

## **Perceptions of Beginning Teachers on Pre-service Teacher Preparation in Turkey<sup>1</sup>**

### **Göreve Yeni Başlamış Öğretmenlerin Türkiye'deki Hizmet-öncesi Öğretmen Yetiştirme Hakkındaki Görüşleri<sup>1</sup>**

*( Received December 3 2014- Approved February 13 2015 )*

Mustafa Öztürk<sup>2</sup> and Ali Yıldırım<sup>3</sup>

#### **Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of beginning teachers on pre-service teacher education. Through a survey, 465 beginning teachers working in randomly selected provinces of Turkey assessed the benefits of their pre-service programs. For data analysis, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The results of the study indicated that the participant teachers' perceptions on their pre-service trainings were not positive and that these perceptions changed significantly by the type of faculty they graduated from, the amount of practice teaching they did during their pre-service years, the existence of a mentor teacher as a part of practice teaching done during pre-service years, and their teaching fields.

**Keywords:** teacher education; theory-practice relationship; pre-service teacher education; beginning teachers

#### **Öz**

Bu araştırma, göreve yeni başlamış öğretmenlerin hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimi hakkındaki görüşlerini ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Tarama deseni çerçevesinde hazırlanmış bir anket yoluyla, Türkiye'nin rastgele seçilmiş illerinde görev yapmakta olan 465 aday öğretmenin, hizmet-öncesi dönemde aldıkları eğitimi değerlendirmeleri sağlanmıştır. Verilerin analizi için betimsel ve çıkarımsal istatistik yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, katılımcı öğretmenlerin hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimiyle ilgili yansıtıkları görüşlerin olumlu olmadığını, bu algıların katılımcıların mezun olduğu fakülteye, hizmet-öncesi dönemde yürüttükleri öğretmenlik uygulamalarının yoğunluğuna, öğretmenlik uygulamaları sırasında bir kılavuz öğretmenden danışmanlık alıp almadıklarına ve öğretmenlik alanlarına göre farklılık gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** öğretmen eğitimi; kuram-uygulama ilişkisi; hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimi; yeni öğretmenler

#### **Introduction**

Teacher education has always been perceived as a critical area in educational systems because of the assumption that teachers have a great impact on the quality of education in schools. Research has also identified the quality of the teacher in the

<sup>1</sup> Presented as a paper at OER (Oxford Education Research) Symposium held at the University of Oxford in the UK on November 25, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Dr., Instructor, Hacettepe University School of Foreign Languages, mustafaozturk@hacettepe.edu.tr

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University Faculty of Education, aliy@metu.edu.tr

classroom as the largest contributing effect on student achievement (Goldhaber, 2007; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004). The role of the teacher has appeared as the most highlighted variable in achieving educational objectives (18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010). A related assumption is that if teachers are prepared effectively during their pre-service teacher education, they will have an increased capacity to offer a better education for their students. At this point, the significance of pre-service years comes into prominence.

Teacher education is not only about assisting student teachers in developing good and effective teaching competencies, but also about educating beginning teachers in professional communities and contributing to a career-long professional development (Smith & Sela, 2005). Adopting collaborative approaches in identifying core program concepts; engaging in self-study; sharing the ideas and resources, and supporting teacher candidate learning (Rosaen, 2003) are important to the development of teachers' professional knowledge. It should be recognized that the teachers' professional development includes their personal or individual development as well as their cognitive and skill-based development. In the case of teacher education context in Turkey, the two principal institutions that are responsible for teachers' education and development are the *Education Faculties* of the universities serving for pre-service teachers before graduation and the *Ministry of National Education* serving for in-service teachers after graduation.

Student population in Turkey is growing, and so is the need for new and qualified teachers, particularly in some branches. As a result, the number of the faculties training teachers and the student quota for each of these faculties have increased steadily. This quantitative change has made it more difficult to control the candidate teachers' development process and monitor the graduates' experiences effectively. Since the foundation of the Republic, Turkey has adopted a route to find a place among well-developed countries, which has resulted in continuing reforms in education as in other fields. Throughout the history of Turkish education, restructuring of the teacher education system has had a critical place among educational initiatives. Therefore, there has been a long and continuous debate on the issue of teacher education in Turkey.

