



## The pedagogy lab: A practice-oriented redesign of the collegiate language pedagogy seminar

*Sophia Strietholt*, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 

### Abstract

*This report presents the “Pedagogy Lab,” a practice-based graduate seminar modeled on the structure and logic of a STEM laboratory. Designed to address the limitations of traditional graduate teaching assistant (GTA) preparation in language programs, the Lab replaces one-off workshops and theory-heavy seminars with a recursive, inquiry-driven environment. Drawing on principles from experiential learning and reflective practice, the Lab organizes weekly “experiments” in the form of lesson design, microteaching, peer review, and iterative feedback. Like scientific labs, it treats pedagogical knowledge as something to be tested, observed, and refined over time. GTAs are positioned as practitioner-researchers who explore instructional hypotheses in a controlled, feedback-rich space. Thematic modules anchor each week’s inquiry. Additional components such as classroom observations, discussion forums, and a teaching portfolio (similar to a cumulative lab report) reinforce the course’s lab-based ethos and support the development of reflective teaching identities. Originally implemented in a German graduate program, the Lab offers a replicable, discipline-specific model for GTA development across language contexts. Ultimately, the Pedagogy Lab posits that applied, iterative, and field-specific training is essential for preparing language GTAs to meet the complex realities of instruction shaped by shifting institutional expectations, technological change, and the demand for student-centered pedagogy.*

**Keywords:** *Language Teacher Education, Graduate Teaching Assistants, Curriculum Design, Pedagogy Seminar*

**APA Citation:** Strietholt, S. (2026). The pedagogy lab: A practice-oriented redesign of the collegiate language pedagogy seminar. *Second Language Research & Practice*, 6(1), 80–91.  
<https://hdl.handle.net/10125/69905>

### Introduction

In a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, Rifkin et al. (2023) raise a critical issue: graduate students are expected to teach, yet many receive little formal preparation. This concern resonates across institutions in North America, particularly in departments where graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) are the backbone of undergraduate instruction. Nowhere is this more evident than in language programs, where GTAs step into the classroom from day one and must navigate the pedagogical, linguistic, and intercultural complexities of language teaching with little formal preparation (Goetze & Schueller, 2025). Institutional training models often fail to prepare them for this multifaceted role (Blouin & Moss, 2015; Hardré & Burris, 2012; Reeves et al., 2016). Many institutions rely on fragmented approaches: one-time workshops, compliance-focused modules, or brief orientation sessions that are rarely discipline-specific (Reeves et al., 2016; Shannon et al., 1998). These forms of training are frontloaded (Paesani, 2025) and often prioritize administrative checkboxes (FERPA, Title IX, grading rubrics) over the cultivation of pedagogical skill or reflective teaching practices (Hardré & Burris, 2012; Pentecost et al., 2012). GTAs end up learning “[...] to teach from on-the-job experience” (Shannon et al., 1998, p. 442). Unlike their STEM or social science

counterparts who often assist faculty or lead discussion sections, most language GTAs are instructors of record. From the start of the semester, they are responsible for lesson planning, instruction, and assessment (Lord, 2014). Language instruction requires managing real-time communication in the target language, scaffolding learners' oral and written production, and supporting students' emotional and cognitive development (Kost, 2008; Maxim & Allen, 2011; Pelton, 2014). These demands call for discipline-specific pedagogical preparation (Enkin, 2015). Sustainable, context-sensitive training models are critical for the long-term development of these instructors (Sadera et al., 2024). While many language programs offer a mandatory semester or year-long pedagogy seminar (Bourns & Melin, 2014; Lord, 2014), these often vary widely in structure, depth, and alignment with the realities of language teaching.

Recognizing the need for a practice-oriented model that provides “[...] a space to connect theory and practice” (Goetze & Schueller, 2025, p. 204), a graduate program in German at a public university in the Southeastern United States developed a field-specific solution to pedagogical training: the Pedagogy Lab, a semester-long, research-informed seminar that reimagines GTA training as reflective, inquiry-based practice in a dedicated, applied space. Inspired by the work of Krogh (2000), Grossman et al. (2009), and Becker et al. (2018), the course combines weekly cycles of microteaching, lesson design, and feedback with targeted readings and portfolio work.

