

2026

## The Devil's in the Details: Instructional Design and the Impact of Role-Play Teaching Simulations or Rehearsals

William Waychunas

*Bradley University*, wwaychunas@bradley.edu

Tegan Nusser

*Bradley University*, tnusser@bradley.edu

---

**Recommended Citation:**

Waychunas, W. & Nusser, T. (2026). The devil's in the details: Instructional design and the impact of role-play teaching simulations or rehearsals. *Midwest Journal of Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.69670/mje.3.1.5>

*Empirical***The Devil's in the Details:  
Instructional Design and the  
Impact of Role-Play Teaching  
Simulations or Rehearsals**

Midwest Journal of Education

84-116

Volume 3, Issue 1, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69670/mje.3.1.5><https://mje.williamwoods.edu/>**William Waychunas, Ph.D**  
**Tegan Nusser, Ph.D****Abstract**

Practice-based teacher education [PBTE] approaches that use activities such as simulations or rehearsals are increasingly popular. However, understanding is limited about how the design aspects, including activity framing, frequency, associated assignments, and feedback routines, impact preservice teachers' [PSTs'] instructional development. We look across content areas and between elementary and secondary grade-level bands to investigate: *What aspects of role-play teaching simulations' instructional designs do PSTs find most impactful for their instructional development?* Utilizing data from interviews and instructor observations, this qualitative case study examines how PBTE design features facilitate preservice teacher (PST) learning of core practices through role-playing simulations. Participants saw role-play simulations as instrumental in their growth, noting that the frequency and length of simulations provided multiple opportunities to learn from classmates and apply lessons learned from previous rehearsals in a community of practitioners focused on learning with and from one another. Additionally, PSTs highlighted the role of the course instructor in framing activities as formative, especially through grading and feedback practices, and structures to help create a more authentic teaching environment, moving such activities away from simple lesson-plan presentations and toward more realistic enactments.

**Keywords**

Practice-based Teacher Education, Rehearsals, Simulations, Preservice Teachers, Methods Courses

**Corresponding Author:**William Waychunas, Assistant Professor, Social Studies Teacher Education  
Bradley University

1501 W. Bradley Avenue, Peoria, IL 61625-0002

Email: [wwaychunas@bradley.edu](mailto:wwaychunas@bradley.edu)

ORCID: 0000-0002-8928-8527

### Introduction and Problem-Space

Sending better-prepared novice teachers out into the field is a key path toward addressing educational injustice and inequity (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Haynes, 2014), as we know that teachers can have multifaceted and long-lasting impacts on students (Ball, 2021, 2022; Chetty et al., 2012; Cotnoir et al., 2014; Petek & Pope, 2023). Unfortunately, teacher preparation programs seem to fall short of meeting this need as teachers often report that their coursework was underwhelming and leave programs feeling underprepared to meet classroom demands (Admiral et al., 2023; Chaney et al., 2020; Cogshell et al., 2012).

Applying theories from preparation coursework in actual classroom settings is a common struggle for new teachers (Kennedy, 2016; McGraw et al., 2025), with scholarship suggesting that although preservice teachers (PSTs) learn *about* instructional approaches in coursework, they lack the tools to put these ideas into practice (Grisham et al., 2014; Martell, 2020). Teacher preparation programs commonly use field placements to bridge this theory-practice divide, relying on clinical placements in schools to provide opportunities for new teachers to see and try out practices. This has long been recognized as problematic, with Feiman-Nemser and Buchman (1985) describing this issue as the *two-worlds pitfall*, where novice teachers are confronted with disconnectedness and misalignment between what is taught in coursework and realities in the field. This challenge continues as it remains common for preparation programs and supervising teachers in the field to promote contradictory instructional approaches (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2007; Braaten, 2019).

The growth of practice-based teacher education (PBTE) is one way that preparation programs have tried to address these challenges (Forzani, 2014). PBTE is based on the idea that PSTs should have the opportunity to observe, discuss, try out, receive feedback, and reflect on their enactment of teaching methods *within* coursework *before* implementing these methods in the field (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Hauser & Kavanagh, 2019). In this approach, PSTs engage in *approximations* (see Cohen et al., 2025; Grossman et al., 2009) where they participate in semi-authentic instruction simulations, sometimes called *rehearsals* (e.g., Ghousseini, 2017). These approximations focus on enacting core or high-leverage practice in a setting of reduced complexity and with targeted feedback aimed at improving instructional skills before PSTs enter the field (Grossman, 2021).

Terminology for different types of approximations is inconsistent in the field, with scholars using terms such as rehearsals, simulations, microteaching, demonstration lessons, run-throughs, and practice lessons (Cohen et al., 2025). We call the approximations in our study *role-play simulations* because they occurred exclusively within in-person coursework and involved PSTs enacting a lesson as the "teacher" while classmates play the role of "students." This is distinct from mixed-reality simulations (Dalinger et al., 2020), where PSTs engage in digital classrooms with virtual avatars. Similarly, we distinguish our role-play simulations as different from rehearsals because they *did not* include associated field assignments where PSTs would go out to teach their lessons in real classrooms, as is common in literature describing rehearsals and implied through the very nature of the word rehearsal.

During these role-play simulations, the teacher educator can facilitate and offer supports such as in-the-moment coaching, pausing the lesson to discuss, post-lesson debriefing, and creating an overall less convoluted imaginary classroom context that minimizes challenges such as disruptions and classroom management issues. The structure and format of such enactments can vary (Brownell et al., 2018; Kavanagh et al., 2019) but role-play simulations seem to be the most typical form of rehearsal or enactment within coursework (Young & Rouse, 2025). Some important variations present in current literature about rehearsals or role-playing simulations include differences in the grain-size and complexity of enacted methods, ranging from giving directions for an activity to leading a discussion, as well as whether every PST participates as the “teacher,” where some studies only have a select few students enact their lessons within their course (Kazemi et al., 2016).

However, the use of practice-based elements within preparation is currently debated within the field while simultaneously having deep historical roots (Forzani, 2014; Zeichner, 2012). Questions, critiques, and challenges to PBTE are at forefront in the current discussion and research around teacher preparation (e.g., Calabrese Barton & Tan, 2020; Cohen & Cohen, 2025; Dominguez, 2021; Markoff, 2025; Percy et al., 2022; Philip et al., 2019) with significant questions about goals, purposes, and potential equity implications, both positive and negative, toward taking a more practical approach to teacher education.

Tensions raised in these debates highlight gaps in knowledge and assumptions about PBTE that require further study. For starters, current literature and arguments are often theoretical and based on assumptions about the possible implications of PBTE, with the benefits of teaching simulations being assumed in the field (Waychunas, 2023). Looking across studies, minimal research examines the perceptions and experiences of PSTs with these approaches (Kazemi, 2016; Moody et al., 2022). Basically, the current literature and debates about PBTE are based on speculation regarding the potential benefits or risks of using such approaches rather than on concrete evidence.

The literature base in PBTE also suggests that there are many different ways to implement this approach in the college classroom. As such, teacher educators (TEs) are faced with many decisions and challenges about how to design, structure, and implement PBTE in their courses (Hurlburt & Krutka, 2020; Percy & Troyan, 2017), including questions about which practices to emphasize, the duration and frequency of simulations, and classroom considerations such as framing, grading, and feedback routines. In Cohen and colleagues' (2025) review of research in this area, they point out the need for more foundational knowledge about how “the contexts, conditions, and corresponding supports” of approximations might maximize their potential utility and help college instructors to capitalize on the precious little time that we have to work with PSTs (p. 3). In short, although much ink has been spilled about potential benefits of PBTE, there are relatively few studies that examine both the outcomes and the nuts and bolts of implementing this approach in methods coursework. More research is needed to inform how TEs might utilize PBTE methods in

ways that are both beneficial for novice teachers and consider the risks and drawbacks raised by critics.