Teacher education has been perceived as one of the top priorities of the education system by almost all of the governments since the initial years of the Republic (18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010). In this context, there have been five critical milestones regarding the reforms in teacher education:

- (1) 1924 - John Dewey's visit to Turkey and report on Turkish Education System
- (2) 1954 - Abolition of a unique training model called Village Institutes
- (3) 1973 - Enactment of Basic Law of National Education
- (4) 1981 - Establishment of Higher Education Council (HEC)
- (5) 1997 - Redesigning of teacher education programs

Starting with the foundation of the Republic, Turkey has intended to achieve

Western standards in education as in all other fields. As a considerable and dominant impact of John Dewey's visit to Turkey in 1924, striking measures were taken in transformation of teacher education between the years 1924 and 1954 (Binbaşıoğlu, 2005; Koçer, 1973; Öztürk, 2005; Turan, 2000; Türkmen, 2007; Uygun, 2008). Accordingly, teacher training schools were diversified and a new model called *Village Institutes* was implemented in the 1940s (Aysal, 2005; Doğan, 2005; Karaömerlioğlu, 1998; Kızılaslan, 2012; Koçer, 1973; Öztürk, 2005; Seferoğlu, 2004; Tarman 2010; Turan, 2000; Türkmen, 2007; Uygun, 2003, 2008). Until the 1950s, teachers in Turkey were trained through two tracks in order to meet different needs in different regions: for urban areas, primary school teachers received education at Teacher Schools; and for rural areas, *village school teachers* received education at *Village Teacher Schools* and *Village Institutes*. Both of the tracks were at the secondary education level and under the supervision of the Ministry of National Education (Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003; Doğan, 2005; Koçer, 1973; 18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010).

From the time when *Village Institutes* were abandoned in 1954, classroom teachers for primary education level were educated in boarding high schools called *Primary Teacher Schools*; teachers for various fields at the level of lower secondary education were educated in two-to-three-year *Institutes of Education*; and teachers for secondary education level were educated in four-year *Higher Teacher Schools* (Doğan, 2005; Kavcar, 2002; Türkmen, 2007; Yüksel, 2012; 18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010).

In 1973, all teacher education programs were increased to higher education level and teachers were required to earn a higher education degree as a result of the *Basic Law of National Education*. With this extensive reform, teacher training schools were redesigned. Particularly, teacher education programs for primary education level were transferred to two-year *Institutes of Education* (Doğan, 2005; Kartal, 2011; Kavcar, 2002; Tarman, 2010; Yüksel, 2012; 18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010).

Another important regulation was related with the *1981 Higher Education Law*, which restructured the Turkish higher education by gathering all higher education institutions under the responsibility of universities. Subsequently in 1982, all institutions training teachers under the supervision of the *Ministry of National Education* were transferred to universities and the responsibility of teacher education was given to higher education institutions. This entailed the establishment of *Faculties of Education* within the universities under the supervision of the *Higher Education Council* (Aydın & Başkan, 2005; Başkan, Aydın, & Madden, 2006; Demirel, 1991; Güven, 2008; Kartal, 2011; Kavcar, 2002; Seferoğlu, 2004; Yüksel, 2012; 18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010). This initiative to transfer teacher education to universities was parallel to the trends in other European countries as well (Clay & George, 2000 cited in Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003). Based on this reform, four-year *Faculties of Education* undertook the responsibility of four-year teacher training colleges to train teachers for the levels of lower secondary and secondary education and the two-year *Schools of Education* started to train teach-

ers for primary education level. In 1989, regardless of the level they taught, all teachers were to receive a four-year undergraduate degree, and thus the programs at Schools of Education were increased to four years, which entailed the establishment of *Departments of Primary Education* within *Education Faculties* in 1992 (Yüksel, 2012; 18<sup>th</sup> NECR, 2010). However, together with the faculties of education, there have always been alternative routes or programs to teacher certification in Turkey (Seferoğlu, 2004; Şimşek & Yıldırım, 2001; Yıldırım & Ok, 2002).

In d1997, teacher education programs were redesigned through an initiative of the Higher Education Council in order to improve quality standards and meet the needs in teacher education (Aydın & Başkan, 2005; Başkan, Aydın, & Madden, 2006; Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003; Güven, 2008; Kartal, 2011; Kavcar, 2002; Yüksel, 2012).