The Lab treats teaching as a skill honed through active engagement rather than observation alone, as “[...] teacher learning is both an individual and social act [...]” (Paesani, 2025, p. 213). Just as language learning requires interaction and feedback, so does teacher development. Weekly microteachings simulate classroom realities, offering GTAs a space to test pedagogical strategies and receive immediate, structured guidance. This consistent feedback loop builds reflective habits and supports a growth mindset (Brookfield, 2017). The approach aligns with research showing that immersive, practice-based models yield more effective teaching than theory alone (Grossman et al., 2009; Zeichner, 2010). For new instructors often grappling with imposter syndrome or defaulting to mimicry, these repeated teaching cycles foster the confidence and clarity needed to shape a personal, research-informed pedagogical identity (Kanno & Stuart, 2011). In the process, the Lab also cultivates community: through collaborative planning and peer feedback, GTAs form a lasting network of pedagogical inquiry and support (Krogh, 2000). In short, the Pedagogy Lab responds directly to the modern challenges in GTA training as laid out in Goetze and Schueller (2025) and Paesani (2025) by positioning pedagogy as a central component of graduate training rather than an auxiliary skill that is best honed by active engagement and consistent, recursive rehearsal.

This report outlines the Pedagogy Lab's design, including its theoretical foundations, core components, and contributions to GTA education. It concludes with reflections on transferability, understood here primarily as relevance to graduate language programs, student feedback, and the Lab's role in supporting human-centered, practice-driven teaching in an AI-informed landscape.

## **Foundations and Structure of the Pedagogy Lab**

The Pedagogy Lab was inspired by apprenticeship models (Kost, 2008), reflective practice frameworks (Brookfield, 2017; Farrell, 2015), and research in the scholarship of teaching and learning (Soler & Tecedor, 2018; Zeichner, 2010). In addition, the Lab integrates practice-based methodologies such as case-based instruction, simulations, and microteaching, which have been shown to help novice GTAs confront and prepare for realistic classroom challenges (Shannon et al., 1998). These approaches align with Broeckelman-Post and Ruiz-Mesa's (2018) recommendation that GTAs should be given opportunities to role-play difficult teaching moments in advance. Tools such as classroom simulators have proven effective for practicing key pedagogical skills like questioning styles and managing wait time (Chini et al., 2016). The Lab also builds on the principle that GTA learning should be flexible and student-centered. Chadha (2013) emphasizes the value of providing GTAs with agency in directing their own development, promoting motivation and deeper engagement. Furthermore, a more complete expansion of GTA training, as suggested by Shannon et al. (1998), includes supervised practicum experiences, an element the Lab integrates through recursive microteaching and peer feedback.

## **Theoretical Frameworks Informing the Lab Design**

The Pedagogy Lab synthesizes scholarship in graduate teacher education to offer a structured, sustained, and context-sensitive model of GTA preparation. Existing approaches to GTA training either call for systemic reforms (Byrnes, 2011; Maxim & Allen, 2011) or propose pedagogical innovation (Blyth, 2011; Enkin, 2015). Yet few models fully integrate these perspectives into practice-based, discipline-specific programming (Soler & Tecedor, 2018).

At its core, the Lab is influenced by the apprenticeship model articulated by Kost (2008), which emphasizes modeling, guided practice, and the gradual development of instructional autonomy. Research supports this approach, showing that scaffolded, context-aware training paired with frequent opportunities for rehearsal and feedback leads to stronger teaching outcomes (Becker et al., 2017). Scholars have further stressed the need for discipline-specific training models that embed mentorship, reflection, and identity development (Hardré & Burris, 2012; Paesani, 2025; Pelton, 2014; Sadera et al., 2024).

The structure and ethos of the Lab are shaped by two intersecting theoretical paradigms: experiential learning and reflective practice. Kolb's (1984) model of experiential learning, built on the cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation serves as a structural backbone. This recursive model is reflected in the Lab's weekly rhythm: students engage with pedagogical theory through readings, reflect on its implications in seminar discussion, test ideas in microteaching sessions, and refine their lessons through feedback and classroom application. This cycle helps GTAs understand teaching not as a checklist of techniques, but as a recursive, inquiry-driven process.