By examining PSTs' experiences within the authors' various methods courses, including social studies and math at both the elementary and secondary levels, we hope to shed light on some of these more practical concerns. In particular, we investigated the following question: *What aspects of role-playing teaching simulations' instructional designs do PSTs find most impactful for their instructional development?*

### Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Deep convictions about the importance of high-quality teachers drive this work. We are concerned that the field of teacher education lacks a robust understanding and evidence about the impacts of formal preparation on beginning teachers' instruction (Goldhaber & Ronfeldt, 2020; Mancenido, 2023; Ronfeldt, 2021), including minimal evidence about the influences of PBTE pedagogies on teacher development (see Mancenido et al., 2025 for lone causal evidence). In a similar vein, the tendency for PBTE research to focus on singular practices, such as posing questions or number talks, to be siloed to a specific content area, such as only focusing only on science methods, and to be bounded by particular grade bands limits the ability to make broad applications and improvements across the field of teacher education (Matsumoto-Royo & Ramírez-Montoya, 2021). With such high stakes, teacher educators are eager for a deeper understanding of how to make teacher preparation more impactful for our PSTs, their future students, and our society more broadly. Thus, we position our collaboration, which combines elementary and secondary methods courses, as not only unique but also important in demonstrating the importance of PBTE across a range of fields and grade levels.

To better understand why and when teacher preparation might work, we acknowledge scholarship documenting why formal teacher preparation may *not* work, using this as a lens to understand how elements of PBTE might address major obstacles to teacher learning. Hammerness, Stroupe, and Masko's review identified **six perennial problems** hindering the impacts of preparation (2022). In designing teaching simulations and data collection, we sought to address and investigate several of these issues.

The challenges of **observation**, where teachers replicate the often-traditional forms of teaching experienced as students (Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014), and **vision**, or the challenge of reshaping teachers' ideas about instruction (Santagata et al., 2010; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988), are both addressed in PBTE frameworks by providing PSTs with alternative models of instruction. In viewing and analyzing these new models of instruction, proponents of PBTE hope that PSTs' traditional instructional visions and goals will be challenged, allowing them to better understand and adopt more student-centered approaches. This occurs during what is referred to as the *Introduce Phase* of the PBTE Learning Cycle (TEDD, 2014), where PSTs view and break down

*representations* of practice to develop a deeper understanding of a practice and its parts, hopefully providing a new conception of quality instruction (see Lampert et al., 2013 for an example).

PBTE also strives to address **enactment** challenges, often described as the theory-practice divide, and the overwhelming **complexity** of teaching (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005; Jackson, 1968) through scaffolded opportunities to practice using increasingly challenging methods. These include *approximations* of practice (Grossman et al., 2009) where PSTs act out or simulate teaching and receive feedback on these enactments (Cohen et al., 2025). By implementing practices within more controlled and collegial environments of preparation coursework, proponents of PBTE posit that PSTs will better have the opportunity to try out methods with engaged colleagues, receive timely feedback, and work out some of the hiccups of enactment in shorter lessons and in a simpler setting, which they will, hopefully, take with them into real classroom applications. Taken together, we aim to investigate some of these theoretical underpinnings of PBTE approaches, specifically considering how the structures and implementation of rehearsals and simulations in coursework might directly address the challenges of observation, vision, enactment, and complexity of teaching identified in the literature as significant obstacles to teacher learning.

In doing so, we also call upon research and situated cognition theory (Brown et al., 1989) suggesting that teacher learning is relational, occurs in social contexts, relates new and prior experiences, situational (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Knight et al., 2015), and use these ideas as a lens in understanding and analyzing PST experiences with PBTE. As other work on teacher development emphasizes the importance of repeated experiences, concrete examples, and confronting situations and scenarios within social contexts and in reflective cycles as pivotal for teacher development of their practice (Korthagen, 2017; Korthagen et al., 2001), we also make considerations for PSTs' past experiences, social contexts, and the interaction with teachers' thinking and practice, viewing these as highly interconnected (Leeferin et al., 2015).

Relatedly, we view teaching simulations and rehearsals as aligning the learning modality with how PSTs apply that knowledge – teaching students in classrooms. Like other work within situated cognition, our study design is also based on a cognitive apprenticeship model (Brown et al., 1989), which involves models of expertise, scaffolding, coaching or feedback, and reflection (Dennen & Burner, 2008). Nested within this situated cognition framework, research about PBTE and teacher experience also aligns with the theoretical lens that learning occurs within communities of practice, primarily through the interactions between novices and experts (Lave & Wenger, 2001), with some research on PBTE suggesting that considerations for interactions between PSTs and teacher educators are critically important mediating factors (Kazemi et al., 2016; Moody et al., 2022; Waychunas, 2025).

Overall, this study is framed by our understanding of the challenges that teacher educators face in preparing teachers, leveraging our knowledge of existing literature and the power of social learning

experiences to examine how our PBTE course structures influence the instructional development of PSTs.

## Methodology

### Participants and Setting

Participants were juniors and seniors from a teacher preparation program at a medium-sized, semi-selective, private university in the Midwest. All students were enrolled in a math or social studies methods class for either elementary or secondary education majors during the 2024-2025 academic year. Secondary PSTs enroll in methods courses the semester before student teaching, bringing a foundational understanding of instructional principles and a corresponding “novice teaching” field placement, which consists of a half-day, pre-student teaching experience. Elementary PSTs enroll anywhere between the second-semester sophomore year and the semester before student teaching. As such, elementary participants did not necessarily have a concurrent field placement, although some were completing a novice teaching placement, approximately 200 hours, or a 40-80 hour field placement for an ESL endorsement program. Though not a cohort model, the small class sizes and fact that PSTs in both programs take many classes together means that students enter the course with some familiarity with one another.

Table 1 (below) details the total enrollment of the four courses we taught in Fall 2024, as well as the PSTs who agreed to participate in the survey, the interviews, and those who were selected for interviews. Eleven interview participants across the methods course represent a robust 35.5% of total students who opted into the study and 24.0% of total students enrolled in the courses, a subsample of PSTs that we feel allows us to make generalizations about the cohort’s overall experiences (Marshall et al., 2013) while avoiding potential data overload (Robinson, 2013).

**Table 1**

#### *Courses, Enrollments, and Participants*

Course	Total Enrollment	Survey Participants	Interview Opt-In	Selected for Interviews
Elementary Social Studies	16	10	9	2
Secondary Social Studies	11	8	8	4
Elementary Math	11	9	8	3
Secondary Math	8	6	5	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11</b>

We chose to purposefully reach out to interview participants with several criteria in mind. Outside of ensuring that we had participants from each of the different courses, we also chose to interview PSTs who indicated that they had and had not done simulations previously in coursework, PSTs who reported struggling with initial simulations and growth in subsequent simulations, those with and without corresponding field experiences, and PSTs with a variety of perspectives of the value of simulations as reported in a screener survey, some reporting them as very important and other less so.

### Instruments

This study utilized instructor observational data and semi-structured interviews with intentional claims testing as our primary sources of data. Each researcher took field notes throughout the semester, and we regularly met to discuss emerging themes and insights. While developing the interview protocol (see Appendix A for the full interview protocol), we wrote questions to gather more data about potential themes and to test tentative initial findings. More specifically, we began the interview with open-ended prompts to minimize leading question bias (e.g., Cairns-Lee et al., 2022) in three areas: instructional development, giving and receiving feedback, and the structure and design of teaching simulations. Some examples of these initial open-ended prompts include:

- What, if anything, did you learn from participating in teaching simulations this semester? (as “teacher” or “student”)
- Did you see benefits or downsides to the public feedback structure?
- How, if at all, did you incorporate feedback into your teaching? (in the field, in subsequent simulations?)
- We’re considering continuing to use these in our courses. What, if any, recommendations would you make about what we should keep or change about teaching simulations? (*such as length, frequency, co-teaching vs. solo-teaching, methods enacted, etc.*)

This allowed PSTs to share more natural and top-of-mind responses about their experiences and thoughts on PBTE approaches in our courses, followed by more specific prompts designed to test claims. These prompts asked participants to agree or disagree with statements, elaborating as appropriate, and allowed for simultaneous claims- and member-checking to be built into the interviews. Several examples of these claims testing, including statements such as:

- The teaching simulations helped me develop confidence in my instruction.
- Teaching simulations were restrictive and caused my teaching to feel inauthentic and rigid.

