

Research : 7

***Using Collaborative Lesson-Preparation for
Developing EFL Prospective Teachers' Lesson
Plan Quality and Pedagogical Performance***

By:

Mohamed Farrag Ahmed Badawi, PhD
Associate Professor of Curriculum & EFL Instruction
Faculty of Education, October 6 University, Egypt

Using Collaborative Lesson-Preparation for Developing EFL Prospective Teachers' Lesson Plan Quality and Pedagogical Performance

Mohamed Farrag Ahmed Badawi, PhD

Associate Professor of Curriculum & EFL Instruction

Faculty of Education, October 6 University, Egypt

Abstract

The present study is an attempt to investigate the effect of Collaborative Lesson-Preparation (CLP) on developing EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and pedagogical performance. The study used a pre-posttest experimental and control group design. The study participants were (n=42) voluntary fourth year English majors at the Faculty of Education, October 6 University, Egypt. The participants were randomly divided into two equal groups. To collect the data for the study, a pre-post lesson plan quality evaluation checklist, a collaborative lesson-preparation training program and a pre-post pedagogical performance observation sheet were designed and implemented. Before the intervention, the quality of the participants' lesson plans was pre-evaluated and their pedagogical performance was pre-observed. While the experimental group participants (n=21) were exposed to the suggested training program, the control group participants (n=21) received their regular instruction and monitoring. Results revealed that the quality of the lesson plans of the experimental group participants was higher than that of the control group and the pedagogical performance of the experimental group was better than that of the control group. Moreover, there was a positive correlation between EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and their pedagogical performance effectiveness. Thus, it could be concluded that using collaborative lesson-preparation was effective in developing EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and pedagogical performance.

Keywords: Collaborative Lesson-Preparation, Lesson Planning Quality, Pedagogical Performance, EFL Prospective Teachers.

1. Introduction

Effective learning requires quality teaching and quality teaching performance calls for quality instruction planning. Quality improvement in education starts from teachers. That is why teachers should be well-educated and highly-trained. Lacking of teaching skills hinders maintaining quality teaching and learning. Effective teaching occurs if the learners want to learn what the teacher wants to teach. In practice, not all teachers are able to deliver quality teaching performance especially novice teachers and student teachers.

In EFL context, practicing teaching for the first time is usually challenging for prospective teachers and novice teachers. EFL prospective teachers are subject to come across several pedagogical difficulties. These difficulties may be due to a gap between their pre-service formation and the requirements of real world teaching profession. Most of these pedagogical difficulties could be noticed and remedied during teaching practicum. For EFL prospective teachers, knowing how to teach is challenging since student teachers are still inexperienced. In other words, they may be anxious to their first teaching practice because some internal and external factors such as less teaching skill. It is practicum that can prepare and form EFL prospective teachers as professionals. In line with this view, Mtika (2011) claims that through practicing practicum, student teachers shape their beliefs and thinking.

As a result, some EFL prospective teachers tend to quit their career. Other promising EFL prospective teachers strive to continue teaching, yet their pedagogical performance is not satisfactory. Therefore, more efforts should be exerted to make good use of teaching practicum. Ideal teaching practicum facilitates EFL prospective teachers' transition from students to student teachers. It is teaching practicum that enables EFL prospective teachers to convert theoretical professional knowledge to real teaching performance. For Smith (2010), the practicum is the most important component in teacher preparation programs. Darling-Hammond (2014) mentions that teaching practicum serves as a platform to make decent connections between theory and practice. Akcan (2016) reports that the significance of practicum for EFL prospective teachers is magnified especially when the preparation courses deliver too much theory and too little practice. That is to say, effective practicum could be a professional development process.

Among the basic professional competencies of EFL prospective teachers is lesson planning which should be acquired and developed in teaching practicum. Lesson planning is a professional competence that novice teachers are supposed to know and be able to do. Practically, many EFL prospective teachers depend heavily on their lesson plans since their accumulative teaching experience has not been acquired yet. For EFL prospective teachers, a lesson plan is a

handy linguistic reference and a supportive pedagogical guide in classroom real teaching situations.

Additionally, Sharil and Kyriacou (2015) confirm that a well-planned lesson provides a provision and a roadmap for the EFL novice teachers. Accordingly, EFL prospective teachers have to know how to write a clear, comprehensive and sequential lesson plan. A high quality lesson plan helps EFL prospective teachers deliver effective teaching performance. To conclude, Jalan, Samani and Mae (2009, p.7) state that “good quality of teachers can produce good quality of students, and then the poor quality of teachers can contribute to the poor achievement of students”. In an attempt to create a cause and effect relationship between lesson planning and some performance based indicators, Wong (2009) argues that an effective teacher is aware of the way to style lessons for student mastery.

However, Ferber and Nillas (2010) argue that preparing comprehensive and functional lesson plan is challenging for EFL prospective teachers because EFL student teachers often fail to put knowledge into practice during teaching practices (Richards, 2008). Further, preparing an effective lesson plan is a significant professional skill for teachers. It may even be considered as a criterion for evaluating teachers’ competencies (Ruys, Van Keer & Aelterman, 2012). In this respect, prospective teachers require more training to convert the static state of written lesson plans into real dynamic teaching performances. That is to say, not only should pre-service teachers be proficient in lesson planning methods, but the implementation of the lesson as well. Shortly, it cannot be assumed that prospective teachers will make automatic transition from a written plan to its implementation. According to Ward (2006), it remains unclear what impact the quality of lesson planning has on the implementation of the lesson. Consequently, the present study proposes that using collaborative planning as an innovative planning technique may escalate EFL prospective teachers’ lesson planning quality which in turn may improve their teaching performance.