Schön's (1983) work on reflective practice further supports the Lab's emphasis on continuous revision and self-awareness. He posits that expert practitioners learn by reflecting both during and after teaching. The Lab operationalizes this idea through debrief discussions, peer feedback, and iterative work on teaching philosophies, encouraging GTAs to see teaching as an evolving process shaped by ongoing dialogue and introspection (Paesani, 2025). This reflective approach aligns with research showing that graduate seminars grounded in exploratory, action-oriented methods promote sustained pedagogical growth (Deocampo, 2024). Crane et al. (2011) similarly illustrate how Exploratory Practice supports long-term GTA development by engaging instructors in collaborative inquiry that builds both teaching insight and a reflective identity, which are core goals of the Pedagogy Lab.

## **Lab-Style Components and Practices**

The Pedagogy Lab's central innovation lies in its lab-style structure, which treats teaching as a dynamic, inquiry-driven practice. Unlike conventional graduate seminars that emphasize theoretical readings and discussion, this course devotes substantial weekly time to instructional experimentation, collaborative lesson planning, and peer feedback. These features transform the seminar into a space where GTAs rehearse, revise, and refine their teaching using methods modeled on scientific and clinical labs. Readings function like research literature, microteachings serve as pedagogical experiments, and class discussions become spaces for critical peer review. Students learn not only to "do" teaching but to investigate, justify, and adapt their pedagogical decisions over time.

The course structure mirrors the logic of inquiry found in lab environments. Students first engage with targeted readings and reflective writing to prepare for seminar discussions, which explore core concepts and their practical implications and take place in the first lesson of each week. In the second lesson, students apply these ideas through microteaching, task design, and peer critique. For instance, in a week focused on multiliteracies, students design lessons using multimodal texts such as websites or comics. In a week on assessment, they explore ungrading practices and create sample rubrics aligned with course goals. Each thematic cycle builds pedagogical understanding while reinforcing connections across modalities and learner needs.

Guest speakers, including language program directors, instructional designers, and faculty mentors, broaden participants' exposure to diverse teaching philosophies.

In terms of course logistics, the Lab is currently offered once every two years to meet minimum enrollment requirements for graduate seminars, though the structure could be adapted to an annual format depending on cohort size. All students are in the same language program (i.e., German). It carries three credits and meets twice per week for 75 minutes across a 16-week semester, with week 16 devoted to portfolio presentations. The microteaching cycle is structured to ensure that all students participate regularly (see section 2.2.2). Depending on the biennial schedule, students enroll either in their first or third semester of graduate study. Only third-semester students are serving as instructors of record, while first-semester students participate in teaching pods paired with more advanced GTAs. In this model, first-year graduate students collaborate on lesson planning and guest teach at least one week or one module in their pod partner's class. This structure allows both beginning and experienced GTAs to engage meaningfully in the Lab's practice-based design. While the current implementation assumes a single-language cohort, the Lab could be adapted for multi-language groups by using cross-linguistic peer feedback and shared theoretical modules. Similarly, for programs where graduate students are not teaching while enrolled, simulated teaching contexts and extended peer microteaching cycles could provide comparable opportunities for practice and reflection.

### ***Thematic Progression***

The Pedagogy Lab is organized around a scaffolded sequence of weekly themes that move from foundational concepts to advanced instructional design. The semester opens with foundational questions about teaching roles, introducing national and international frameworks such as the 2007 MLA Report, ACTFL Standards, and the CEFR self-assessment grid. From there, students explore the building blocks of language instruction, including lesson planning, backward design, and the three communicative modes, while beginning their first microteaching sessions. These early weeks emphasize authentic materials, scaffolding, and the practicalities of classroom management.

As students gain confidence, the course transitions to more complex instructional paradigms, including communicative language teaching, task- and content-based instruction, and flipped learning. These themes are explored alongside technology integration and current developments in SLA research. This middle phase deepens engagement with topics like individual learner differences, the social turn in SLA, and the development of intercultural competence and literacy through multiliteracies pedagogy.