This questioning structure allowed us to test for and against our potential themes (e.g., Jiménez & Orozco, 2021) by providing openings for PSTs to offer both positive and negative feedback about teaching simulations, a step taken to reduce the possibility of respondents providing socially desirable answers or satisficing the interviewers (Krosnick, 1991).

## **Procedure**

PSTs were first exposed to the methods used in role-playing teaching simulations, such as modeling or facilitating discussion, through various representations. These included assigned course readings, observing the instructor's demonstration lessons, watching video clips of teachers using practices in classrooms, analyzing lesson transcripts, and other activities to detail and decompose the essential aspects of each method. In the next steps, PSTs began engaging in approximations of practice by, writing lesson plans using an agreed upon templates, enacting the simulations within the methods courses, and watching a recording of their lesson and reading written feedback provided by the instructor to complete a standardized reflection (documents included in Appendix B and C).

Table 2 (below) summarizes the methods, timing, and format of the role-play simulations. To make the space for such substantial use of role-play simulations, we redesigned our courses to provide extended and multiple opportunities for PSTs to engage in these role-playing simulations in both of our courses. In general, we both allocated significant time for simulations in our classes, about one-third of the semester overall. With our smaller class sizes, ranging from eight to 16 students, this allowed us to dedicate consecutive class sessions at different times in the semester for PSTs to enact 10- to 30-minute role-playing simulations. For example, after learning about and working with representations of the practice of modeling, we were able to have PSTs enact their lessons over the course of three class meetings, totaling approximately four and a half hours of classtime, as simulations were conducted back-to-back-to-back across several class periods. In this routine, PSTs were all able to teach, observe each others' lessons, as well as to hear and give feedback on instruction, a process that was repeated at several points in the semester. One important distinction of this structure, and why we call these role-play simulations rather than rehearsals, is that method or lesson enactment in clinical placements was not an expectation of the assignment, although a number of PSTs used the activity to "test-drive" a lesson that they later used in the field.

Because simulations were done in class and with classmates acting as students, we sought to enhance authenticity by assigning PSTs with student roles, which included specific examples of how to act like a K-12 student. These roles (see Appendix D for examples) ranged from being eager participants to disruptive and disengaged students, and included prompts for typical classroom behavior, such as sharing an incorrect answer or finishing a task quickly. We emphasized that PSTs assigned roles should enact them in such a way that allows their peer teaching the lesson a chance to respond with an appropriate teaching action to resolve the behavior, and once addressed, to comply. Their role playing should then not present as attempting to derail the lesson but rather help inject semi-regular challenges faced in the classroom.

The "teacher" in the simulation started the lesson by providing their peers with context information (grade level, what the imaginary class has been learning, etc.). They would then signal that the actual instruction was about to begin. As they launched their lessons, their peers, as role-playing

students, would get into character and begin taking on their assigned roles as the teacher enacted the lesson. In the social studies methods courses, one or two PSTs would “sit-out” the lesson and, instead of acting out the role of a student, they acted as designated observers, completing the same online feedback form as the instructor. After the instructor informed the class that their apportioned time was up – “end scene” – PSTs provided feedback to their peer who taught the lesson by using a “glows and grows” protocol. PSTs offered *glows* regarding what went well with the lesson and *grows* about what could have gone better, points of confusion, or recommended modifications. The instructors would offer their “glows and grows” immediately following or concurrently with peer feedback. To conclude each simulation experience, PSTs wrote structured reflections designed to elicit their thinking regarding the strengths of their lesson, how they could have improved, what they learned from experiencing or observing their peers’ lessons, and how to use what they learned in subsequent lessons.

The teaching simulations were organized across courses to contain similarities and key differences, including methods, timing, and frequency. Table 2 details the order in which PSTs completed their teaching simulations, organized by methods course.

**Table 2**

*Teaching Simulation Order by Methods Class*

Elementary Math Methods	Secondary Methods	Math Elementary Studies Methods	Social Secondary Social Studies Methods
Modeling with Representations or Manipulations ( <i>solo-taught, 15 minutes</i> )	Modeling Worked Examples ( <i>solo-taught, 20 minutes</i> )	Modeling Skills and Thinking Routines ( <i>co-taught, 15 minutes</i> )	Modeling Skills and Thinking Routines ( <i>co-taught, 15-20 minutes</i> )
Facilitating Mathematical Discourse ( <i>co-taught, 20 minutes</i> )	Teaching with Manipulatives ( <i>solo-taught, 20 minutes</i> )	Facilitating Discourse ( <i>solo-taught, 10-15 minutes</i> )	Various Methods: Discussion, Writing, Reading Support, Historical Thinking, etc. ( <i>solo-taught, 30 minutes</i> )
Teaching with Small Groups via Learning Centers ( <i>solo-taught, 7 minutes</i> )	Facilitating Mathematical Discourse ( <i>solo-taught, 25 minutes</i> )	n/a	Interactive Lecture ( <i>solo-taught, 15 minutes</i> )

*Note:* Parenthetical information specifies whether the simulation was co- or solo-taught and its time length.

Semi-structured interviews were completed early in the following semester, typically lasting 30-60 minutes. Table 3 (below) describes the programmatic breakdown of PSTs who opted into the semi-structured interviews, showing how we also selected interviewees to represent the diversity of the courses.

**Table 3***Participants, Programs, Enrollments, and Field Placements*

Participant	Program	Fall Enrollment	2024 Course Taken w/Novice Placement	Course Taken w/ESL Placement	Course Taken w/No Field Placement
Nancy	Elementary	Elementary Math		X	
Serena	Elementary	Elementary Math			X
Viv	Elementary	Elementary Math		X	
Pam	HS Math	Secondary Math	X		
Nola	HS Math w/ESL	Secondary Math	X		
Mandy	LBS (w/ESL)	Elementary Social Studies		X	
Emily	LBS (did not have ESL placements)	Elementary Social Studies			X
Riley	MS History	Secondary Social Studies	X		
Hector	HS History	Secondary Social Studies	X		
Anthony	HS History	Secondary Social Studies	X		
Carey	HS History	Secondary Social Studies	X		

*Note:* Abbreviations have the following meanings - HS = High School, MS = Middle School, ESL = English as a Second Language Endorsement, and LBS = Learning Behavior Specialist or Special Educator

**Analysis**

We conducted a thematic content analysis (Vaismoradi et al., 2013) by refining our initial claims, adding new claims, and engaging in negative case analysis by searching interview transcripts for confirming and disconfirming evidence (Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Morse, 2015). For example, as we did the interviews, it initially appeared that peer pressure was a positive influence on lesson enactment, which would be a strong finding within our group of participants. However, as the interviews continued and as we searched for more disconfirming evidence, it became clear that

PSTs' individualities determined the actual effect of peer pressure. Those who had more competitive personalities indicated that this peer effect pushed them to teach better. In contrast, others sought to teach better to please their professor, or the anxiety even had a negative effect on their lesson enactment. We engaged in this iterative process to develop and refine thematic claims that we used in the next steps of analysis.

We created a case profile matrix (Saldana, 2021) to examine cases across each theme and see which claims were most prevalent, coding the transcript for alignment with our claims. Through this process, we were able to add on to and further revise initial claims, increasing the validity of our findings by collecting both examples and non-examples or discrepant cases. Additionally, this process allowed us to determine which claims were most prevalent across cases by using the case profile matrix to track the number of participants for each claim as a proxy measure for the intensity and accuracy of each claim across participants (e.g., *Claim # 3 is true for 10 out of 11 participants versus Claim #8 was only true for 2 participants*). To conclude our analysis, we searched the transcripts for exemplar quotes that represented each claim, looking for and finding descriptions that provided representation of the voices of PSTs from each course (e.g., from both elementary and secondary methods courses for social studies and mathematics).