2. Context of the Problem

In Egypt, four-year undergraduate teacher education programs are offered by Faculties of Education. The existing English and Education BA program, at Faculty of Education - October 6

University, goes in line with the main components of the accredited EFL teacher education programs which, as Karakas (2012) mentions, comprise field knowledge (linguistic competence), teacher education (pedagogic competence), general knowledge and teaching practices. At the Faculty of Education, October 6 University, EFL teaching practicum courses are offered along two academic years to the third and fourth year English majors.

During teaching practicum, EFL prospective teachers are assigned to prepare lesson plans and deliver them. Habitually, there are joint committees including university supervisors and school EFL experts who are responsible for guiding and monitoring EFL prospective teachers' lesson preparation and teaching performance. As a general supervisor of the practicum, the researcher noticed that a quite large number of EFL prospective teachers' lesson plans were overfull of pedagogical and sometimes linguistic mistakes. In an attempt to identify and classify the common mistakes committed by EFL prospective teachers, the researcher reviewed (15) random lesson plans. This revision revealed that the first common frequent mistake was the inaccuracy of lesson learning objectives. Secondly, some selected learning activities were stereotyped. Thirdly, evaluation activities were not aligned to the learning items and learning objectives. Coupling lack of experience to shaky lesson planning, EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance might be negatively affected.

Whereas lesson planning is a basic professional competence, prospective teachers' lesson plans were not taken into account to analyze teachers' competences (Ruys, Van & Terman; 2012). That is to say, investigating EFL prospective teachers' lesson plans takes a step back. Clearly, EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality was marginalized TEFL research. Subsequently, the present study tried to explore the effect of utilizing collaborative lesson planning on developing EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality and teaching performance.

3. Statement of the Problem

Inspired by the insights gained from field observations and pertinent literature review, it could be stated that neither EFL

prospective teachers' lesson plans nor their pedagogical performance is up to the optimal level. Thus, the present study attempted to investigate the effect of using collaborative planning on rising EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality and their pedagogical performance.

4. Questions of the Study

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

- 4.1.** What is the effect size of collaborative lesson preparation on EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality?
- 4.2.** What is the effect size of quality lesson on EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance?
- 4.3.** To what extent is EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance correlated to their lesson plan quality?

5. Hypotheses of the Study

The study aims at testing the following hypotheses:

- 5.1.** There is no statistically significant difference between the quality ratings of the lesson plan of the control group students and the experimental group participants on the pre-administration of the lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC).
- 5.2.** There is a statistically significant difference between the quality ratings of the lesson plan of the experimental group participants on the pre and post-administration of the lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC) favoring their mean scores on post-administration.
- 5.3.** There is no statistically significant difference between the pedagogical performance ratings of the control group students and the experimental group participants on the pre-administration of the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS).
- 5.4.** There is a statistically significant difference between the pedagogical performance ratings of the experimental group participants on the pre and post-administration of the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS) favoring the experimental group participants' mean scores on post-administration.

5.5. There is a positive correlation between EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and their pedagogical performance effectiveness.

6. Aim of the Study

The main aim of the present study is to investigate the effect of Collaborative Lesson-Preparation (CLP) on developing EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality and pedagogical performance.

7. Significance of the Study

The significance of the present study stems from the following considerations:

7.1. Lesson planning contributes to the plea for taking new sources of assessment into account when investigating teacher's pedagogical performance.

7.2. Collaborative planning is an innovative planning technique is worthy to be investigated.

7.3. Lesson planning is a professional competency that needs more research.

7.4. Developing EFL prospective teachers' teaching performance is a pedagogical necessity.

7.5. Shedding light on teaching practicum may draw the attention of other researchers to conduct more in-depth studies.

8. Definitions of Terms

8.1. Quality Lesson Plan (QLP):

Jalongo, et.al (2007, p.12) state that "effective [quality] planning is an essential element of good teaching and of promoting student achievement". Lesson planning is the systematic process of deciding what and how students should learn (Borich, 2007). In the present study, a quality lesson plan is an accurate comprehension instructional/teaching plan prepared by EFL prospective teachers in light of certain measurable pedagogical criteria.

8.2. Collaborative Lesson Preparation (CLP):

Collaborative lesson preparation rests on the concept of collaboration as defined by Friend and Cook (2007) who mentioned that collaboration is a voluntary interaction of equals to reach a shared goal by a mutual decision-making process. In the present study, collaborative lesson preparation refers to the cooperative and mutually supportive peer-learning process in which each five EFL prospective teachers work together to create and implement high quality lesson plans during their practicum experience. The basic collaborative work protocol procedures are share, reflect, write and implement.

9. Delimitations of the Study

The findings of the current study should be recognized in light of the following delimitations:

- 9.1. The operational definitions of the key terms and variables.
- 9.2. EFL fourth year English majors (2nd Term, 2017-2018).
- 9.3. Faculty of Education, October 6 University, Egypt.
- 9.4. Academic facilities that were available in the second term of 2017-2018.

10. Literature Review

10.1. Theoretical Background

10.1.1. Lesson Planning

Lesson planning is a significant element of teaching/learning process. Through lesson planning, teachers decide about the form and content of their instruction, such as how much presenting, questioning, and discussing to do; how much material to cover in the assigned time; and the way the deliver their instruction (Borich, 2007). Simply, lesson planning is a strategy for teaching a particular unit attempting to save time, energy and give the maximum output in a less time-period (Khan, 2006). According to Haynes (2010), the first step of teaching is planning and preparation activities that should be done before teaching a class. That is why teacher education and training programs have often emphasized instructional planning (Kitsantas & Baylor 2001; Baylor2002; Yildirim 2003) because student teachers can gain experience in the way to teach and the way to judge their teaching performance. Furthermore, the importance of planning the lessons is recognized by Schoenfeldt and Salsbury (2009) who mention that planning the lessons is a process that tries to provide teaching for students' learning. Thoughtful decisions are

made when a teacher plans a lesson which based on the knowledge and skills of the teacher. Gillies and Boyle (2010) stress the importance of careful lesson planning as learning will be effective if the teacher plans the lessons carefully.