In the latter half of the course, attention turns to critical and inclusive teaching practices. Students investigate social justice pedagogy, gender-just language instruction, and accessibility through readings and guest speakers, while continuing to refine their teaching portfolios and instructional materials. At the same time, they explore assessment strategies, including error correction, classroom-based assessment, and ungrading, and develop targeted approaches for teaching grammar, vocabulary, and the four core modalities: reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

The final weeks focus on professional identity and reflective practice. Students examine how their pedagogical values have evolved, draft and revise teaching philosophies, and present their teaching portfolios. Through this structured progression, the Lab supports the emergence of informed, reflective instructors who are equipped not only with theoretical knowledge but also with practical tools and a developing teaching identity grounded in classroom experience.

The thematic structure of the course supports the broader lab ethos by sustaining a cyclical pattern of input, experimentation, reflection, and refinement. A full week-by-week overview of topics, activities, and their alignment with the Lab model is provided in [Appendix A](#).

### ***Microteaching***

The centerpiece of the Pedagogy Lab is microteaching. Each week, students deliver short lessons (5–10 minutes) aligned with the weekly theme. These sessions are not treated as performances but as opportunities to test pedagogical hypotheses in a controlled, feedback-rich environment. The seminar typically enrolls 6–10 students, and each participant microteaches multiple times across the semester in alignment with the

weekly themes. Microteaching occurs weekly, with one day of the week dedicated to Microteaching and all students typically teaching each session; in larger cohorts, the group may be split so that students alternate weeks, ensuring that each participant microteaches multiple times across the semester.

Each microteaching segment is followed by a structured peer-led debrief and guided instructor feedback. These reflections address lesson design, theoretical grounding, and implications for the GTA's evolving teaching philosophy. Classmates assess whether the task achieved its intended outcomes, identify effective scaffolding, and consider how learners might respond in a language classroom. The feedback and reflection is guided by a shared rubric adapted from the program's peer observation framework, with categories such as lesson objectives and structure, language use and participation, pedagogical design, instructor presence, use of materials, and opportunities for reflection (see [Appendix B](#)).

Students benefit not only from teaching but also from observing their peers. Komarraju (2008) highlights that observing peers and expert instructors provided GTAs with vicarious experiences, contributing to their self-efficacy and helping them reflect on effective teaching strategies. Because students frequently draw from their actual teaching contexts as they teach concurrent to taking the Lab, the feedback is both timely and actionable. This immediacy adds authenticity to the process: pedagogical theory is directly applied to instructional challenges, and students often leave with adjustments they can implement that same week.

### ***The Teaching Portfolio as a Lab Report***

As is often practice in pedagogy seminars, the semester culminates in a teaching portfolio in which students design a multi-day instructional unit centered around a cultural artifact or theme (Lord, 2014). This portfolio brings together lesson plans, task rationales, reflections on learner needs, and assessment strategies. The process is scaffolded in progressive stages: students begin by brainstorming and outlining their unit, then draft individual lessons, receive peer and instructor feedback, and revise their work accordingly. Each unit is built using a backward design approach (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), starting with intended outcomes and assessment criteria before selecting texts and designing tasks. This structure enables students to prioritize communicative and cultural goals, while avoiding the "coverage trap" often associated with textbook-driven planning.

Importantly, the portfolio project serves as a capstone expression of the Pedagogy Lab's core principles. Just as weekly sessions integrate theory and practice through microteaching, lesson analysis, and reflective dialogue, the portfolio requires students to synthesize those iterative experiences into a coherent, research-informed teaching unit. By working on the portfolio throughout the semester, students repeatedly engage in the lab-style cycle of planning, testing, receiving feedback, and revising.

For example, one teaching portfolio unit focused on the Frankfurt Book Fair (Frankfurter Buchmesse) to explore reading habits, literary genres, and cultural events in Germany. Students interpreted infographics, analyzing data on German reading habits and genre preferences. Additional tasks included genre classification, video-based listening, and interactive map work. The unit culminated in a group presentation simulating a day at the Book Fair. This design reflects the Lab's emphasis on multimodal input, inductive learning, and performance-based assessment grounded in authentic cultural content.

The portfolio supports the development of a professional teaching identity. It encourages GTAs to articulate their own instructional priorities, justify decisions through pedagogical theory, and demonstrate their ability to design inclusive, communicative, and culturally rich instruction. In this way, the teaching portfolio functions similarly to a lab report in STEM disciplines: it documents a hypothesis (e.g., a pedagogical approach), outlines the design process (lesson planning and task creation), reflects on the observed outcomes (via feedback and revision), and draws conclusions that inform future practice.