## Findings

### Structure, Feedback, and Community

Looking across the data, it became clear that, from PSTs' perspectives, the instructional design and the professor's role in structuring these teaching simulation activities were key to their success. Participants described the ways that simulations were framed and launched, graded, organized across the course, and the opportunities for feedback and growth as especially important for their instructional development.

### *Framing, Expectations, and Authenticity*

Seven of the eleven participants emphasized the importance of the framing and expectations for simulations, explicitly comparing them to teaching demonstrations from other courses. Though many indicated that they had done something somewhat similar in other classes, they noted that those teaching demonstrations "usually just end[ed] up being *presentations*, either in front of the whole class or to just one other group about like what [their] lesson *would* have been" (Riley). [emphasis added]

Highlighting that we wanted students to role-play and get into character seemed especially pivotal in making simulations more realistic to classroom teaching and less like presenting or sharing lesson plans. Nearly every participant noted that the student roles helped to encourage the authenticity of simulations as they "forced teachers to react to unexpected classroom occurrences, like blurting out or giving a wrong answer" (Emily). In a couple of exceptions, some PSTs thought

these student roles failed to go far enough, a view originating from these specific participants who faced more challenging classroom management situations in their teaching placements.

### ***Grading and a Formative Focus***

A majority of participants noted how the grading and feedback structures also helped to shift the focus of the activities from being a high-stakes assessment to instead being more formative and growth-oriented. This is especially important, given that six out of the eleven participants raised these topics during the open-ended and unprompted portion of the interviews, which asked general questions about their experiences with teaching simulations.

Instructors explained to students beforehand that they would not be graded on the quality of their lessons, but that we wanted to see them try things out, experiment a bit, and demonstrate improvement over the semester by incorporating feedback. This shifted the focus toward learning, as Nola indicated that this helped her “feel more confident” because “maybe [she] did freeze up, maybe [she would] forget what [she] was doing” in the middle of her lesson, but that the emphasis was that she tried hard on the lesson and we didn’t really “need to put a grade on it when the feedback is really all [she] cared about.” Mandy had similar feelings, explaining that:

I liked that you weren't a tough grader on [the simulations]. You wanted us, even if we were to mess up... because that was like how we were going to practice and learn. So, I think we all knew going in that you weren't going to grade too tough, even if we weren't doing amazing, and so that was reassuring.

Because students perceived the simulations as an opportunity for practice, it allowed them to feel comfortable experimenting or making mistakes while teaching a new method in an authentic but safe environment.

### ***Frequency and Opportunity to Improve***

One of the key design features of our simulations that is not ubiquitous across the field is the inclusion of multiple simulations in our courses throughout the semester. Rather than having only a single chance to do a role-play rehearsal, which seems common across the literature, the multiple opportunities in our simulation design helped to further frame these activities as formative and growth-oriented, which participants found to be instrumental in their development.

Across interviews, nearly all participants noted that the increased frequency of the simulations helped facilitate their learning to teach, especially because it gave them a chance to “see [themselves] grow throughout the semester and...implement what feedback [they] got from earlier lessons” (Anthony). Similarly, Viv noted how the multiple rounds of simulations made the teaching get easier over time, specifically pointing out how watching others teach gave her the

chance to see lots of examples of teaching and that she had the “videos to go back to [see her] mistakes and [focused on the] stuff that [she] wanted to improve on” for her final simulation.

Although this finding seems logical, it is especially important as it aligns with the few recent studies suggesting that repeated rounds of practice are a crucial course design feature that facilitates accelerated method mastery by PSTs (Moody et al., 2022; Prilop et al., 2025).

### ***Environment and a Learning Community***

Another aspect that participants identified as a positive impact on the teaching simulations was the cultivation of a learning community between the students and instructors in each course. This sense of community and safety made these activities more collaborative and less stressful. The fact that seven out of the eleven participants brought this up in the open-ended portion of the interviews further underscores the importance they saw in having a safe and respectful learning environment for enacting teaching simulations.

Though many students were familiar with one another before the course, Hector noted that “seeing each other do the simulations helped build camaraderie and build confidence” across the semester. Nola also tied this sense of a learning community back to the framing and feedback structures, explaining that:

I think the community of our classroom and the environment of our classroom was so good. It was like, if you messed up, no one was going to judge you... We were all going to help you get back to where you needed to be.

Collectively, PST comments suggested that having a firm foundation as a learning community was essential at the start for implementing teaching simulations and that simulations are a way to cultivate and deepen such connections within the classroom.

### ***Quality Feedback***

Every participant emphasized the importance of feedback in making simulations useful for their instructional development, highlighting how various design elements influenced the impact of feedback.

Many participants indicated that the giving and receiving feedback format was particularly useful. Several mentioned the use of the “glows and grows” post-lesson debriefs, noting that “getting to hear from [their] peers was nice, getting their ideas and hearing, ‘okay, this is something you did really well’” (Viv) was helpful for their improvement.

Others noted that having student roles and class observers in the social studies methods course, who didn’t act as students but acted only as observers completing that same feedback form as the instructor, was important in facilitating their noticing of practice. This unique aspect of the social

studies courses provides an interesting comparison point between classes and suggests that this might be a useful structure for making simulations more impactful. Emily and other participants explained that having student roles to act out helped them to give “more targeted and specific feedback.” However, this sometimes limited their attention, as Anthony explained,

When I was given a role as a student, I would hyperfocus on what I wanted them to fix [for my specific student needs]. I couldn't focus on anything else, which is why it was good to have the observers in the back who can kind of just be like, okay, ‘big picture.’

An interesting caveat emerged from several participants, linking quality of feedback to their trust in their classmates and instructor legitimacy. Feedback was especially effective when it came from respected sources. One instance in an interview stands out. After suggesting that the feedback received in these courses was different and more comfortable than prior experiences, we probed:

**Interviewer:** *What makes a professor's feedback feel uncomfortable?*

**Serena:** *I think it's just when a professor does or tells me to do things that they don't do themselves...when it feels hypocritical.*

Serena and several other participants highlighted the importance of their perception of the instructor's legitimacy and reputation as an effective educator in determining how they received and utilized feedback. When the professor is viewed as a valuable instructional model and expert, PSTs may take their feedback more seriously. When professors fail to practice what they preach, their feedback seems to fall flat with skeptical students. Similar to the importance of teacher credibility for learning in K-12 settings (Hattie, 2023), this finding builds on some of our work within PBTE contexts that highlights the importance that professors and course instructors play as instructional role models that PSTs draw on when forming their visions of teaching and to call upon in their actual day-to-day practice (Waychunas, 2024; Waychunas, in press).

### **Competence and Confidence Building Amidst Peer Pressure**

Our students were unanimously positive about and reported increased confidence in enacting the teaching methods practiced in the simulations. Overall, students attributed their increased confidence to the *multiple* opportunities for practice, the combined impacts of the previously described activity structures, and an increasing comfort in potentially making mistakes within the learning community.

#### ***Opportunities for Practice***

PSTs used teaching simulations to try out lessons and saw the multiple opportunities to teach as chances to put feedback into practice, highlighting how frequent simulations spurred instructional improvement. Carey used the in-class simulation to pilot a lesson that she created, edited based on feedback, then used in her novice-teaching placement, explaining that, “getting to practice it

beforehand, [she] was more confident” using the lesson in a real classroom. Similarly, Pam elaborated that her confidence increased because she “could teach and get feedback from people I’m a lot more comfortable with. If you mess up, it’s not the end of the world because it’s a teaching simulation.” Collectively, the format structures, such as the previously described growth-oriented framing, frequency of opportunities, and cycles of feedback and enactment, were perceived by PSTs as critical features that facilitated their instructional development.

Other participants highlighted the difference between writing and sharing lesson plans and *actually* teaching them in simulations. Riley noticed the difference between enacting a lesson versus reading about or *presenting* it to classmates, like they did in other coursework: “It gave practice on things in a way that you don’t get when you just read articles or present your lesson to one person type of projects.” PSTs frequently reported having completed teaching simulations in their prior coursework as one-shot assignments, presenting what they *would do* if they were teaching actual students or co-taught the lesson with a small group of PSTs.

