons behind their decisions. They identified six decisions teachers frequently made in implementing instructions and a list of pedagogical reasons such as time management, COVID-19, students' levels, using L1, and so on. Başar (2021) also investigated the main reasons behind English language instructors' decision making skills when departing from pre-planned lesson plans. Affective factors, academic needs, classroom management and timing were found to be the main reasons behind the departure. Also, these teachers' beliefs in deviation from lesson plans were consistent with the decisions they made during their teaching practice. It is advised for teacher educators to prepare STs not only for ideal lesson plans but also the realities of the real teaching atmospheres by giving room for STs' decision making skills against unprecedented incidents.

As the literature shows, although pedagogical reasoning and lesson planning were investigated from different perspectives in different contexts, there has been a scarcity of research for STs' pedagogical reasoning and decision making skills in second language teacher education microteaching sessions. Therefore, this study examines the decisions made by English language STs and the pedagogical reasoning behind these decisions in a methodology course "Teaching English to Young Learners" in a pre-service programme. Accordingly, this study addresses the research questions below:

- What decisions do STs make in TEYL microteaching courses?
- What are the pedagogical reasons behind these decisions?

Methodology

The study utilised a case study method which was exploratory and descriptive in nature in the data collection and analysis procedures (Mackey & Gass, 2015). Case study research design was employed because it allows researchers to capture and describe the complexity of real-life events.

Participants

Three third-year English language student-teachers participated in this study. They were attending the TEYL course at the time of the study. Their ages were 20. One of them was male while the rest were female. The courses they had taken in the programme were advanced writing, listening, speaking, reading, approaches and methods, special teaching methods, literature, linguistics and language acquisition. Ali (the male ST) was interested in teaching very young learners. He was teaching kindergarten students at the time of the study. He is an affectionate, passionate and hardworking student-teacher. İrem (one of

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022   **180**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

the female participants) just started to tutor secondary school pupils during the study. It was a new experience for her. Through this study, she became more empowered to seek new ways of conceptualising her own teaching techniques and practices. Leyla (the other participant) was new to the TEYL field. The course was the first place for her to be introduced to the field. She had no teaching experience before. The participants were selected through purposive sampling from the ELT programme of a large state university in Middle Anatolia in Türkiye. They submitted consent forms before the study. The reason for preferring purposive sampling and case study design was to gain a rich and deeper understanding of their decisions and pedagogical reasoning. For ethical reasons, participating STs were given pseudonyms. The study was approved by the university ethics committee.

Data Collection

Data came from three sources: STs' lesson plans, reflection notes on these performances and plans, and interviews with student-teachers in the TEYL course. In this way, we aimed to achieve methodological triangulation in data collection. In terms of the TEYL syllabus, STs were required to prepare two lesson plans: one for preparing a song, an art and craft, and a game for very young learners, and the other one for storytelling, and to perform these plans in microteaching sessions. STs referred to their decisions and pedagogical reasoning in three stages of the lesson plans: pre-stage, while-stage and post-stage of the lesson. In other words, each ST developed at least three decisions and reasons per lesson plan. According to the rules of the course, the topic/theme of the plans were assigned by the teacher educator for each ST separately. These plans and microteaching performances took place twice in an academic term, one for midterm and the other one for final evaluation. In total, we collected six lesson plans and participated in six presentations.

Table 1. Data collection details

Data source	Data collection timing	Aim of the tools
Two lesson plans per ST	one in April and one in June	to help STs plan their teaching presentations, to evaluate STs' techniques and strategies in planning
Reflection notes per ST	one in April and one in June	to enable them to self-evaluate their plans and performances
Interviews with STs	one after midterm presentation, the other one after final presentation	to deepen researchers' understanding of STs' reasoning

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022 **181**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

Next, the participants were asked to write their reflections on their plans and performances. In the face-to-face interviews which were conducted after the presentations, they were requested to verbalise their decisions and explain their reasons behind in detail while they were revising their lesson plans step by step. Their responses were audio-recorded and later transcribed for content analysis. Their reflections were also analysed in content and themes.