Lesson planning is assumed to demonstrate teachers' teaching performance. Stein et al (2007) put it clearly that lesson planning can tell more about classroom instruction. Lesson plans are "intended curricula" reflecting teachers' thinking about how a lesson should be taught (Stein, Remillard, & Smith, 2007). Tillema (2009) emphasizes that the analysis of lesson plans is a suitable approach of gaining insight into teachers' competence. Baylor (2002) and Yildirim (2003) mention that instructional planning is in general perceived as an important process in the professionalization of teachers. Recently, Gillies and Boyle (2010) highlights the importance of instructional planning in EFL and ESL context. Meyen & Greer (2009) provides evidence for the relationship between lesson planning and teaching quality in terms of student achievement and instructional behavior. Brown (2009) argues that to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning, teachers should first consider the "design" of classroom instruction, which begins with careful lesson planning. In short, as long as lesson planning is a complex process (Fernandez & Cannon, 2005), it is difficult to expect teachers to effectively develop lesson planning skills by themselves. Thus, there is a need to guide and support teachers' lesson planning practices (Fernandez & Cannon, 2005). In a word, a shaky lesson plan misleads both teachers and learners. A dull lesson plan is fruitless.

10.1.2. Quality Lesson Planning

Ten years ago, the quality and style of many U.S. teachers' lesson plans were discouraging (Cai, 2005; Fernandez & Cannon, 2005). These unexpected findings call for greater effort to deliberately develop teachers' planning skills to maintain quality lesson plans. Jalongo, et.al (2007, p.12) state that "effective planning is an essential element of good teaching and of promoting student achievement". Although the length of a lesson plan does not necessarily reflect its quality, a brief outline cannot adequately prepare teachers to "unfold tasks" during classroom instruction (Charalambous, 2010).

Quality lesson plans deliberately tend to stimulate learning through active participation (MacDonald and Phillips, 2005). Quality lesson plan should meet three criteria of planning lessons namely articulating clear EFL learning objective for the lessons, selecting EFL learning materials, and selecting assessment aligned with the objectives to be achieved. Furthermore, reviewing literature reveals that quality lesson plan is guided by clearly specified objectives. Activities in the lesson should follow a logical sequence. Comprehensible input is provided. There are multiple opportunities for communicative practice. Enabling strategies are provided to help students perform effectively. Ongoing assessment informs lesson design and implementation. According to Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2008, p. 24), one of the characteristics of effective instruction planning is that it is guided by “concrete [...] objectives that identify what students should know and be able to do”. Lesson objectives can be derived from the core lesson content. While stating learning objectives is a good starting point, most of these objectives seem to be problematic because they can easily lead to a lesson plan in which individual activities are very loosely connected. In addition, these objectives tell very little about how they will be attained and in what ways the attainment will be measured. Accordingly, developing EFL prospective teachers’ lesson plan quality and teaching performance requires utilizing innovative strategies and techniques among which collaborative lesson planning.

10.1.3. Collaborative Lesson planning

Initially, the theoretical conceptualization of collaborative planning is gained from that of collaborative learning. Simply, collaborative learning refers to any instructional method in which students work together toward a common goal, emphasizing interaction and group processes. Whereas there is no universally adopted meaning of collaborative learning and the strategies of collaborative learning are less specific and not easy to define (Rose, 2004; Resta and Laferrrière, 2007), collaborative planning is well-defined and conceptualized. Friend and Cook (2007) define collaborative planning as a voluntary interaction of equals to reach a shared goal by a mutual decision-making process. Darling-Hammond, (2010) reports that there is evidence that when teachers collectively

work on problems of practice, they will be likely to better meet the needs of all students. Therefore, well-developed teacher collaborative learning can positively improve teachers' teaching practices, students' learning activities (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008), and students' achievements (Chichibu & Kihara, 2013). Moreover, collaboration can promote knowledge creation (Bruce, Flynn & Stagg-Peterson, 2011).

Regarding its significance as appropriate activity for lesson planning, collaborative lesson planning has been a topic of investigation in the relevant literature (Nyugen, 2017). Dudley (2014) defines collaborative lesson planning as a procedure in which teams of teachers do planning, teaching, observing, and analyzing learning and teaching collaboratively. It is collaborative lesson-preparation that enables EFL prospective and novice teachers to receive more training in lesson planning in addition to the opportunities to develop other necessary professional skills. According to Burns and Lawrie (2015), teacher collaboration through teacher learning communities has always been thought to rise the quality of teaching and learning, emphasizing the need for ongoing support for teachers. Furthermore, Lamb (2015) mentions that planning process or rather collaborative lesson-preparation helps prospective and novice teachers to create and implement their instructional plans in a cooperative and mutually supportive peer-learning environment. Nyugen (2017) concludes that in collaborative lesson planning, teachers are involved in a reflective process utilizing prior experience to design a well-grounded lesson plans. A according to Van der Linden et al. (2000: 39), collaborative lesson planning "serves as the basis for individual understanding, a personal viewpoint and identity."

In practice, collaborative lesson planning can be used in pre-service language teacher education so that EFL prospective teachers have an opportunity to practice lesson planning and reflect on their previous theoretical professional learning experiences. According to Bauml (2014), collaborative work is appropriate for lesson planning. As a mutual reflective process, collaborative lesson planning activates EFL prospective teachers' prior experience to design a well-built or quality lesson plan. For Jalongo, Rieg, and Helterbran (2007), collaborative planning gives novice teachers the opportunity to

become closer to democratic ideals, become members of collegial community, develop competence, and acquire self-efficacy. Therefore, EFL prospective teachers could promote their professional development via collaborative planning. In many cases, EFL prospective teachers exercise teaching in only one school or even in only one class during their practicum experience. Ideally, they need more opportunities to work collaboratively with peers in similar and different contexts of teaching practices. Thus, collaborative planning allows EFL prospective teachers to prepare their lesson plans together making good use of their expertise diversity.