### ***Public Teaching and the Pressure to Perform***

One of our claims testing prompts, which gauged PSTs’ anxiety about enacting teaching simulations, took a unique turn we did not anticipate based on participants’ personalities and values. Over half of our participants indicated that anxiety from peer pressure led to better enactments of teaching simulations to uphold self-image, please professors they respected, and match their peers’ level of enactments. Nancy described how she went more in-depth preparing for her teaching simulation than in her field placements, wanting to impress her professor: “It was nerve-wracking teaching in front of you. So I think... I went more in-depth teaching these sims than in my placement.” Other PSTs explained how comparing themselves to their peers contributed to a sense of healthy competition and improved confidence. Hector demonstrated this in stating:

I wouldn’t be as confident or be as prepared without these simulations. But yeah, the anxiety definitely pushed me to do better. It’s like a good pressure, in a way. Stressful, but in a way that helped you.

Serena also showed a sense of healthy competition, driving her to improve upon prior simulations: “I wouldn’t say anxiety because I really wasn’t anxious, but I did catch myself comparing myself to other classmates...I was like, oh, what can I do better than this person?” This finding adds to other work on PBTE, suggesting the potential for in-class rehearsals and simulations as a way to ratchet up the expectations for lessons as PSTs might feel more pressure to deliver high-quality lessons in front of peers and their professors than out in the field (Stroupe & Gotwals, 2018; Waychunas, 2025).

### ***Learning from One Another***

Each PST reported an increased understanding of how to enact various teaching methods, and many stated that they picked up strategies from one another, especially small classroom management and engagement moves. Part of this came from shifting roles as PSTs adopted a preservice teacher perspective in addition to their role as a college student. Carey described how she enjoyed observing the simulations because it shifted her perspective:

When I was a student in high school, I never thought about like ‘how is the teacher teaching, what methods are they using?’, and stuff like that...getting to put myself in that student role and then seeing, ‘okay, this is what whoever is teaching at the moment, what they’re trying to do. Is it working? Am I engaged?’

PSTs learned ways to adjust their instruction as the simulations progressed, modifying their lesson after submitting their initial lesson plan. Mandy noted, “Watching people do it beforehand really, really helped me to adjust mine on the spot and make it as good as it possibly could be.”

### **Conclusions and Implications**

The findings of this study contribute to the growing literature based about PBTE connecting approximations of practice done in coursework to impacts, at least perceived impacts, on preservice teachers’ instructional development (Kang & Windshitl, 2018; Macinindo et al., 2025; Stroupe et al., 2022). In particular, our study underscores critical features regarding how instructors implement PBTE approaches in coursework, most especially the importance of providing multiple opportunities for practice and considering the voices and experiences of PSTs in teacher educators instructional decisions (Moody et al. 2022; Ward et al., 2018; Waychunas, 2023). Accordingly, we believe that this study sheds light on not only the potential that teaching simulations and other approximations of practice hold for cultivating better-prepared beginning teachers, but *how* the design of such activities can facilitate such learning.

There are a multiplicity of ways to make approximations of practice and rehearsals work within coursework, a consideration that is especially important for implementing PBTE approaches in different contexts. The first author designed his social studies methods courses around role-play simulations; the second author had to significantly redesign his math methods courses. While students in math methods courses completed fewer assignments and projects than in the pre-PBTE iterations of the class, making room for role-play simulations resulted in: a) deeper understanding of core practices (i.e., modeling, facilitating discussions), b) skillful enactment of more general teaching practices (i.e., responding to student behaviors and launching learning activities with clear expectations), and c) cultivation of collegial professional dispositions and breaking down traditional teaching norms of privacy (Little, 1990; Lortie, 1975) and making instruction a more public act. This tradeoff may be difficult to swallow for some instructors as we make tough decisions about what to remove from our classes, but our experience of the PSTs in this study

suggest that such cuts and tough redesigns are worthwhile: doing less, but doing it better, is the way to go when it comes to learning how to teach. Instead of just touching on or covering a swath of methods, we now feel confident that our PSTs enter student teaching skilled in at least a few baseline methods that form a strong foundation in core practices of instruction.

Outside of curricular changes, class sizes and program structure play an important role in how TEs structure enactments like role-play simulations. We acknowledge that the small class sizes of eight to 16 students in this study may make replication of role-play simulations seem unrealistic for those in programs with larger classes. However, with modified structures and creative designs, it is possible to make simulations work with more students while still providing all PSTs with multiple opportunities to practice. In particular, we recommend finding ways to divide up larger classes, such as establishing several microclassrooms so all PSTs have the opportunity to teach, having students video record their simulations, and enlisting the occasional help of colleagues to facilitate smaller groups as promising ways to address issues of scale (see Waychunas, 2023 for a more in-depth example).

We also know that many readers or teacher educators interested in adopting PBTE approaches may already be utilizing some aspects of representations and approximations in their courses. Such enactment pedagogies are nothing new in teacher preparation (Forzani, 2014; Zeichner, 2012), and engaging in similar activities might already be familiar to many readers, even without using that exact PBTE terminology. These might include assignments such as writing and critiquing lesson plans, reviewing student work, and other approximations of practice (Hurlbut & Krutka, 2020). Below, we highlight some of the recommended considerations and structures that TEs make when engaging with role-play simulations or rehearsals, perhaps serving as a guide for TEs looking to implement or redesign the ways that PSTs engage with practice in their courses.

First and foremost, it seems that dedicating significant time to role-play simulations is critical for their success. In light of our study, we find the comparative brevity and relative infrequency of rehearsals and simulations in the current literature to be somewhat surprising. Examples of limited opportunity rehearsals in the high-profile studies include a small percentage of PSTs having the opportunity to practice their instruction before entering classrooms (Kazemi et al., 2016) or brief time allotment (Lampert et al., 2013), sometimes averaging only 7 minutes (Kavanagh et al., 2019). The restrictive nature of approaching simulations in such a manner seems problematic for meaningful growth opportunities based on what our PSTs shared with us in this study. We worry that the benefits that our participants experienced will be diluted or undermined if TEs place too many constraints on their use of such approximations of practice. Having only a single rehearsal, watching only a couple classmates demonstrate a method, or trying to teach a lesson in less than 10 minutes seems like it would deny PSTs the opportunity to deeply engage with practice.

Though further research is necessary, we strongly feel that the increased duration and multiple cycles of role-play simulations in our study were essential for PSTs to be able to put feedback into

action during the rounds of rehearsals and contributed to cultivating an environment that was collegial, collaborative, and which embraced productive struggle amongst peers (Murdoch et al., 2020). Lower stakes, more frequent (Moody et al., 2022; Reich, 2022), and longer (Stroupe & Gotwals, 2018; Waychunas, 2023) opportunities to enact practices in the controlled environment of the college classroom seem to be a promising path toward improving the effectiveness of rehearsals and role-play simulations.

This study also highlights the importance of the learning environment within which the role-play simulations take place: promoting a safe, semi-authentic, and collaborative space where both the TE and PSTs can give feedback is crucial. It seems that the framing of these activities, grading procedures, and feedback structures are pivotal in establishing and maintaining a classroom culture focused on collegiality and teacher development. Few studies have explored the role of learning communities and how they might serve as mediating factors on the effectiveness of such simulations, but what exists spotlights the importance of the social context as a pivotal consideration for teacher educators (Donat, 2015; Waychunas, 2023).

Similarly, it is easy for such simulations to feel fake and inauthentic, meaning that TEs must take steps to make them more realistic. In our case, providing PSTs with student roles helped to get them into character and helped to focus their attention and feedback to specific aspects of the lesson. Different from lesson “run-throughs,” establishing rich, semi-authentic environments can make rehearsals seem less like presentations about what PSTs *would* do, and instead reframe the activity to better mirror actual classroom instruction.