Data Analysis

Shulman's (1987) pedagogical reasoning model was used as the data analysis framework in this study. Data analysis started with content analysis and thematic categorization (Mackey & Gass, 2015). First, each researcher read each data set repeatedly to identify recurring themes from the comprehension to the evaluation stages of Shulman (1987). In this way, we focused on understanding the decisions and reasons behind them which they preferred in simulated contexts. Then, they came together and compared their analysis for inter-rater reliability (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The agreement rate for each data set was found to be 90% and above.

Results

Results were presented in order of the research questions. Both research questions were addressed in relation to Shulman's cycle. So, as an answer to the first research question, we identified the types of decisions each ST reported in their plans and made in microteaching presentations from comprehension to evaluation stages. To start with the first ST, İrem prepared one lesson plan for teaching English to young learners (ages 6–12) and one for very young learners (ages 3–6). Her assigned topic for the first plan was Farm Animals for young learners and for the second plan was Life Below Water for very young learners.

İrem's decisions came from the target age group learners' characteristics, learning styles and her pedagogical content knowledge. She tried to transform the theoretical knowledge she gained in courses into practice in the plans and presentations. Since it was quite a difficult transformation for her at the first lesson plan, she gained self-confidence and got used to thinking and behaving like a very young learner thanks to the in-class sample teaching activities in TEYL courses. Below (Table 2) we present İrem's decisions and pedagogical reasoning behind them.

İrem reflected on her overall plan and performance after her micro-teaching. On her performance, she stated: "I recognized the fact that I love preparing materials for young learners". She discovered herself and the target group. She developed herself in terms of body language use, using her voice effectively, and full teaching potential to very young learners.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022 **182**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

Table 2. İrem's decisions and reasons

Pedagogical reasoning cycle	STs' decisions	STs' pedagogical reasoning behind these decisions
comprehension	using simple past tense for 6-year-old learners for a series of actions sea animals did below water	to enable them to be familiar with the "World Oceans Day", to learn about actions for saving the ocean, and to make sentences with the target vocabulary items
transformation	choosing elicitation technique, decorating the class like ocean	to raise curiosity of learners, to help them imagine the ocean and familiarise themselves with target words about ocean
instruction	using storybook, guided listening activity, story-reading technique trash collection game	to take their attention, to engage them in the story actively, to raise their awareness about saving the ocean
evaluation	story sequencing activity, controlled writing activity	to check their memory about the story, to improve their visual literacy

She also mentioned: "TEYL lesson plans taught me the fact that each and every method has a meaning and a purpose to be used according to learners' needs and interests."

For example, comprehension, in Shulman's (1987) definition, means that teachers should first understand the subject matter themselves and then understand how ideas are connected. From this aspect, İrem said that she had a good knowledge of subject matter in the topics of lesson plan (the use of simple past tense for narration). As for her own self-confidence to teach it, she had some hesitations due to learners' age, mother tongue and characteristics. Hence, in her midterm lesson plan, she did not prefer kinesthetic activities very much for fear of losing the classroom management and students' concentration. This could have affected her evaluation and performance in the eyes of the teacher educator. However, in her final presentation, she became more aware of the teaching methods and techniques. She related this improvement to the in-class short sample teaching activities in which the educator guided the whole class in the TEYL sessions. She explained: "We planned everything so elaborately that we could show what we aimed for in the plan explicitly and successfully."

Second, Leyla's first plan was for young learners on the topic of "fruits" while her second plan was for very young learners and on the topic of "good health and wellbeing". She recycled healthy and unhealthy food she used in her first plan and connected them to her new topic in the second presentation. Different from İrem, Leyla's decisions emerged from her endeavour to relate her lesson plan to real classroom context because she believed that language learning should resemble daily life situations. In this way, she thought students could make sense of what they were learning in the classroom. She searched for the daily context

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022 **183**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

students communicated to each other on health and wellbeing, contacted classroom teachers about this topic used in kindergartens, and learnt what kind of activities they loved doing about it. As a result, she prepared a list of activities and tasks based on her research and preparation. Then, she related these activities to a set of useful language items by checking some language course books. Her aim was to engage students in a variety of real-like communicative activities in which they could use the target language for real purposes. In the post-stage of her plan, she considered students' motor skills and oral language development.