### ***Additional Assessments and Alignment with Lab-Based Learning***

In addition to microteaching and the teaching portfolio, the Pedagogy Lab includes a set of targeted assessments that reinforce its lab-based structure. These assignments are designed to deepen students' engagement with teaching as an evolving practice. By focusing on analysis, revision, and connection to

instructional contexts, they help GTAs develop a more deliberate and informed approach to their work in the classroom.

#### *Discussion Forum Posts and Peer Engagement*

Students complete two structured discussion forum cycles during the semester: one focused on a pedagogical article and one on a scholarly SLA research article of their choosing. These asynchronous assignments ask students to summarize, critique, and connect readings to classroom experience, and then respond to a peer's post. This format reinforces the Lab's emphasis on collaborative meaning-making, peer-to-peer learning, and the application of theory to practice. It also helps students build fluency in the scholarly discourse of language pedagogy, especially as most of the GTAs in the program are trained as literary scholars rather than applied linguists.

#### *Language Class Observations and Reflective Reports*

Each student observes two language classes (one in their target language and one in a language they do not teach) and submits a comparative reflection. Common practice in standard pedagogy classes (Lord, 2014), these observations support the Lab model by encouraging ethnographic, context-sensitive thinking: students analyze classroom interactions, teaching moves, and learner engagement, gaining insight into how theory translates across diverse instructional settings. The reflection report scaffolds the development of a critical and comparative lens that informs students' own instructional decisions. This reflective model draws on the work of Schön (1983) and Farrell (2015), who stress the importance of reflection both "in action" and "on action."

#### *Professional Development Summary*

Students attend at least one professional development event during the semester (e.g., a campus workshop, roundtable, or guest lecture) and write a brief report on their experience. This task extends the Lab beyond the classroom, encouraging students to view teaching as a professional practice embedded within larger disciplinary and institutional networks.

#### *Teaching Philosophy Draft and Revision*

The Lab culminates in a teaching philosophy statement, developed in two stages: a draft submitted mid-semester, and a final revised version submitted at the end. This recursive process mirrors the Lab's broader structure: students gather insights from weekly themes, feedback from microteaching and readings, and apply them in a personal, theory-grounded articulation of their beliefs about language teaching. It not only serves as a professional document but as a capstone reflection tool for integrating the semester's learning.

#### *Teaching Pods*

Another structural element that supports this design is the use of teaching pods, which pair first-semester and third-semester graduate students. Because GTAs in the program do not begin teaching as instructors of record until their second year, third-semester participants bring their concurrent classroom experience into the Lab, while first-semester students collaborate with them on lesson planning and guest teach at least one week or one module in their pod partner's class. This arrangement ensures that novice GTAs engage in authentic, low-stakes teaching while advanced GTAs develop mentoring experience.

### **Contributions to the Field and Transferability**

This seminar contributes to the evolving conversation on graduate teacher education by offering a hybrid model that merges theoretical engagement with recursive, lab-style pedagogy. In contrast to models that rely exclusively on conceptual seminars or short-term teaching workshops, this course proposes an alternative: a sustained, inquiry-driven format that situates pedagogy as a scholarly and experimental practice.

First, the course's recursive structure serves as a replicable model for other collegiate graduate language

programs in which GTAs serve as instructors of record. By cycling students through planning, experimentation, reflection, and revision, the seminar transforms teaching into a process of ongoing intellectual engagement. This structure is reinforced by the alignment of weekly themes with hands-on assignments, ensuring that theoretical insight is always connected to pedagogical application. The recursive structure of the Lab also anticipates principles of continuing professional learning, which view teacher education as an ongoing, socially situated practice rather than a one-time orientation (Paesani, 2025). By engaging GTAs in iterative cycles of planning, teaching, and reflection, the Lab cultivates habits of praxis that extend beyond the seminar and support long-term professional growth.

Second, the integration of real-time teaching contexts significantly enhances the relevance of the course. Because students concurrently teach undergraduate language courses or assist in teaching pods, the seminar allows them to immediately test and refine the concepts discussed in class. This parallel structure ensures that pedagogy remains grounded in the everyday realities of teaching and learning.