10.1.4. Quality Teaching Performance

Literature reveals that there is no difference between quality teaching and effective teaching. According to Al Darwish (2017), qualified teachers can create the best environment for learning. There are many variables and experts involved in defining quality teaching. According to Hanushek (2002, p. 3), teaching quality is represented by good teachers, “who get large gains in student achievement for their classes; bad teachers are just the opposite”. In addition, Ko, Sammons, and Bakkum (2013) consider that effective teaching focuses on teacher behaviors and classroom processes that promote better student outcomes.

Quality teaching performance targets teachers’ knowledge, and teachers’ actions in the classroom, or teachers’ instructional roles (Muijs, 2006). Quality teaching can be realized through teachers’ instructional roles and their relationship with student achievement (Antoniou, 2009). Effective teachers also organize their materials in a step-wise manner, starting with the easy aspects and/or review of previous lessons (Muijs & Reynolds, 2011). In addition, Ko, Sammons and Bakkum (2013) concluded that effective teachers were clear about instructional goals, knowledgeable about curriculum content and the strategies to teach the content, communicate to their students what is expected of them. Effective teachers were knowledgeable about their students and were able to adapt instructions according to students’ needs. This conclusion is in line with Bohn, Roehrig, and Pressley (2004) who stated that effective

teachers are found to provide sufficient practices and appropriate feedback.

Based on the above review, some insights were gained. Firstly, teaching quality and effective teaching was interchangeably used to avoid repetition. Secondly, teaching quality could be defined as teachers' instructional activities which lead to effective learning, which in turn means the thorough and lasting acquisition of knowledge, skills, and values that have been set up. Simply, teaching quality refers to teachers' instructional activities that are positively related to student outcomes. Thirdly, no attempt was made to link quality teaching to quality lesson plan. Accordingly, the present study tries to bridge this gap.

10.2. Previous Research

While many studies investigated experienced teachers' lesson planning, few studies have attempted to examine planning practices by beginning teachers. The study conducted by Livingstone and Borko (1989) revealed that the planning of novices was less efficient than the experts and the novices had more problems in conducting the lessons when unexpected events interfered with the set plan. Richard (1998) conducted a study on experienced and less experienced language teachers in planning lesson. The study indicated that the experienced teachers rarely made lesson plans as they made greater use of mental plans than written plans. On the contrary, the less experienced teachers made fully elaborated plans, tended to follow the plan closely, and dropped activities mainly due to the time factor. Both experienced and less experienced teachers reported the usefulness of planning in teaching; however, the experienced teachers tended to make more use of improvisation in teaching than less experienced teachers. Brown (1993) studied two novice secondary teachers' lesson planning. The study revealed that the first-year teachers developed knowledge of teaching in the first year on the aspects of integrating their plans with those of other teachers, planning with the school schedule in mind, selecting materials to supplement the textbook, making plans to accommodate student needs, and becoming socialized into the role of teacher.

Furthermore, Prajas (2009) conducted a study to describe the development of teachers' lesson plan in grade one English speaking class based on school-curriculum. The subjects of the study were six English teachers from six different public high schools in Malang, Indonesia. Each one of English teachers provided one English speaking lesson plan that the teachers considered as the best lesson plan. The researcher analyzed merely the document of English lesson plans using a checklist. The study results revealed that the lesson plans for grade one English speaking class developed by the English teachers of public senior high schools were considered as well-developed, meaning that the teachers did not have difficulties in constructing lesson plan for English speaking skills. Pujiono (2013) conducted a qualitative study of lesson plan by the English teachers of senior high schools. Six lesson plans were collected from six English teachers from different senior high schools. The results of the study revealed that four out of six English teachers were in fair category, one English teacher was in a good category, and the other one was in the excellent category in planning English lessons.

The present study gained from the aforementioned previous studies three major insights. Firstly, lesson plan quality can be rated according three categories, namely fair, good and excellent (Pujiono, 2013). Secondly, lesson plan is a rich area of research as it stimulated a number of researchers. Finally, shaky effort was exerted to investigate EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning. To be specific, no recent signal study – to the best knowledge of the researcher-investigated EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality in Egypt.

11. Study Method

11.1. Participants

The study participants were 42 fourth year students majoring in English language at the Faculty of Education, October 6 University, Egypt. The participants were randomly divided into two equal groups. While the first group involved 21 students representing the control group, the second group comprised 21 students representing the experimental group. Before the intervention, all the participants' lesson plans were pre-evaluated by a Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation

Checklist (LPQEC) and their pedagogical performance was pre-observed via a Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS). Ratings of lesson plan pre-evaluation and pedagogical performance pre-observation revealed that the two groups were equal in terms of their lesson plan quality and pedagogical performance where the difference between the ratings of the two groups were insignificant.

11.2. Experimental Design

The study used a pre-post-test experimental and control group design. Accordingly, before the intervention, all the participants' lesson plans were pre-evaluated by a Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation Checklist (LPQEC) and their pedagogical performance was pre-observed via a Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS). During the intervention, the experimental group participants were trained in a collaborative lesson-preparation training unit in addition to their regular practicum supervision. On the contrary, the control group students just received their regular practicum supervision. After the intervention, the lesson plans and the pedagogical performance of the two groups were post-evaluated and post-observed respectively.

12. Research Instruments

12.1. Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation Checklist (LPQEC)

12.1.1. Aim of the LPQEC

The Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation Checklist (LPQEC) was developed to evaluate EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality. The LPQEC was prepared to achieve two objectives. Firstly, the checklist was used to pre-evaluate the EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality to determine the equality and homogeneity of the experiment two groups before the intervention. Secondly, the checklist was used to post-evaluate EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality after the intervention to decide the effect of using collaborative planning on developing the quality of EFL prospective teachers' lesson plans.