Table 3. Leyla's decisions and reasons

Pedagogical reasoning cycle	STs' decisions	STs' pedagogical reasoning behind these decisions
comprehension	using present simple tense for daily habits	to make the classroom learning real life like to create a real like context
transformation	participate in group work activities, singing a song, odd-one-out activity, preparing a healthy lunch box	to practice the target language orally, to reinforce learners' previous knowledge of colours and food (for recycling the words), to relate classroom tasks with daily life activities
instruction	using a puppet choosing a Hippo as the main character in the story (characterisation) letter recognition	to raise their curiosity, to create interaction, to enhance classroom interaction to develop their motor skills
evaluation	drawing and telling	to understand their comprehension of the topic via motor skills and oral production

Third, Ali's midterm presentation was for very young learners on the topic of "clothes" while his final presentation was on "celebrations" for 8-year-old young learners. Due to his target culture preference in the plan, he decided to choose "Halloween" as the "celebrations" theme. In case students may fear from some Halloween characters, he planned to choose some cute and age-appropriate characters and emphasise that they are all fictional characters. He prioritised concrete words and action verbs instead of abstract concepts. For this reason, he employed a game, art and craft activity, and a song to verbalise the characters and verbs through body language. He believed that students would better internalise the concepts and new words through interaction with each other. Thus, he mainly focused on speaking and listening skills in the design of his activities. Also, to address all learning styles, he incorporated four language skill-based activities in his plan. Unlike his peers, he preferred to check students' comprehension and give feedback in every stage of his lesson plan.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022   184

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

Table 4. Ali's decisions and reasons

Pedagogical reasoning cycle	STs' decisions	STs' pedagogical reasoning behind these decisions
comprehension	to practice "have/has got…" through Halloween characters for expressing possession.	to show possession through the materials of interesting characters
transformation	art and craft activity look and say approach watching and singing a song	to verbalise characters in practice of "have/has got" to help them visualise Halloween party and to give them an aim for oral participation
instruction	writing a letter	to practice party invitation for a friend
	a Halloween text	to practice reading for the main idea for spoken interaction
	a game	for encouraging extroverted students
	sing along the song and find a partner reading and letter writing activities	for encouraging introverted students
evaluation	using puppets, asking comprehension questions, ordering activities and "find your partner" activity using verbal positive reinforcement: "well done, great job, so on."	for checking and feedback as a guest in the classroom, for reading correction, for encouragement and positive reinforcement

Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the decisions STs made and the pedagogical reasons behind these decisions in TEYL lesson plans and microteaching presentations. Explored through lesson plans, observations of microteaching presentations, and reflection notes over an academic semester, the study yielded a range of decisions and reasons behind them across three STs. Rather than comparing these STs to each other as in some other studies (Tsui, 2009), the study in this paper provides a more descriptive and inclusive understanding of the STs' decisions and actions in a TEYL context. They prepared lesson plans individually as the course requirement. While they were preparing their microteaching presentations with materials and activities based on the lesson plans, they endeavoured to imagine a typical very young or young learner classroom, their behaviours, reactions, feelings and needs through British Council Kids videos, National Geographic videos, and other young learner channels on YouTube. Then, they transferred, adapted, and altered their decisions, plans and actions accordingly before the presentations. From this aspect, it may be criticised that STs did not observe a typical

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022 **185**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

classroom in the Turkish context in which they are expected to teach after the graduation, and so they did not internalise or understand the problems, situations or affordances they could meet. Hence, we agree with Nilsson (2009) in that STs should be provided with sample critical incidents to help them better foresee and understand the student profile and classroom situations in such methodology classes.

The first research question aimed to understand the decisions STs made in TEYL lesson plans and microteaching presentations while the second question was to identify the pedagogical reasons behind these decisions. Both decisions and their reasoning appeared to be closely related and complementary in STs' answers, so we preferred to present them in relation to each other here. Since they were in a simulated practice context at a pre-service programme and most of them had not been involved in a teaching practice before, they could not imagine what the actual young learner classrooms would be like or require them to react. Hence, their decisions mainly came from the techniques and principles (the theory) they learnt in the TEYL course.