No matter how many measures have been taken so far to improve teacher education, unresolved problems of teacher education in Turkey have remained. Çakıroğlu and Çakıroğlu (2003) summarized the problems of teacher education in Turkey under two headings: (a) problems originating from outside factors and (b) problems originating from teacher education programs. The first heading described issues such as increasing population of the country, high demand for teachers, political facts resulting from instability of governments, central management concerns, problems of the teaching profession including low salary, socio-economic status and heavy workload; and admission system for teacher education programs. The second heading highlighted the importance of curriculum and its relevance to real life. The gap between theory and practice has been defined to be the central problem of teacher education by various educators (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hammerness, 2006; Korthagen *et al.*, 2001).

The problems regarding teacher education in Turkey have continuously been mentioned in many reports or papers (Aydın & Başkan, 2005; Binbaşıoğlu, 1995; Bulut *et al.*, 1995; Doğan, 2005; Demirel, 1991; Gürşimşek *et al.*, 1997; Karagözoğlu & Murray, 1988; Karagözoğlu, 1991; Koçer, 1973; Seferoğlu, 1996; Seferoğlu, 2004, 2006; Uygun, 2005). However, few studies have been carried out with an empirical tradition by focusing on practising teachers' views on their pre-service preparation. In Levine's (2006) study, school principals' and graduate teachers' views were investigated and only 40% of school principals perceived that teacher education schools were doing good work when preparing teachers and 62% of graduates felt their teacher preparation program did not adequately prepare them for the realities of the classroom. Good *et al.* (2006) observed first-year practices of teachers based on school level and type of pre-service teacher preparation. In the study, analyses revealed higher quality classroom management practices at the elementary level and among teachers who attended traditional training programs. Senemoğlu (2011) conducted a study on the effectiveness of primary teacher education programs through the perceptions of student teachers, faculty members, and newly graduated teachers. All three groups perceived

that student teachers in primary teacher education were prepared at least adequately in terms of competencies defined in the questionnaire although there were some differences among the perceptions of subject groups. Seferoğlu (2004) examined senior undergraduate student teachers' perspectives on alternative routes to teacher certification, which reflected a negative perception on the part of the participants. In another study, Seferoğlu (2006) explored teacher candidates' reflections on methodology and practice components of a pre-service training program in Turkey, which indicated a lack of close connection between the course materials and practical application in real classrooms as well as insufficient opportunities for microteaching experiences. Caires, Almeida, and Vieira (2012) intended to describe the general feelings, cognitions, and perceptions of student teachers with respect to dimensions of learning and supervision; professional and institutional socialization; emotional and physical impact; and career aspects. The results highlighted some difficulties during pre-service years as well as some positive perceptions.

As seen from the research done previously, most of the studies were conducted with student teachers, but not enough attention has been given to the evaluation of the system from the perspectives of the newly-qualified in-service teachers, who are affected directly as stakeholders of the system as they are trained by the system and currently working in actual classrooms to implement what they gained from pre-service years. Therefore, this study aimed to look into the perceptions of beginning teachers through a survey by enabling them to assess the benefits of their pre-service teacher training programs on certain aspects of the teaching profession. The study intended to answer the following research questions: (1) How do the beginning teachers assess the pre-service teacher preparation in Turkey? and (2) Do those perceptions vary significantly by certain background variables?

## **Method**

This study was a descriptive survey in which a questionnaire was used to investigate how the new teachers assessed their pre-service education. The target population of the study was the beginning teachers teaching in various school contexts in different parts of Turkey. Considering the huge number of the target population, which is approximately 15.000 and changes each year based on teacher assignment policies of the Ministry of National Education, the study was conducted with a 'sample'. Considering the resources of the researchers, such as financing, time, transportation, etc. as well as the limitations placed upon them by the permission procedures, cluster random sampling was used. Rather than selecting a random sample among all individuals, it was practical to cluster the population and select some provinces of Turkey randomly, and implement the study with all the novice teachers in those provinces: Konya ( $n=125$ ), Batman ( $n=96$ ), Ordu ( $n=73$ ), Niğde ( $n=64$ ), Erzurum ( $n=39$ ), Muğla ( $n=39$ ), Kütahya ( $n=17$ ), and Ankara ( $n=12$ ). The total number of the beginning teachers participating in

the study was 465, 87% of whom were the graduates of “Education Faculties” ( $n=404$ ) and the rest (13%) of whom graduated from other faculties ( $n=61$ ).