Third, the course's emphasis on scaffolded assignment design and formative feedback provides a sustainable model for supporting novice instructors. Assignments such as microteaching, lesson plan revisions, and the final portfolio are broken down into smaller, manageable components that build toward larger instructional goals. Frequent feedback sessions foster a sense of collaboration and reflection, rather than competition. Finally, the seminar's attention to identity, inclusion, and learner agency mirrors broader shifts in SLA toward more humanistic and socially aware models of instruction. By prompting students to consider their own positionality and that of their learners, the course prepares them to build equitable, culturally responsive classrooms. This emphasis is critical not only in language education, but across disciplines.

These features position the seminar as a flexible model for graduate pedagogy in modern languages and other fields focused on communication and learner development. As Goetze and Schueller (2025, p. 207) elaborate: "With the future professoriate needing to be trained effectively for the multifaceted demands of their career, it is vital to invest now in needs-based, theory-guided, and practice-oriented models of formal [GTA] education [...]." As academic careers shift toward more teaching-focused roles, the lab structure helps graduate students build adaptable practices and reflective habits that support long-term growth as educators.

## **Conclusion**

The Pedagogy Lab offers a timely and necessary reimagining of GTA preparation: one that is discipline-specific, reflective, and grounded in both theory and practice. Responding to growing calls across higher education for more sustainable and context-sensitive models of graduate teaching development (Reeves et al., 2016; Sadera et al., 2024), the Lab stands as a deliberate alternative to the traditional graduate pedagogy seminar in FL programs, which often centers theory without sustained opportunities for practice, feedback, or application (Lord, 2014).

Following the initial offering of the course, student feedback emphasized the value of the Lab's structure and collaborative teaching model. Several participants described microteaching and peer observation as a "safe space to try things out" and credited the Lab with giving them "confidence to experiment." Many highlighted the ongoing support of their seminar peers and said the Lab gave them the confidence they needed to navigate day-to-day teaching.

At its core, the Lab affirms that teaching is not an auxiliary skill but a scholarly and professional practice worthy of deep engagement. Through its lab-style design, the seminar provides graduate instructors not only with foundational knowledge, but with repeated opportunities to test, revise, and reflect. In doing so, it treats GTAs not merely as assistants, but as emerging educators with the capacity to shape classrooms, curricula, and educational cultures. This approach is especially urgent in FL programs, where GTAs serve as the primary face of instruction from day one. These instructors must navigate a unique intersection of communicative, intercultural, and affective demands that cannot be met through generic, one-size-fits-all

pedagogical training. In an era where graduate students may be tempted to lean heavily on AI tools for lesson planning and assessment, the Lab's recursive, hands-on components emphasize the irreplaceable value of human-centered pedagogy. By requiring GTAs to design, test, and revise lessons through authentic practice and peer interaction, the course counterbalances technological shortcuts with reflective, embodied teaching experience.

More broadly, the Pedagogy Lab offers a model for what higher education can and should become. Preparing the next generation of faculty must involve more than teaching them how to grade or how to avoid FERPA violations; it must involve guiding them toward thoughtful, research-informed, and learner-centered pedagogy. By embedding pedagogical inquiry into the graduate curriculum, the Lab suggests that teaching deserves the same intellectual seriousness as research. It models a vision of higher education where graduate instructors are empowered to ask hard questions, take pedagogical risks, and grow into reflective, ethical, and effective educators. In doing so, it offers a concrete model for integrating serious pedagogical training into graduate education, one that is adaptable across disciplines and responsive to the evolving demands of academic teaching.