Mostly preferred techniques for the "transformation" stage appear to be art & craft activities, using songs, and using visuals. This stage is defined to be the stage in which teachers adapt their content knowledge (subject matter knowledge) into forms and ways that are pedagogically powerful and responsive to learner varieties for effective teaching. All STs reasoned that students would learn best when they imagined the context which was the ocean in one example and the Halloween party in another. For this reason, they preferred addressing their visual learning style and imagination, which was parallel to students' characteristics as taught in the theoretical part of this course. For fear of losing classroom management and students' attention, however, they did not prefer kinesthetic activities in midterm presentations and lesson plans. They felt incompetent about learners' age (3–6 years old and 6-12 years-old target groups) and characteristics while they were preparing lesson plans for the first time. They believed that they would not be able to manage the class properly in their first microteaching attempt, so this became the deterring factor for them. Another reason for this was the teacher educator's evaluation criteria. In other words, they thought their lessons may not continue as they planned or expected in the lesson plan and this could cause lower grades for the TEYL course at the programme. Unlike the participants in Asghari et al.'s study (2018), the participants in this study did not prefer to use the native language of the students. A possible reason for this is the importance of English mediated instruction as suggested in TEYL theory and the teacher educator's limitations of STs about this issue. To better understand these STs' tendency, consistency and preference to keep teaching in the target language, future studies as also conducted by Güngör et al. (2019) may involve tracing, observing and interviewing novice teachers in terms of pedagogical reasons and

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022   **186**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

decisions they made in their own teaching contexts when they become novice teachers. One limitation of this study might be the fact that although they learnt in the theoretical part of the course, they could not identify the learner varieties in its exact sense for making their teaching effective and responsive. They assumed, imagined and contextualised their micro teachings only through videos and classroom descriptions as defined by the educator.

We are also aware that STs' decisions appeared mostly in the "transformation" and "instruction" stages of Shulman's (1987) cycle. To continue with the "instruction" stage, STs preferred using a puppet and a storybook about the target theme because they believed that students at these ages would learn best if their attention was taken and their curiosity aroused through their favourite materials they used in their daily lives (Pang, 2016). This finding is in line with that of Nilsson (2009) in which the participants emphasised the importance of connecting concepts to the pupils' everyday world to make it concrete for them. They also reasoned that if they were engaged in the story which was the learning context for them, they could achieve interaction, keep their attention, and encourage all students to speak authentically. Particularly, STs developed more self-confidence after the midterm presentations as the theoretical knowledge was transferred into practical knowledge more through sample art and craft, song, game, storytelling, simple listening, speaking, and limited reading and writing activities in the TEYL courses. Such a wide range of application of techniques in the class encouraged STs and deterred them from feeling ashamed of being ridiculous in front of their classmates. Clearly, as also acknowledged by Nilsson (2009), the teacher educators must understand the STs' emotions and reasons which could limit or enhance their decisions in preparing lesson plans and microteaching presentations. Accordingly, they may shape their methodology course content by taking these concerns, limitations or enhancements into consideration at pre-service programmes.

Another stage in which STs expressed their decisions and reasons was the "evaluation" although not varied as in two previous stages. STs decided to check students' comprehension by keeping their motor skills active (asking them to draw and tell), checking their memory (story sequencing activity), and giving feedback to them (verbal positive reinforcement through "well done, great, so on). They preferred to evaluate the students' learning or comprehension at the end of the lesson which was also the post-stage of the lesson plan (Pang, 2016). The simulated context made it difficult for STs to understand if and to what extent students in the real context would understand and learn or not in this stage. This, inevitably, shows us another limitation of the study resulting from simulated contexts. For this reason, they only referred to their peers' comments, feedback and questions to understand how much a real very young or young learner would understand or learn in the classroom.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022　　**187**

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ...

An important finding in this study is that STs felt confident about the subject matter knowledge due to the order and content of target topics to be taught to very young and young learners. The appropriate topics for this age group were seen as simple and mastery to any language user. For this reason, STs did not experience any anxiety or lack of self-confidence in the transformation, instruction or evaluation stages related to the target content. In that sense, the findings of this study should not be generalised over other methodology courses which were, for example, aimed for adult learners, but be compared and contrasted with other studies conducted in the TEYL context at pre-service programmes. However, their stress emerged from the age, characteristics and learning styles of this age group of students and the need to simplify the content to the characteristics of these students. As an overcoming strategy, they found it useful to observe and take notes of the comments and feedback provided by the educator on plans and performances of their peers throughout the term as also found out in Cheng et al.'s (2014) study.