The data collection tool was constructed by the researchers based on an external analysis of the related literature and the program specifications of the pre-service teacher education in Turkey. The data collection tool included *Likert* type questions enabling the participants to decide on the choice across each statement that best indicates their perception on the benefits of their pre-service preparation regarding certain aspects of the teaching profession and open ended items where the participants could provide their further comments on the issue. After having necessary revisions based on expert opinions and the approval of the Committee of Ethics at Middle East Technical University, the final draft was obtained. The questionnaire was administered in eight different provinces. Reliability of the instrument was ensured through “reliability analysis”. The internal consistency of the items in the instrument, which is Cronbach’s alpha level, was .94. The data were analyzed through descriptive statistics to understand general tendencies among the participants and through inferential statistics like t-test, ANOVA, and Chi-Square to understand group differences in relation to the perceptions of the participants by independent variables. The responses were summarized in frequency distribution tables; the findings were organized according to percentages, means, and standard deviations; and “*F*”, “*t*”, and “*p*” values were presented in tables. After ANOVA, necessary multiple comparisons as “post-hoc” tests were administered. The follow up test Dunnett C was conducted to evaluate the differences among the means. The significance level of t-tests and ANOVAs was established at  $p < .01$ .

## **Results**

The results of the study were presented in four parts: (a) responses given by the participants in relation to their preparation for the teaching profession; (b) participants’ reported perceptions on the contributions of their pre-service trainings to certain aspects of the teaching profession; (c) differences in the participants’ perceptions by background variables; and (d) further comments provided to the open-ended items by the participants.

### ***Results about the participants’ preparation for the teaching profession***

In relation to participants’ preparation for the teaching profession, the participants were asked about the benefits of their practice teaching experiences. According to the responses given to the item, 40% of the participants benefited from their practice teaching experiences in pre-service years to some extent, whereas only 17.8% benefited from it considerably. On the other hand, 33.5% found it a little beneficial, and the rest (8.6%) did not benefit from it at all. In another item, the participants were asked whether they had worked actively with a mentor teacher as a part of their practice teaching during their pre-service years, and 67.3% answered “yes” and 32.7% “no”



(see Table 1).

**Table 1.** Responses in relation to participants' preparation for teaching profession

Items	Categories	<i>F</i>	%
To what extent did you benefit from your practice teaching experiences in your PRESET?	Much	83	17.8
	Average	186	40.0
	Little	156	33.5
	None	40	8.6
Did you actively work with an MT in your PRESET?	Yes	313	67.3
	No	152	32.7

MT=Mentor Teacher, PRESET=Pre-service Training

In order to see the differences in the proportions of the groups, Chi-Square was conducted in some analyses. In Table 2, perceived benefits of practice teaching experiences in pre-service years were compared with respect to the type of faculty the participants graduated from. According to the results, there were significant differences in the responses of the EF (Education Faculties) and Non-EF (Other Faculties) graduates ( $p < .001$ ). In view of that, the EF graduates had more benefits from their practice teaching experiences than the Non-EF graduates did. As another point, 54.1% of the Non-EF graduates and 40.4% of the EF graduates responded that their practice teaching experiences did not contribute to their development at all or that its contribution was very small.

**Table 2.** Perceived benefits of practice teaching by faculty

$\chi^2$ ( $df=3$ , $N=526$ ) =127.430, $p < .001$	Groups	%				<i>M</i>
		M (1)	A (2)	L (3)	N (4)	
	EF	17.8	41.8	31.7	8.7	2.31
	Non-EF	18.0	27.9	45.9	8.2	2.44

M=Much, A=Average, L=Little, N=None,  
EF=Education Faculties, Non-EF=Other Faculties

As for the existence of a mentor teacher in practice teaching experiences during pre-service years, 42.6% of the participants that graduated from Non-education Faculties did not have a chance to work with a mentor teacher. The findings also revealed that 31.2% of the EF graduates did not work actively with a mentor teacher in their pre-service years (see Table 3).