As we have occasionally run into in our work, we hope that this study pushes back on the most orthodox implementations of PBTE to show that there are a variety of ways to get PSTs practicing instruction before entering the field. Others have noted the range of ways that TEs can implement PBTE in courses (Brownell et al., 2018; Kavanaugh et al., 2019), and, as evidenced by this study, there are many successful ways to utilize, design, and structure rehearsals and simulations. Beyond the previously described differences with our approach to role-play rehearsals, in regard to length and repetition of these activities, this study also adds the caveat that simulations need not be connected to enactments in the field in order for them to still be impactful. This finding is especially important for programs that struggle to find high-quality clinical placements, as simulations can help to provide PSTs with instructional models and opportunities to practice that they might not have with cooperating teachers. As programs and courses have different requirements and structures for field placements and assignments, we hope that our work, in the light of other literature about PBTE, demonstrates that there are many different ways to successfully design and integrate rehearsals and simulations into a variety of contexts.

Another important aspect of this research that surfaced, and which warrants further investigation, is the role of TE credibility in the eyes of their PSTs as a mediating factor in whether or not rehearsals and simulations are experienced as useful from the perspective of future teachers.

Though the field has long acknowledged that TEs “practicing what we preach” is an important, if implied, maxim of our work (Loughren & Berry, 2005; Lunenberg et al., 2007), the participants in the study underscored how instructor credibility or legitimacy can reinforce or discredit if PSTs accept and implement feedback on their own teaching. More work exploring instructor credibility and facilitation skills might shed important light on how the instructor plays a role in whether or not such activities are fruitful learning experiences for PSTs.

The opportunities for follow-up research on PBTE are numerous. This study found that the formative aspect of our grading was impactful for how PSTs felt free to experiment and provide one another critical feedback. Accordingly, a follow-up research question about how rehearsals are graded across the field of teacher education and impacts on PST learning seems pertinent. Regarding critical feedback, other work could investigate how or if PSTs grow in their ability to provide one another with meaningful feedback over time. In this sense, we wonder: do PSTs develop the ability to better perceive, notice, and provide feedback on others’ teaching across simulations? On a related note, another avenue for investigation would be to study how and if PSTs’ ability to role-play as students changes over subsequent rounds of rehearsals.

Other, more in-depth studies could further investigate and validate teacher learning. Rather than just what PSTs perceive to be learning, what is actually showing up in their instruction? Does their improvement include core practices or is it more granular teaching practices like tricks for classroom management or engagement strategies? Similarly, it would be important to explore the role of simultaneous and future clinical placements to see how these environments might mediate PST experiences with PBTE approaches, especially whether or not the methods from role-play simulations carry over into their actual teaching in the field.

We are excited that this study contributes to the growing literature base about PBTE, but we know that the work can and must go further. It is our hope that this study, and the experiences of our preservice teachers, can provide insight to those who are both implementing and studying the ways that preparation coursework might better support the instructional development of beginning teachers.

**Acknowledgements:** This study was supported by a grant from the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning at Bradley University. This study was approved and conducted with IRB approval from Bradley University (24-066). In accordance with the privacy and consent procedures, data used in this research will not be made publicly available.

**Declaration of Interests:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this work.

## References

- Admiraal, W., Kittelsen Røberg, KI., Wiers-Jenssen, J., & Saab, N. (2023). Mind the gap: Early-career teachers' level of preparedness, professional development, working conditions, and feelings of distress. *Social Psychology of Education, 26*, 1759–1787. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09819-6>
- Anagnostopoulos, D., Smith, E. R., & Basmadjian, K. G. (2007). Bridging the university–school divide: Horizontal expertise and the “Two-Worlds Pitfall.” *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(2), 138–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487106297841>
- Ball, D. L. (2021). Understanding the power of teaching and its role (in) justice. In *Felix Klein Award Lecture at the 14th International Congress on Mathematical Education. Shanghai, China*.
- Ball, D. L. (2022). Reimagining American education: Possible futures: Coming to terms with the power of teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 103*(7), 51–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217221092236>
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497–511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479>
- Braaten, M. (2019). Persistence of the two-worlds pitfall: Learning to teach within and across settings. *Science Education, 103*(1), 61–91. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21460>
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018001032>
- Cairns-Lee, H., Lawley, J., & Tosey, P. (2022). Eliciting interview data cleanly through minimising leading questions. In H. Cairns-Lee, J. Lawley, & P. Tosey (Eds.), *Clean language interviewing: Principles and applications for researchers and practitioners* (pp. 17-30). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/9781801173308>
- Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2020). Beyond equity as inclusion: A framework of “rightful presence” for guiding justice-oriented studies in teaching and learning. *Educational Researcher, 49*(6), 433–440. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20927363>
- Chaney, B., Braun, H., & Jenkins, F. (2020). Novice middle school teachers' preparedness for teaching, and the helpfulness of supports: A survey of one state. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 28*(107), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.5001>
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2011). *The long-term impacts of teachers: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood* (No. w17699). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass.

- Coggshall, J. G., Bivona, L., & Reschly, D. J. (2012). Evaluating the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs for support and accountability. Research & Policy Brief. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality*.
- Cohen, A., & Cohen, A. (2025). The role of practice in teacher education for democratic citizenship: Experiences of Israeli preservice teachers. *The New Educator*, 21(2), 158–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2024.2417902>
- Cohen, J., Marisa Yonas, A., & Elizabeth Wilson, K. (2025). Approximating teaching: A systematic review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543251368383>
- Cotnoir, C., Paton, S., Peters, L., Pretorius, C., & Smale, L. (2014). The lasting impact of influential teachers. *Online Submission*.
- Dalinger, T., Thomas, K. B., Stansberry, S., & Xiu, Y. (2020). A mixed reality simulation offers strategic practice for pre-service teachers. *Computers & Education*, 144, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103696>.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.) *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 390-441). Jossey-Bass.
- Dennen, V. P., & Burner, K. J. (2008). The cognitive apprenticeship model in educational practice. In *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 425-439). Routledge.
- Domínguez, M. (2020). Cultivating epistemic disobedience: Exploring the possibilities of a decolonial practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(5), 551–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120978152>
- Donat, E. (2015). *Footprints of practice-based teacher education: Understanding teachers' development through practice* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington). [https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/33784/Donat\\_washington\\_0250E\\_15125.pdf?sequence=1](https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/33784/Donat_washington_0250E_15125.pdf?sequence=1)
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record*, 87(1), 53–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818508700107>
- Forzani, F. M. (2014). Understanding “core practices” and “practice-based” teacher education: Learning from the past. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(4), 357–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533800>
- Ghousseini, H. (2017). Rehearsals of teaching and opportunities to learn mathematical knowledge for teaching. *Cognition and Instruction*, 35(3), 188–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2017.1323903>

- Goldhaber, D., & Ronfeldt, M. (2020). Toward causal evidence on effective teacher preparation. In J.E. Carinci, C. Jackson, & S. J. Meyer (Eds.), *Linking teacher preparation program design and implementation to outcomes for teachers and students* (pp. 211-236). Information Age Publishing.
- Grisham, D. L., Yoder, K. K., Smetana, L., Dobler, E., Wolsey, T. D., Lenski, S. J., Young, J., Chambers, S., Scales, R. Q., Wold, L. S., Ganske, K., & Scales, W. D. (2014). Are teacher candidates learning what they are taught? Declarative literacy learning in 10 teacher preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 27(1), 168–190.
- Grossman, P. (Ed.). (2021). *Teaching core practices in teacher education*. Harvard Education Press.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. W. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2055–2100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810911100905>
- Guba E., & Lincoln Y. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage
- Hammerness, K., Stroupe, D., & Matsko, K. K. (2023). Learning to teach equitably: Theoretical frameworks and principles for international research and practice. In I. Menter (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of teacher education research* (pp. 1-35). Springer International Publishing.
- Hattie, J. (2023). *Visible learning: The sequel: A synthesis of over 2,100 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hauser, M., & Schneider Kavanagh, S. (2019). Practice-based teacher education. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.419>
- Haynes, M. (2014). On the path to equity: Improving the effectiveness of beginning teachers. *Alliance for Excellent Education*.
- Hurlbut, A., & Krutka, D. (2020). Where do we start? Initiating a practice-based teacher education program around high-leverage practices. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 9(2), 169–199. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jtee/issue/56618/653811>
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Jiménez, T. R., & Orozco, M. (2021). Prompts, not questions: Four techniques for crafting better interview protocols. *Qualitative Sociology*, 44, 507–528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-021-09483-2>
- Kang, H., & Windschitl, M. (2018). How does practice-based teacher preparation influence novices' first-year instruction? *Teachers College Record*, 120(8), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811812000803>