In general, STs found the lesson planning and pedagogical reasoning practices in the TEYL course cognitively demanding but at the same time useful and awareness-raising. They could figure out the actual reasons and actions behind their decisions thanks to the pedagogical reasoning oriented lesson plans instead of trying to obey the course evaluation criteria or the educator's syllabus only. Through the pedagogical reasoning oriented lesson plans and interviews on presentations enabled them to reflective reasoning, STs could confirm or change their emerging beliefs about TEYL and gained multiple perspectives of their peers and the educator on the teaching and learning that took place in the presentations. Nevertheless, in order to better understand what STs think, know, believe and do, there is a need for more in-depth awareness raising studies which explore their pedagogical reasoning through longitudinal studies in language teacher cognition research as also suggested by Borg (2003) and Freeman (2002).

REFERENCES

Asghari, M., Alemi, M., & Tajeddin, Z. (2021). Novice EFL Teachers' Decision-making and Pedagogical Reasoning in Implementing Instruction. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, *13*(28).

Başar, S. (2021). Exploring EFL Teachers' Decision-Making Skills: Departure from Lesson Plans. *ELT Research Journal*, *10*(1), 61–82.

Boadu, G., Donnelly, D., & Sharp, H. (2020). History teachers' pedagogical reasoning and the dynamics of classroom implementation in Ghana. *History Education Research Journal*, *17*(2).

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language teaching*, *36*(2), 81–109.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE A GREAT EDUCATOR, 2022

188

M. A. GÜNGÖR & M. N. GÜNGÖR. Student-Teachers' Pedagogical Reasoning in Teyl Lesson Plans and ..

Cheng, M. M., Tang, S. Y., & Cheng, A. Y. (2014). Differences in pedagogical understanding among student–teachers in a four-year initial teacher education programme. *Teachers and Teaching*, *20*(2), 152–169.

Council of Higher Education (CoHE). (2018). Guideline for the teaching practice of student-teachers in state schools in Turkey [Uygulama öğrencilerinin Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'na bağlı eğitim-öğretim kurumlarında yapacakları öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin yönerge]. https:// oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_06/25172143_YYnerge.pdf (Retrieved August 3, 2022)

Farrell, T. S. (2013). Reflecting on ESL teacher expertise: A case study. *System*, *41*(4), 1070–1082.

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL quarterly*, *23*(1), 27–45.

Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. A perspective from North American educational research on teacher education in English language teaching. *Language teaching*, *35*(1), 1–13.

Güngör, M. N., Akcan, S., Werbinska, D., & Ekiert, M. (2019). The early years of teaching: A cross-cultural study of Turkish and Polish novice English teachers. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 287–302.

Kavanagh, S. S., Conrad, J., & Dagogo-Jack, S. (2020). From rote to reasoned: Examining the role of pedagogical reasoning in practice-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 89.*

Liyanage, I., & Bartlett, B. J. (2010). From autopsy to biopsy: A metacognitive view of lesson planning and teacher trainees in ELT. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(7), 1362–1371.

Loughran, J. (2019). Pedagogical reasoning: the foundation of the professional knowledge of teaching. *Teachers and Teaching, 25*(5), 523–535.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* Routledge.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* Sage.

Pang, M. A. Y. (2016). Pedagogical reasoning in EFL/ESL teaching: Revisiting the importance of teaching lesson planning in second language teacher education. *Tesol Quarterly*, *50*(1), 246–263.

Nilsson, P. (2009). From lesson plan to new comprehension: Exploring student teachers' pedagogical reasoning in learning about teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *32*(3), 239–258.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard educational review*, *57*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411

Tsui, A.B., (2009). Teaching expertise: approaches, perspectives, and characterization. In Burns, A., Richards, J. (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 190e197.

Zeichner, K. M. (1995). Reflections of a teacher educator working for social change. In T. Russell and F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education* (pp. 11–24). Routledge.