**Table 3.** Existence of an MT in preset by faculty

Faculties	Yes (%)	No (%)	N
Education Faculties	68.8	31.2	404
Non-Education Faculties	57.4	42.6	61

MT=Mentor Teacher, PRESET=Pre-service Training

***Participants' reported perceptions on the contributions of pre-service trainings to certain aspects of the teaching profession***

In this part of the investigation, the participant teachers were asked to rate the contributions of their pre-service trainings to certain aspects of teaching profession. The mean values calculated for each item in this part indicated that the lowest ratings were given to the programs' contributions in teaching the law and regulations related to the teaching profession ( $M=1.77$ ) and in introducing the curricula of the Ministry ( $M=1.80$ ). Similarly, the programs did not seem to contribute adequately to professional development ( $M=2.17$ ), overcoming instructional difficulties ( $M=2.20$ ), instructional planning ( $M=2.23$ ), evaluating student achievement ( $M=2.27$ ) or guiding the students ( $M=2.27$ ). On the other hand, the participants seemed to be slightly satisfied with the programs in terms of empowering skills in making teaching more attractive ( $M=2.40$ ) and considering individual differences ( $M=2.43$ ) (see Table 4 for the mean values and percentages of the other aspects).

**Table 4.** Perceptions on the contributions of pre-service trainings to certain aspects

How well did your pre-service training contribute to...	%				M
	Sufficient (4)	(3)	(2)	Insufficient (1)	
teaching the law and regulations related to the teaching profession	5,8	18.3	29.5	40.4	1.77
introducing the curricula of the Ministry	4,7	21.1	29.5	38.9	1.80
providing resources for professional development	10,8	28.4	31.8	25.4	2.17
overcoming instructional difficulties	7,5	30.3	39.4	21.1	2.20
instructional planning	10,1	31.4	30.8	27.1	2.23
using course book and materials	9,5	32.7	35.3	19.6	2.26
evaluating student achievement	8,8	34.4	33.8	21.5	2.27
guiding the students	8,6	33.8	35.3	21.3	2.27
classroom management	11,6	33.1	32.5	21.3	2.32
teaching methods and techniques	12,5	37.0	28.8	20.9	2.39
introducing the profession	11,6	37.2	30.8	19.6	2.39
gaining a teacher identity	14,2	35.5	28.8	18.7	2.39
making teaching more attractive	16,1	31.8	31.2	18.5	2.40
considering individual differences	14,8	34.0	32.3	18.1	2.43
Total Value*	10.4	31.4	32.2	24.1	2.23

\*This was computed by summing up the values of each item and dividing the sum by the number of the items within this section.



In order to see how well the pre-service trainings contribute to student teachers' preparation for the teaching profession in general, the total mean value was calculated by summing up the mean values of each item and dividing the sum by the number of the items, and this was 2.23 out of 4, which did not indicate a positive perception on the part of the beginning teachers. Examining the total percentages, it could be claimed that only 10% of the participants considered pre-service training programs adequately contribute to the student teachers' preparation for the profession by rating 4 out of 4. On the other hand, 24% of the participants considered pre-service programs insufficient by rating 1 out of 4 (see Table 4).

### ***Differences in the perceptions by background variables***

A t-test and two ANOVAs were conducted to investigate whether the differences in the participants' perceptions were statistically significant by certain background variables. The results (see Table 5) revealed that there were significant differences in the reported perceptions of the participants with respect to their teaching fields,  $F(7,457)=2.785, p=.008$ ; the amount of practice teaching they did in their pre-service years  $F(3,461)=28.653, p<.001$ ; and the existence of a mentor teacher as a part of practice teaching they did during pre-service years  $t(463)=4.565, p<.001$ . To exemplify further from the results of the Dunnett's C test in post hoc comparisons, kindergarten teachers ( $M=3.60$ ) seemed to be more satisfied with their pre-service programs than both Turkish teachers ( $M=3.01$ ) and Maths/Science teachers ( $M=3.08$ ). There were significant mean differences also in terms of perceived amount of practice teaching. In this regard, the participant teachers who were engaged in more practice teaching ( $M=3.66$ ) seemed to have more positive perceptions about their pre-service training programs than the other groups. Lastly, the teachers who worked with a mentor teacher ( $M=3.44$ ) as a part of their practice teaching in pre-service years tended to reflect more positive perceptions about their pre-service training programs than the ones who did not have any chance to work with a mentor teacher ( $M=3.03$ ).