- Kazemi, E., Ghouseini, H., Cunard, A., & Turrou, A. C. (2016). Getting inside rehearsals: Insights from teacher educators to support work on complex practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(1), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115615191>
- Kennedy, M. (2016). Parsing the practice of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(1), 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115614617>
- Knight, S. L., Lloyd, G. M., Arbaugh, F., Gamson, D., McDonald, S. P., Nolan Jr., J., & Whitney, A. E. (2015). School-based teacher learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(4), 301–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115596828>
- Korthagen, F. (2017). A foundation for effective teacher education: Teacher education pedagogy based on situated learning. In D. J. Clandinin & J. Husu (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research on teacher education*, 2, 528–544. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402042.n30>
- Korthagen, F., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Routledge.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5(3), 213–236. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2350050305>
- Lampert, M., Franke, M. L., Kazemi, E., Ghouseini, H., Turrou, A. C., Beasley, H., Cunard, A., & Crowe, K. (2013). Keeping it complex: Using rehearsals to support novice teacher learning of ambitious teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(3), 226–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112473837>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (2001). Legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice. In J. Clarke, A. Hanson, R. Harrison, & F. Reeve (Eds.), *Supporting lifelong learning* (pp. 121-136). Routledge.
- Leeferink, H., Koopman, M., Beijgaard, D., & Ketelaar, E. (2015). Unraveling the complexity of student teachers' learning in and from the workplace. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(4), 334–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115592163>
- Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, 91(4), 509–536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819009100403>
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.
- Loughran, J., & Berry, A. (2005). Modelling by teacher educators. *Teaching and teacher education*, 21(2), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.005>
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F., & Swennen, A. (2007). The teacher educator as a role model. *Teaching and teacher education*, 23(5), 586–601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.001>

- Mancenido, Z. (2023). Impact evaluations of teacher preparation practices: Challenges and opportunities for more rigorous research. *Review of Educational Research, 94*(2), 268–307. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231174413>
- Mancenido, Z., Hill, H. C., Garcia Coppersmith, J., Carter, H., Pollard, C., & Monschauer, C. (2025). Practice-based teacher education pedagogies improve responsiveness: Evidence from a lab experiment. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 1*–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2025.2456716>
- Markoff, B. (2025). Beyond interest convergence: Abolitionist horizons in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 47*(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2025.2520210>
- Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research?: A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 54*(1), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2013.11645667>
- Martell, C. C. (2020). Barriers to inquiry-based instruction: A longitudinal study of history teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71*(3), 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119841880>
- Matsumoto-Royo, K., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2021). Core practices in practice-based teacher education: A systematic literature review of its teaching and assessment process. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 70*, 101047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101047>
- McGraw, R., Fernandes, A., Guerrero, S., & Wolfe, J. A. (2025). Promoting access to learning: The experiences of early-career teachers in the USA. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 1*–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-025-09727-w>
- Moody, S. M., Kuo, L. J., & Eslami, Z. R. (2022). Learning to be teachers: Preservice teacher descriptions of practice-based teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education, 31*(3), 5–25. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1362796>
- Morse J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research, 25*(9), 1212–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315588501>
- Murdoch, D., English, A. R., Hintz, A., & Tyson, K. (2021). Feeling heard: Inclusive education, transformative learning, and productive struggle. *Educational Theory, 70*(5), 653–679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12449>
- Peercy, M. M., Tigert, J., Fredricks, D., Kidwell, T., Feagin, K., Hall, W., Himmel, J., & Lawyer, M. D. (2022). From humanizing principles to humanizing practices: Exploring core practices as a bridge to enacting humanizing pedagogy with multilingual students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 113*, 103653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103653>

- Peercy, M. M., & Troyan, F. J. (2017). Making transparent the challenges of developing a practice-based pedagogy of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 61*, 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.10.005>
- Petek, N., & Pope, N. G. (2023). The multidimensional impact of teachers on students. *Journal of Political Economy, 131*(4), 1057–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1086/722227>
- Philip, T. M., Souto-Manning, M., Anderson, L., Horn, I., J. Carter Andrews, D., Stillman, J., & Varghese, M. (2019). Making justice peripheral by constructing practice as “core”: How the increasing prominence of core practices challenges teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*(3), 251–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118798324>
- Prilop, C. N., Rotsaert, T., & Vanderlinde, R. (2025). Fostering pre-service teachers’ classroom management knowledge, self-efficacy, and professional vision: The effect of different expert feedback and pre-service teachers’ feedback perceptions during online video analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 157*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.104949>
- Reich, J. (2022). Teaching drills: Advancing practice-based teacher education through short, low-stakes, high-frequency practice. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 30*(2), 217–228. <https://doi.org/10.70725/023707spaywm>
- Robinson, O. C. (2013). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11*(1), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543>
- Ronfeldt, M. (2021). *Links among teacher preparation, retention, and teaching effectiveness. Evaluating and improving teacher preparation programs*. National Academy of Education.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Santagata, R., Kersting, N., Givvin, K. B., & Stigler, J. W. (2010). Problem implementation as a lever for change: An experimental study of the effects of a professional development program on students’ mathematics learning. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 4*(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2010.498562>
- Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. E. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 29–52. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/teaceducquar.41.4.29>
- Stroupe, D., & Gotwals, A. W. (2018). “It’s 1000 degrees in here when I teach”: Providing preservice teachers with an extended opportunity to approximate ambitious instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(3), 294–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117709742>
- Stroupe, D., Gotwals, A., Christensen, J., & Wray, K. A. (2022). Becoming ambitious: How a practice-based methods course and “macroteaching” shaped beginning teachers’ critical

- pedagogical discourses. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 33(6), 683–702.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2021.1988037>
- Teacher Education by Design (TEDD). (2014). *The Design*. Teacher Education by Design.  
<https://tedd.org/the-design/>
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- Ward, P., Chen, Y. J., Higginson, K., & Xie, X. (2018). Teaching rehearsals and repeated teaching: Practice-based physical education teacher education pedagogies. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 89(6), 20–25.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2018.1476937>
- Waychunas, W. (2024). Teaching teachers with, for, and through dialogue: Demonstrating democratic and ambitious social studies teaching through an education foundations course. *The Good Society*, 33(1), 73–106.
- Waychunas, W. (2025). Using simulations or rehearsals in teacher preparation coursework: Learning from preservice social studies teacher experiences to inform future practice. *The Teacher Educator*, 60(1), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2024.2357090>
- Waychunas, W. (in press). When how we teach is what we teach: Teacher educators as instructional models for novice teachers. *Journal of Education Research and Practice*.
- Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), 525–539.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818808900403>
- Young, M. K., & Gillespie Rouse, A. (2025). A systematic review of rehearsal use in literacy methods courses. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 64(4), 431–447.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2024.2366208>
- Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(5), 376–382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112445789>

## Appendix A - Interview Protocol

### Email to Participants (one day beforehand)

We're looking forward to talking with you tomorrow about your experiences with teaching simulations last semester! Here are just a few things to think about beforehand in case you want some time to gather some of your thoughts...