12.1.2. Content of the LPQEC

The content of the LPQEC was prepared in light of the standers and criteria mentioned in the available literature related to

lesson plan evaluation. The checklist consisted of six domains namely, lesson basic information, lesson objectives, anchor activities, content teaching activities, content learning activities, and content assessment activities. Each domain was evaluated by five indicators. Accordingly, the checklist comprised 30 indicators or items (Appendix 1).

12.1.3. Validity of the LPQEC

The content validity of the LPQEC was determined by a panel of TEFL experts. Having the LPQEC modified in light of the experts' remarks, the final version of the checklist proved valid in terms of its aim and content.

12. 1.4. Reliability of the LPQEC

As for the reliability of the LPQEC, the test re-test procedure was used. The LPQEC was given to 3 TEFL university lecturers to rate 6 lesson plans. After ten days, the same raters were asked to re-evaluate the same 6 lesson plans. Correlation between the two ratings were calculated. The reliability coefficient for the checklist was ($r = .69$). This value means that the test displayed reasonable reliability.

12.1.5. Implementation of the LPQEC

Two days before beginning of the intervention, the LPQEC was pre-administered to evaluate 21 lesson plans of the control group participants and 21 lesson plans of the experimental group participants (42 lesson plans). After the intervention which lasted for a month, the LPQEC was post-administered to evaluate 21 lesson plans of the experimental group participants who trained in collaborative planning. Gained ratings were compared and statically treated.

12. 1.6. Scoring the LPQEC

The participants' lesson plans were rated and scored according to a rubric of 3 categories in light of the total evaluation score that was (3 points max item score \times 30 items number = 90 points max checklist score). Each item/indicator was given a rate ranging from 1 point (lowest rate) to 3 points (highest rate). Lesson

plan ratings were converted into three quality categories namely; fair, good and excellent.

12.2. Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS)

12.2.1. Aim of the PPOS

The Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS) was developed to pre and post evaluate EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance. The PPOS was developed to achieve two objectives. Firstly, the PPOS was used to pre-evaluate EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance quality to determine the equality and homogeneity of the experiment two groups before the intervention. Secondly, the PPOS was used to post-evaluate EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance quality after the intervention to decide the effect of using collaborative planning on developing the quality of EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance.

12.2.2. Content of the PPOS

The content of the PPOS was prepared in light of the insights gained from the available literature related to teaching performance evaluation. The checklist consisted of five domains namely, anchor activities, teaching activities, learning activities, assessment activities, and closing activities. Each domain was evaluated by five relevant indicators. Thus, the final version of the checklist comprised 25 indicators/items (Appendix 2).

12.2.3. Validity of the PPOS

The content validity of the PPOS was determined by a panel of TEFL experts. In light of the experts' remarks, necessary modification were made such as replacing the domain of warm-up activities by anchor activities to be more comprehensive. The final version of PPOS proved valid in terms of its aim and content.

12.2. 4. Reliability of the PPOS

As for the reliability of the PPOS, the test re-test procedure was used. The researcher and other two trained observers used the PPOS to evaluate the pedagogical performance of four EFL prospective teachers during teaching practicum. The correlation

between threatening scores awarded by the three observers was calculated. The reliability coefficient for the observation sheet was ($r = .73$). This value means that the observation sheet displayed reasonable reliability.

12.2.5. Implementation of the PPOS

Two days before beginning of the intervention, the PPOS was pre-run to evaluate teaching performance of the control group participants ($n=21$) and experimental group participants ($n= 21$). After the intervention which lasted for a month, the PPOS was post-run to evaluate the teaching performance of the experimental group participants who trained in collaborative planning program. Gained ratings were compared and statically treated.

12.2.6. Scoring the PPOS

The teaching performance of the participants was rated and scored according to a rubric of 3 categories in light of the total evaluation score that was calculated as follows: The max item score is 3 points \times items number 25 = the max checklist score 75 points. Each item/indicator was given a rate ranging from 1 point (lowest rate) to 3 points (highest rate). Accordingly, the lowest rate could be gained via the checklist was 25 where the min item score (1 point) multiplied by number of the checklist items (25). Teaching performance ratings were converted into three quality categories poor; good and excellent.

12.3. The Suggested Training Program

12.3.1. Program Rationale

The rationale of the suggested sensory program rested on the claim that EFL prospective teachers' lesson plans were not up the required quality level. Accordingly, EFL prospective teachers need more training in collaborative planning to gain more skills to improve the quality of their lesson plans.

12.3.2. Program Aim

The main aim of the suggested training program is to develop EFL prospective teachers' lesson plans and in turn improve their teaching performance.

12.3.3. Program Objectives

By the end of the suggested training program, EFL prospective teachers who successfully completed the program will be able to:

1. Explain the importance of lesson planning.
2. Identify the basic elements of high quality lesson plan.
3. Apply to apply collaborative planning procedures.
4. Plan the anchor activities that match the target of lesson plan.
5. Identify the teaching activities that match the target of lesson plan.
6. Select the learning activities that match the target of lesson plan.
7. Align the assessment activities and learning outcomes of the target of lesson plan.
8. Use proper lesson closing activities.
9. Plan high quality lesson plan.
10. Evaluate lesson plan in light of some basic quality indicators.

12.3.4. Program Content

In accordance with the 10 objectives of the suggested training program, its content contained 10 lessons/topics where each lesson was targeted by a training session of 50 minutes. The content was arranged in the Student's Training Book (Appendix: 3) as follows:

1. Importance of lesson planning.
2. Basic elements of high quality lesson plan.
3. Collaborative planning procedures.
4. Anchoring activities.
5. Teaching activities.
6. Learning activities.
7. Alignment of assessment activities and learning outcomes.
8. Lesson closing activities.
9. High quality lesson plan.
10. Lesson plan evaluation indicators.