## References

- Becker, E. A., Easlon, E. J., Potter, S. C., Guzman-Alvarez, A., Spear, J. M., Facciotti, M. T., Igo, M. M., Singer, M., & Pagliarulo, C. (2017). The Effects of Practice-Based Training on Graduate Teaching Assistants' Classroom Practices. *CBE life sciences education*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.16-05-0162>
- Blouin, D. D., & Moss, B. G. (2015). Graduate student teacher training: Still relevant (and missing?) 20 years later. *Teaching Sociology*, 43(2), 126–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X14565516>
- Blyth, C. (2011). The relevance of cultural linguistics to foreign language graduate education: From “language and culture” to “language as culture.” In H. W. Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 149–168). Heinle & Heinle.
- Bourns, S. K., & Melin, C. (2014). The foreign language methodology seminar: Benchmarks, perceptions, and initiatives. *ADFL Bulletin*, 43(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.43.1.91>
- Broeckelman-Post, M. A., & Ruiz-Mesa, K. (2018). Best practices for training new communication graduate teaching assistants. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, 1, 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.31446/JCP.2018.16>
- Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Byrnes, H. (2011). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: “Mind your language!” In H. H. Maxim & H. W. Allen (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 17–42). Heinle Cengage.
- Chadha, D. (2013). Reconceptualising and reframing graduate teaching assistant (GTA) provision for a research-intensive institution. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(2), 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.696537>
- Chini, J. J., Straub, C. L., & Thomas, K. H. (2016). Learning from avatars: Learning assistants practice physics pedagogy in a classroom simulator. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.12.010117>
- Crane, C., Sadler, M., Ha, J. A., & Ojiambo, P. O. (2011). Beyond the methods course: Using exploratory practice for graduate student teacher development. In H. W. Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 107–127). Heinle Cengage.

- Deocampo, M. F. (2024). Microteaching reflective practices to enhance the teaching efficacy of English language pre-service teachers. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication*, 29(46), 1–22, retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/NJLC/article/view/280612>.
- Enkin, E. (2015). Supporting the professional development of foreign language graduate students: A focus on course development and program direction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(2), 304–320. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12131>
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Reflective practice in ESL teacher development groups: From practices to principles*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goetze, J., & Schueller, J. (2025). Formal Language Teacher Education in Collegiate Language Programs. In Brown, A.V., Crane, C., Dupuy, B.C., & Ene, E. (Eds.). (2025). *The Routledge Handbook of Language Program Development and Administration* (pp. 201–212). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003361213-20>
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(2), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875340>
- Hardré, P. L., & Burris, A. O. (2012). What contributes to teaching assistant development: Differential responses to key design features. *Instructional Science*, 40(1), 93–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9163-0>
- Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 236–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01178.x>
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
- Komarraju, M. (2008). A social-cognitive approach to training teaching assistants. *Teaching of Psychology*, 35(4), 327–334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280802374344>
- Kost, C. R. (2008). Innovations in teaching assistant development: An apprenticeship model. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(1), 29–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03278.x>
- Krogh, M. C. (2000). A skill, process, and person-oriented graduate seminar on teaching. *Teaching Sociology*, 28(4), 333–345. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1318583>
- Lord, G. (2014). *Language program direction: Theory and practice*. Pearson.
- Maxim, H. H., & Allen, H. W. (2011). Coda: Foreign language graduate student teacher development in the twenty-first century. In H. W. Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 231–237). Heinle Cengage.
- Paesani, K. (2025). Continuing professional learning for language teachers. In Brown, A.V., Crane, C., Dupuy, B.C., & Ene, E. (Eds.). (2025). *The Routledge Handbook of Language Program Development and Administration* (pp. 213–225). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003361213-21>
- Pelton, J. A. (2014). Assessing graduate teacher training programs: Can a teaching seminar reduce anxiety and increase confidence? *Teaching Sociology*, 42(1), 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X13500029>
- Pentecost, T. C., Langdon, L. S., Asirvatham, M., Robus, H., & Parson, R. (2012). Graduate teaching assistant training that fosters student-centered instruction and professional development. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 41(6), 68–75. Retrieved from [https://www.colorado.edu/sei/sites/default/files/attached-files/graduate\\_teaching\\_assistant\\_training\\_that\\_fosters\\_student-centered\\_instruction\\_and\\_.pdf](https://www.colorado.edu/sei/sites/default/files/attached-files/graduate_teaching_assistant_training_that_fosters_student-centered_instruction_and_.pdf)