- What do you see as the benefits or challenges of participating in teaching simulations this past semester?
- Thoughts or comments on the structure and design (lesson planning, co-teaching vs. solo-teaching, length, focus methods, student roles, content, feedback, etc.)
- Connections between teaching simulations and...
  - Clinical placements
  - Similarities and differences with other ETE courses
  - Your own experiences in school

### Interview Prompts

- **Instructional Development**
  - What, if anything, did you learn from participating in teaching simulations this semester? (as “teacher” or “student”)
  - Did you learn from observing and participating in your classmates’ simulated lessons? How?
    - Student roles?
    - Lesson Observer? (in History/SS)
- **Giving and Receiving Feedback**
  - How did you approach giving your peers feedback?
    - What did you look for?
    - Over the course of the semester, how, if at all, did giving feedback change for you?
  - Differences between getting feedback from the instructor, classmates (in debrief), and in the feedback form (for SS methods)
  - Did you see benefits or downsides to the public feedback structure?
    - Did you ever use feedback that peers received?
  - How, if at all, did you incorporate feedback into your teaching? (in the field, in subsequent simulations?)
- **Structure and Design:** We’re considering continuing to use these in our courses. What, if any, recommendations would you make about what we should keep or change about teaching simulations?
  - Co-teaching vs. Solo Teaching
  - Methods? (modeling, discussion, using manipulatives, lecture, etc.)
  - Length? (10-15 or 20-30 minutes?)
  - Number of Simulations?
  - Repeating the same practice (a do-over/2nd attempt) vs. Seeing a Variety of Methods
  - Provided materials vs Making/Finding your own
- **Claim Testing: Some of these claims might be or might not be applicable to you. We’d like to hear how or if they apply to your experiences with teaching simulations.**

- The teaching simulations helped me develop confidence in my instruction
- The teaching simulations had no impact on my knowledge of history/math
- The teaching simulations helped me better understand how to implement different teaching practices
- Enacting teaching simulations got easier over the course of the semester
- The teaching simulations caused me anxiety because I compared myself to my classmates' teaching
- Student roles, or simulations generally, helped me to think about how different students might experience lessons differently (culture, gender, skills, race, introvert/extrovert, etc.)
- Because I was teaching in front of peers and the professor, I felt more pressure to deliver outstanding lessons (maybe more than I do in the field)
- I picked up and used strategies and practice that I saw my classmates use in their simulations
- Student roles were not authentic and negatively impacted the teaching simulations
- I planned and prepared differently for teaching simulations in comparison to writing lesson plans for my other coursework and field placements
- Teaching simulations were restrictive and caused my teaching to feel inauthentic and rigid
- Depending on clinical placement:
  - No placement: Teaching simulations were especially important for me because they gave me a chance to get me practice teaching that I would have otherwise done in the field.
  - In Novice or Other Placement:
    - Teaching simulations gave me the chance to try out a lesson before I taught it in the field
    - Teaching simulations gave me the chance to “do-over” a lesson that I had previously taught in the field
    - Teaching simulations gave me the chance to try out some methods that I couldn't really use in my field placement
- **Connections to field placements (depending on if they were in a placement)**
  - If you were in a field placement, did you use the strategies you implemented in teaching simulations in your novice placement? (What was different? What was the same? How did it go?)
    - If they didn't use strategies, why not?
  - If you used lessons from novice placements in your teaching simulations, what, if anything, was different?
  - Were the methods from the simulations similar or different from your CT's teaching?
    - If there was a vast difference, did that encourage you to try something different?
- **Comparisons to other coursework**
  - If you have done teaching simulations in other coursework, how were these simulations similar or different?
  - How, if at all, was lesson planning for teaching simulations similar to or different

- **Method and Content Familiarity**
  - How familiar were you with the different **methods** called for in the teaching simulations from your own schooling and field experiences?
    - Modeling
    - Discussion/Discourse
    - Lecture
    - Manipulatives
    - Small Group Instruction (Learning Centers)
  - How familiar were you with the **content knowledge** needed for the teaching simulations?
    - History/Social Studies
      - Modeled Skills (map grids, timelines, etc.)
      - Historical Thinking Skills (secondary only)
      - Factual Knowledge of People/Places/Events and Concepts
    - Math
      - Were there any lessons in which you found the math surprisingly difficult? If so, why?

### Appendix B - Lesson Plan Template

<p><b>Instructional Goal</b> <i>What will students know and be able to do by the end of this lesson?</i></p>	<p><b>Objectives:</b> SWBAT</p>	
<p><b>Standards</b> <i>Give a standard that would apply to this lesson. Select at least one standard from two of the three sets: IL state standards, Common Core Standards, or C3 standards</i></p>		
<p><b>Opening Activity</b> <i>How will you start your lesson and get students interested?</i></p> <p>Time: ___ minutes ('time-stamps' to pace out your lesson)</p>	<p><i>Teacher Actions</i> (what is the teacher doing/saying?)</p>	<p><i>Student Actions</i> (what are students doing?)</p>
<p><b>Lesson Activities</b> <i>How will you engage students throughout your lesson?</i></p> <p>Time: ___ minutes (include 'time-stamps' to pace out your lesson)</p>		
<p><b>Closing</b> <i>Wrapping it up....how will you close out the lesson?</i></p> <p><i>How will you know what students learned?</i></p> <p>Time: ___ minutes (include 'time-stamps' to pace out your lesson)</p>		
<p><b>Lesson Considerations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How balanced are teacher and student talk time?</li> <li>• How active or passive are student actions across the lesson? (are they all just "sitting and listening" or are they engaging in activities throughout)</li> <li>• <i>Checking-for-Understanding</i>: Where are you checking for student comprehension throughout your lesson? (rather than just at the end of the lesson)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Do your CFUs assess whole class learning or is it only a few students?</li><li>• Does your lesson connect to student prior or background knowledge?</li><li>• Have you done the activities and assignments yourself to test them out or create an answer key?</li><li>• Have you considered where students might struggle or be confused? Do you have a way to re-teach, re-phrase, and address misconceptions?</li><li>• Which student responses, answers, and ideas do you want to be sure to highlight?</li><li>• Is your lesson organized in a way that all the different parts are connected? How will you explicitly connect pieces of the lesson? How will you transition between activities?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What order did you provide examples and activities? Why did this sequence make sense?</li></ul></li></ul>
--	---

Please attach any handouts or modifications to the text that you've created!!!!

### Appendix C - Teaching Simulations Reflection

*Review the video recording of your lesson as well as the feedback given to you by your instructor, classmates, and observers after the lesson to answer the following questions...*

1. **Lesson Strength(s):** Describe at least one aspect of the lesson which went as planned or that you thought was a particularly strong part of the lesson. What made it so successful?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. **Areas for Improvement:** Pick two moments, activities, or aspects of your lesson that you would change if you were going to teach the lesson again. Describe what happened, what you believe the issue was, and give a specific idea for how you could have approached this differently
  - a.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  - b.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
3. **Looking Across:** What did you learn from watching or participating as a “student” in other folks’ simulated lessons?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
4. **Looking Forward:** What will you do differently in a future simulation or real lesson based on what you learned from this activity?

## Appendix D - Example Student Roles

In one of the lessons, <b>ask the teacher to repeat directions</b> at some point	In one of the lessons, <b>ask the teacher to repeat directions</b> at some point
In one of the lessons, be that kid who always has their hand raised and wants to answer every question	At some point in a lesson, <b>share an incorrect answer</b>
In a lesson that involves some reading aloud, struggle with some of the bigger and tougher words, and maybe ask the teacher what a word means	<b>Get confused by the steps</b> of the task and <b>ask the teacher to explain it another way</b>
Disengage and put your head down during one of the lessons (don't do this for more than a few minutes - re-engage if the teacher intervenes)	<u>Speed-racer</u> : Be that kid who finishes their work really fast ( <i>hey, teacher, come check my answers! I'm done!</i> )
<u>Blurting/Interrupting</u> : During one of today's lessons, shout out answers, blurt out something funny, or interject a question without raising your hand	<u>Shy kid</u> : During one of the lessons, avoid participating or sharing as much as possible
<u>Tortoise</u> : During one of the tasks in today's lessons, take <i>much</i> longer to complete a task than the rest of the class	<u>Rambler</u> : During one of the lessons, share a personal story that is only somewhat related to the topic (max 30 seconds)
<u>Daydreamer</u> : During one of the lessons, get distracted (daydreaming) and stop participating until you get redirected by the teacher (don't do for more than a few minutes)	<u>Materials Mess</u> : Forget, lose, or need something during a lesson (a pen/pencil or lost a card...oops, here it is on the floor!)