12.3.5. Program Training Design

The suggested training program was designed in light of the following procedures;

1. Identifying training needs.
2. Defining training scope.
3. Stating training objectives
4. Identifying of the target group.
5. Stating tentative program title.
6. Selecting key program topics.
7. Specifying training activities.
8. Identifying required resources.
9. Deciding training duration.
10. Evaluating training outcomes.

12.3.6. Program Training Approach

Collaborative learning principles were adopted to carry out the suggested training program. Details were mentioned in the Teacher’s Guide (Appendix: 4).

12.3.6. Program Implementation

On 2nd of March 2017, the intervention training program was implemented and lasted for a month. Once the intervention training was completed, a sample (21) of EFL prospective teachers’ lesson plans and their teaching performance was observed.

12.3.8. Program Evaluation

The program learning outcomes were subject to be assessed by formative and summative evaluation procedures. (Appendices: 3 & 4).

13. Results and Discussion

13.1. Results of Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation Checklist (LPQEC)

Table 1: Differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the Pre-Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation Checklist (LPQEC) Using Mann-Whitney Z

Pre	N	Mean	SD	z	Mann-Whitney	Sig.
Control	21	33.1	10.67	-	186.000	0.382
Experimental	21	33	11.67	.875		Insigificant

Table 1 shows that the mean scores of the control group (m=33.1) looks a lot like the mean scores of the experimental group (m=30) on the pre-lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC). According to Mann-Whitney equation calculations, z equals (0.875) and the difference significance is (0.382) meaning that the difference between the two mean scores is statistically insignificant. By conventional criteria, this difference (0.382) is considered to be not statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. The result reveals that the two groups are equal in terms of their lesson plans.

In light of this result, the study first hypothesis was accepted as it was stated: There is no statistically significant difference between the quality ratings of the lesson plans of the control group students and the experimental group participants on the pre-administration of the lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC). Sensibly, such result seems logical since the two groups did not receive any previous formal instruction pertinent to using collaborative planning for planning lesson plans. It seems possible that this result is due to the claim that EFL perspective teachers' inability to prepare high quality lesson plans.

Table 2: Differences between the mean scores of the experimental group on the Pre and Post-Lesson Plan Quality Evaluation Checklist (LPQEC) Using Mann-Whitney Z

Experimental	N	Mean	SD	z	Mann-Whitney	Sig.
Pre	21	33	11.76	-	13.000	0.000
				5.24		Significant
Post	21	76.67	14.1			

Table 2 displays that the mean scores of the experimental group (m=76.67) on the post-lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC) is remarkably higher than their mean scores (m=33) on the pre-lesson plan quality evaluation checklist. According to Mann-Whitney equation calculations, z equals (-5.24) meaning that the difference between the two mean scores is statistically significant. By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. The result reveals that using collaborative planning for lesson planning was effective in improving the experimental group participants' lesson planning quality. Based on

this result, the study second hypothesis was accepted as it was stated: There is a statistically significant difference between the quality ratings of the lesson plans of the experimental group participants on the pre and post-administration of the lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC) favoring their mean scores on post-administration.

Table 3: Program Effect Size on Developing EFL Prospective Teachers' Lesson Planning Quality

Σ Test Score	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	M.G.R.	Sig.
90	33	76.67	1.25	Accepted: Above 1.2

$$\text{Black Modified Gain Ratio} = \frac{\bar{Y} - \bar{X}}{T - \bar{X}} + \frac{\bar{Y} - \bar{X}}{T}$$

- Y = Mean of scores for the post test for the experimental group students;
- X = Mean of scores for the pre-test for the experimental group students;
- T = Total score in the test.
- Blake's registered max. Value= 2.
- Accepted Value starts at 1.2.

$$\text{Black MGR} = \frac{76.67-33}{90-33} + \frac{76.67-33}{90} = \mathbf{1.25}$$

As shown in table 3. the effective size of the suggested program on developing EFL perspective teachers' lesson planning quality was acceptable since Black's modified gain ratio was (1.25) which is higher than the required acceptance level (1.2). Accordingly, the second hypothesis was accepted as it was stated: There is a statistically significant difference between the quality ratings of the lesson plans of the experimental group participants on the pre and post-administration of the lesson plan quality evaluation checklist (LPQEC) favoring their mean scores on post-administration.

13.2. Results of Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS)

Table 4: Differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS) Using Mann-Whitney Z

Pre	N	Mean	SD	z	Mann-Whitney	Sig.
Control	21	32	9.06	-	215.500	0.899
Experimental	21	31.29	8.4	.126		Insignificant

Table 4 shows that the mean scores of the control group (m=32) looks a lot like the mean scores of the experimental group (m=31.29) on the pre-pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS). According to Mann-Whitney equation calculations, z equals (-.126) and the difference significance is (0.899) meaning that the difference between the two mean scores is statistically insignificant. The result tells that the two groups are equal in terms of their pedagogical performance. In light of this result, the study third hypothesis was accepted as it was stated: There is no statistically significant difference between the pedagogical performance ratings of the control group students and the experimental group participants on the pre-administration of the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS). Rationally, such result seems logical since the two groups did not receive any previous formal instruction pertinent to using collaborative planning for improving EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning which in turn may develop their pedagogical performance. Another possible evidence is given by Awang, Jindal-Snape, and Barber (2013) who confirm that the courses of teacher training institutions may not be enough for dealing with a real classroom context.