- Reeves, T. D., Hake, L. E., Chen, X., Frederick, J., Rudenga, K., Ludlow, L. H., & O'Connor, C. M. (2016). A conceptual framework for graduate teaching assistant professional development evaluation and research. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *15*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.15-10-0225>
- Rifkin, B., Natow, R. S., Salter, N. P., & Shorter, S. (2023, March 16). *Why doctoral programs should require courses on pedagogy*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/why-doctoral-programs-should-require-courses-on-pedagogy>
- Sadera, E., Suonio, E. E. K., Chen, J. C. C., Herbert, R., Hsu, D., Bogdan, B., & Kool, B. (2024). Strategies and approaches for delivering sustainable training and professional development of graduate teaching assistants, teaching assistants, and tutors: A scoping review. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, *16*(5), 2199-2215. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-08-2023-0323>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Shannon, D. M., Twale, D. J., & Moore, M. S. (1998). TA Teaching Effectiveness: The Impact of Training and Teaching Experience. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *69*(4), 440–466. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2649274>
- Soler, I. G., & Tecedor, M. (2018). Foreign Language Teaching Assistant Training: A Contrastive Analysis of Trainers and Trainees' Perspectives. *Hispania*, *101*(1), 38–54. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26387640>
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the Connections Between Campus Courses and Field Experiences in College- and University-Based Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 89–99. <https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1177/0022487109347671>

## Appendix A. Pedagogy Lab Semester Plan with Corresponding Lab-Style Components

Week	Topic	Activities	Lab-Style Correspondence
Week 1	Introduction to the Lab	Overview, self-assessment, intro to lab cycle	Establishes inquiry-based foundation and iterative rhythm
Week 2	Backward Design & Communicative Modes	Lesson planning; reflection	Connects curriculum theory to design and reflection
Week 3	Classroom Management & Learner Support	Scenario simulation, strategy discussion	Applies theory to planning challenges
Week 4	TBLT, Content-Based, & Flipped Learning	Task/flipped lesson design	Expands experiential teaching strategies
Week 5	Pedagogical Models in Context; Guest Input	Guest speaker and reflection	Adds applied insight from expert perspective
Week 6	SLA Foundations	Discussion post linking SLA theory to classroom experience	Grounds applied practice in SLA theory
Week 7	The Social Turn & Multiliteracies	Multimodal lesson planning; begin portfolio	Initiates portfolio; integrates social/multimodal design
Week 8	Inclusive Teaching & Multimodal Practice	Guest speaker and reflection	Supports inclusive teaching through expert input

Week 9	Justice-Oriented Pedagogy	Analyze inclusive practices; reflect on portfolio	Deepens reflection on identity and teaching goals
Week 10	Assessment & Feedback	Rubric design	Aligns feedback tools with theory and practice
Week 11	Grammar & Vocabulary	Task design; portfolio check-in	Links grammar tasks to communicative aims; supports portfolio development
Week 12	Reading & Writing	Design and peer review of literacy tasks	Applies literacy strategies to planning
Week 13	Listening & Speaking	Design oral tasks	Develops oral skills through task design
Week 14	Professional Identity	Draft teaching philosophy; portfolio draft	Synthesizes learning into personal pedagogy
Week 15	Collaborative Revision & Planning	Peer/instructor feedback; revise portfolio	Finalizes portfolio through guided revision
Week 16	Capstone Presentations	Present portfolio and teaching project	Culminates inquiry-driven, iterative process

## Appendix B. Microteaching Peer Feedback Rubric

Category	Criteria	Comments/Notes
Lesson Objectives & Structure	Objectives are clear and appropriately scoped; lesson stages are purposeful, varied, and well-sequenced; time management supports activity flow.	
In-Class Language Use & Participation	Balance of L2 use, clarity of instructions, wait time, feedback and error correction; evidence of student engagement in pair/group and whole-class activities.	
Pedagogical Design & Creativity	Activities match learning goals; use of authentic or multimodal materials; creativity and appropriateness of tasks given the time frame.	
Instructor Presence & Facilitation	Professional demeanor; relationship with students respectful and encouraging; voice, gestures, and pacing support engagement; adaptability to learner responses.	
Use of Materials & Technology	Materials/tech are appropriate, accessible, and purposeful; enhance rather than distract; connect to learning objectives.	
Reflection & Debrief Potential	Activity generates useful discussion; instructor can articulate rationale and identify areas for growth in post-teaching reflection.	

## About the Author

Sophia Strietholt is Assistant Professor of German Linguistics and German Language Program Director at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her research in applied linguistics and SLA combines theoretical perspectives on L2 motivation with applied projects in pedagogy, curriculum design, and graduate teacher preparation.

**E-mail:** [striet@unc.edu](mailto:striet@unc.edu)