Table 5: Differences between the mean scores of the experimental group on the Pre and Post- the Pedagogical Performance Observation Sheet (PPOS) Using Mann-Whitney Z

Experimental	N	Mean	SD	z	Mann-Whitney	Sig.
Pre	21	31.29	8.4	-	18.000	0.000
Post	21	65.29	13.4	5.102		Significant

Table 5 demonstrates that the mean scores of the experimental group (m= 65.29) on of the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS) is higher than their mean scores (m= 31.29) on the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS). According to Mann-Whitney equation calculations, **Z** equals (-5.102) meaning that the difference between the two mean scores is statistically significant. By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. The result discloses that using collaborative planning for lesson planning was effective in improving the experimental group participants' pedagogical performance. Based on this result, the study fourth hypothesis was accepted as it was stated: There is a statistically significant difference between the pedagogical performance ratings of the experimental group participants on the pre and post-administration of the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS) favoring the experimental group participants' mean scores on post-administration.

Table 6: Program Effect Size on Developing EFL Prospective Teachers' Pedagogical Performance

Σ Test Score	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	M.G.R.	Sig.
75	31.29	65.29	1.23	Accepted: Above 1.2

$$\text{Black Modified Gain Ratio} = \frac{\bar{Y} - \bar{X}}{T - \bar{X}} + \frac{\bar{Y} - \bar{X}}{T}$$

- Y = Mean of scores for the post test for the experimental group students;
- X = Mean of scores for the pre-test for the experimental group students;
- T = Total score in the test.
- Blake's registered max. Value= 2.
- Accepted Value starts at 1.2.

$$\text{Black MGR} = \frac{65.29 - 31.29}{75 - 31.29} + \frac{65.29 - 31.29}{75} = \mathbf{1.23}$$

As shown in table 6. the effect size of the suggested program on developing EFL perspective teachers' pedagogical performance

was acceptable since Black's modified gain ratio was (1.23) which is higher than the required acceptance level (1.2). Accordingly, the fourth hypothesis was reassured as it was stated: There is a statistically significant difference between the pedagogical performance ratings of the experimental group participants on the pre and post-administration of the pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS) favoring the experimental group participants' mean scores on post-administration. Supporting the effectiveness of collaborative planning, Darling-Hammond (2010 p. 40) states that pre-service teachers "learn to practice in practice".

Table 7: Correlation between EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and their pedagogical performance (Nonparametric Correlation: Spearman's Rank)

Spearman's Rank Correlation	r	Sig.
Lesson Plan Quality	0.87**	Positive Significant
Pedagogical Performance		

***I= positive correlation, -I= negative correlation, 0= no correlation*

Table 7 demonstrates the correlation coefficient between the mean scores of the experimental group (m=65.29) on the post pedagogical performance observation sheet (PPOS) and their mean scores (m=76.67) on the post lesson planning quality checklist was calculated by Spearman's Rank Correlation where $r = 0.87$ meaning that there was a positive correlation between EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and their effective pedagogical performance. Simply, the more EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality is high, the more effective is their pedagogical performance. Accordingly, the study fifth hypothesis was accepted as it was stated: There is a positive correlation between EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and their pedagogical performance effectiveness. This finding goes in line with the finding that effective planning will lead to more effective teaching (Lederman & Niess, 2000). This does not mean that EFL prospective

teachers will make automatic transition from lesson planning to lesson delivery. Pre-service teachers must be equipped with necessary skills not only in lesson planning but in its implementation as well (Tsangaridou, 2008).

14. Study Conclusion

The present study is an attempt to investigate the effect of collaborative lesson-preparation (CLP) on developing EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality and their pedagogical performance. The present reveals two main findings. Firstly, using collaborative lesson-preparation is effective in developing EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality and their pedagogical performance. Secondly, there is a positive correlation between EFL prospective teachers' lesson plan quality and their pedagogical performance effectiveness. However, such findings do not mean that EFL prospective teachers can make automatic transition from lesson planning to its effective implementation. Thus, educators should keep in mind that pre-service teachers must be equipped with necessary skills not only in lesson planning but in its implementation as well (Tsangaridou, 2008).

Moreover, this study did not investigate other variables which would influence such findings. EFL prospective teachers need more practical training in lesson planning and teaching effective delivery. They are not empty vessels to be filled up by sole expert, but they have valuable inputs into the lesson planning and delivery processes when they work together. Thus, collaborative lesson planning should be generalized in practicum. Qualified EFL prospective teachers can coach their peers and create the best environment for learning. They can learn some strategies to solve teaching problems and puzzles through discussion and sharing. Training EFL prospective teachers on the competences of quality lesson planning via CLP should be one of the core objectives of TEFL methodology and practicum in EFL pre-service program and one of the basic training sessions of the in-service training program in the future. Finally, more research is required to investigate other independent variables that may positively affect lesson planning quality and teaching performance of EFL prospective teachers.

References

- Akcan, S. (2016). Novice non-native English teachers' reflections on their teacher education programmes and their first years of teaching. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 18(1), 55-70.
- Al Darwish, S. (2017). The influence of the practicum course on EFL student teachers. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5 (1), 15-27.
- Al Sohbani, Y. (2012). Prospective EFL teachers' perception of the teaching practice experience at AUST. *Arab World English Journal*, 3(4), 195-213.
- Antoniou, P., Demetriou, D., & Kyriakides, L. (2006). Towards a dynamic model of educational effectiveness: A meta-analysis of studies investigating the impact of school factors on student achievement gains. *Proceedings of the IX Conference of the Cyprus Pedagogical Association*. Nicosia.
- Awang, M., Jindal-Snape, D., & Barber, T. (2013). A documentary analysis of the government's circulars on positive behavior enhancement strategies. *Asian Social Science*, 9(5), 203-208.
- Bailey, M. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartels, N. (2005). Applied linguistics and language teacher education: What we know. In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education* (pp. 405-424). NY: Springer.
- Baylor, A. (2002) Expanding pre-service teachers' metacognitive awareness of instructional planning through pedagogical agents. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 50(2), 5-22.
- Bohn, C., Roehrig, A. D., & Pressley, M. (2004). The first days of school in the classrooms of two more effective and four less effective primary-grades teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(4), 269-287.
- Borich, G. (2007). *Effective teaching Methods*, Unit and Lesson Planning, six edition, Pearson, Merrill Prentice Hall, Ohio.
- Brown, M. (2009). The teacher-tool relationship: Theorizing the design and use of curriculum materials. In J. Remillard, G. Lloyd, & B. Herbel-Eisenmann (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work:*

- Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp. 17–36). New York: Routledge.
- Bruce, C. D., Flynn, T., & Stagg-Peterson, S. (2011). Examining what we mean by collaboration in collaborative action research: A cross-case analysis. *Educational Action Research*, 19(4), 433-452.
- Cai, J. (2005). U.S. and Chinese teachers' constructing, knowing, and evaluating representations to teach mathematics. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 7, 135–169.
- Charalambous, C. (2010). Mathematical knowledge for teaching and task unfolding: An exploratory study. *Elementary School Journal*, 110, 247–278.
- Chichibu, T., & Kihara, T. (2013). How Japanese schools build a professional learning community by lesson study. *Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 2(1), 12-25.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. London: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education: Issues of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations*, 89(4), 547-561.
- Dudley, P. (2014). *Lesson Study Handbook*. Cambridge: UK
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. & Short, D. (2008). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners*. The SIOP Model. Boston, New York: Pearson.
- Ferber, T., & Nillas, L. A. (2010). Through the eyes of student teachers: Success and challenges in field teaching experience. *National Teacher Education Journal*, 3(2), 61-86.
- Fernandez, C., & Cannon, J. (2005). What Japanese and U.S. teachers think about when constructing mathematics lessons: A preliminary investigation, *Elementary School Journal*, 105, 481–498.
- Gillies, R. and Boyle, M. (2010). Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 933–940.
- Hanushek, E. (2002). Teacher quality. In L. T. Izumi & W. M. Evers (Eds.), *Teacher quality* (pp. 1–12). Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

- Haynes A. (2010). *The Complete Guide to Lesson Planning and Preparation*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Hunter, M. (1994). Mastery teaching. In Black, J.H. Everson, S.T. and Guskey, T.R. (Eds.), *School Improvement Programs* (p.181-204). New York: Scholastic.
- Jalan, F., Samani, M., & Mae, C. (2009). *Teacher certification in Indonesia: A strategy for teacher quality improvement*. Jakarta: Department Pendidikan National.
- Jalongo, M. R., Rieg, S. A., and Helderbran, V. R. 2007. *Planning for Learning: Collaborative Approaches to Lesson Design and Review*. New York: Columbia Univ.
- Karakas, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English language teacher education program in Turkey. *ELT Weekly*, 4(15), 1-16.
- Khan, I. (2006). *Foundations of Education*. Delhi: Anmol Publication
- Ko, J., Sammons, P., & Bakkum, L. (2013). *Effective teaching: A review of research and evidence*. Berkshire, UK: CFBT Education Services.
- Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 21-34.
- Lederman, N. & Niess, M.L. (2000). If you fail to plan, are you planning to fail? *School Science and Mathematics*, 100 (2), 57-61.
- MacDonald, J. & Phillips, R.A.D. (2005). Developing teaching briefs and plan teaching sessions. *Education for Primary Care*, 16, 496-498.
- Marzano, R. J.; Marzano, J. S.; Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom Management That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Every Teacher*, Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development Publications.
- Meyen, E. and Greer, D. (2009). The role of instructional planning in math instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 41(5), 1-12.
- Mtika, P. (2011). Trainee teachers' experiences of teaching practicum: Issues, challenges, and new possibilities. *African Education Review*, 8(3), 551-567.
- Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2011). *Effective teaching: Evidence and practice*. London, UK: SAGE.

- Nguyen, H. (2017). *Models of mentoring in language teacher education*. Switzerland: Springer.
- Resta, P. & Laferrière, T. (2007). Technology support of collaborative learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19, 65–83.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). Second Language Teacher Education Today. *RELC*, 39(2), 158-176.
- Rose, M. (2004). Comparing productive online dialogue in two group styles: cooperative and collaborative. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 18, 73–88.
- 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.
- Schoenfeldt, M. & Salsbury, D.E. (2009). *Lesson planning: A research-based model for K-12 classrooms*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Sharil, W., & Kyriacou, C. (2015). Reflective practice on instructional planning: Relevance and contribution to pre-service teachers' professional development. *International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 1(3), 211-217.
- Skowron, J. (2006). *Powerful lesson planning: Every teacher's guide to effective instruction* (2nd Edition). California: Corwin.
- Smith, K. (2010). Assessing the practicum in teacher education- Do we want candidates and mentors to agree? *Studies in Educational Evaluation Journal*, 36, 36-41.
- Stein, M., Remillard, J., & Smith, M. S. (2007). How curriculum influence student learning. In F. K. Lester (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (Vol. 1, pp. 319–369). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Tillema, H. (2009) Assessment for learning to teach: Appraisal of practice teaching lessons by mentors, supervisors, and student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60, 155–167.
- Tsangaridou, N. (2008). Trainee primary teachers' beliefs and practices about physical education during student teaching. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(2), 131-152.
- Van der Linden, J., Erkens, G., Schmidt, H. and Renshaw, P. (2000). Collaborative learning. In R.J. Simons, J. van der Linden and T.

- Duffy (eds), *New learning*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 37–54.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 24(1), 80-91.
- Ward, P. (2006). What we teach is as important as how we teach it. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*. 77(8), 23-25.
- West, L. & Staub, F.C. (2003). *Content-Focused Coaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Wong, H. & Wong, R. T. (2009). *The First Days of School: How to Be an Effective Teacher*. Harry K. Wong Publications.
- Yildirim, A. (2003) Instructional planning in a centralized school system: lessons of a study among primary school teachers in Turkey. *International Review of Education*, 49(5), 525–543.