**Table 5.** Differences in perceptions by background variables

Background Variables		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Teaching Fields $F(7,457)=2.785, p=.008$	Classroom	3.29	.70	87
	English	3.24	.69	73
	Turkish	3.01	.76	59
	Mathematics & Science	3.08	.73	69
	Social Studies & Morals	3.24	.70	61
	Computer & Technology	3.28	.78	37
	Kindergarten	3.60	.52	30
	Others	3.39	.62	49
Amount of Practice Teaching $F(3,461)=28.653, p<.001$	Much	3.66	.64	83
	Average	3.36	.67	186
	Little	3.00	.62	156
	None	2.74	.69	40
Existence of MT in PRESET $t(463)=4.565, p<.001$	MT in PRESET	3.44	.70	313
	No MT in PRESET	3.03	.68	152

MT=Mentor Teacher, PRESET=Pre-service Training

### ***Further comments of the participants***

At the end of the questionnaire, the participants were provided with an open-ended item to make further comments on the pre-service teacher education in Turkey. After coding and summarizing the responses given by the participants, three categories emerged: (a) complaints, (b) opinions, and (c) suggestions regarding teacher education in Turkey.

As stated by 22 participants, the most frequent complaints were teaching in multi-level classrooms without enough support and being the only teacher in a village. They claimed that they had not been trained for such cases during their pre-service years. For some, many implementations regarding teaching profession were just in theory and on paper without real practice ( $f=10$ ); and some of them were disappointed with the realities, so they needed some morale and motivation ( $f=10$ ). Other minor but striking points were that they complained about the problems in implementing the curriculum of the Ministry and the insufficiency of the resources and physical conditions.

As for the opinions reflected in the open-ended part, the most emphasized ones indicated that: there appeared a gap between pre-service preparation and real teaching contexts ( $f=11$ ); courses in pre-service teacher education programs were not preparatory enough for the profession ( $f=10$ ); and pre-service preparation was solely memorization of theoretical and historical knowledge that is not updated adequately ( $f=9$ ). There were also other comments about the insufficiency of the programs for the realities of the profession; the teaching profession being the hardest job, which cannot be done without love; and pre-service preparation being a white lie told to draw a pessimistic picture.

Some of the participants provided suggestions at the end of the questionnaire. These suggestions included measures like carrying out practice teaching during pre-service years in different and more realistic environments such as distant places, rural areas, and multi-level classrooms so that student teachers can see and work under various conditions rather than the best school contexts ( $f=8$ ); and providing trainings around practical issues like classroom management, planning (lesson, unit, and yearly plan), and teaching methods, ( $f=5$ ). Moreover, renovating all practice teaching activities for a better education; providing 'real' mentoring programs, not in formality; setting a close contact and cooperation between universities and schools; redesigning the programs of pre-service preparation; and spending the last year in a real school environment by having the chance of getting to know all aspects of the profession were among the other suggestions.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

The figures and numbers obtained from the participants of the study portrayed some significant aspects and limitations of the current teacher education context in Turkey, which have long been discussed by previous literature (Aydın & Başkan, 2005;

Binbaşıoğlu, 1995; Bulut *et al.*, 1995; Doğan, 2005; Demirel, 1991; Gürşimşek *et al.*, 1997; Karagözoğlu & Murray, 1988; Karagözoğlu, 1991; Koçer, 1973; Seferoğlu, 1996; Seferoğlu, 2004, 2006; Uygun, 2005). At a glance, it could be claimed that a considerable number of teachers did not have the chance to work with a mentor teacher when getting prepared for the profession and could not sufficiently benefit from their practice teaching experiences during their pre-service years. The striking point was that even some student teachers at the Education Faculties could not work actively in practice with a mentor teacher in their pre-service years although it is one of the compulsory requirements of the degree programs. As Çakıroğlu and Çakıroğlu (2003) asserted, these problems are derived from teacher education programs and their management and irrelevance to real life. Those general percentages tend to increase even more among the graduates of the alternative routes, which were also portrayed in the studies of Seferoğlu (2004), Şimşek and Yıldırım (2001), and Yıldırım and Ok (2002).

The general results in the study revealed that pre-service teacher education does not adequately respond to the needs of the teachers in early years. This finding puts forward parallel points with Levine's (2006) study but dissimilar points with Senemoğlu's (2011) research. Covering strategies to be used in the classroom without "real-life" examples does not supply a deep understanding or enactment for them. These programs were perceived to be too theoretical and were criticized for having little connection to practice and for offering irrelevant or ineffective courses for further stages in the teaching profession. These are the points that many studies (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hammerness, 2006; Korthagen *et al.*, 2001; Seferoğlu, 2006) also asserted in relation to the disconnection between theory and practice. The general complaints of beginning teachers mostly resulted from the discrepancy between the teachers' expectations from pre-service trainings and the outcomes of actual teaching experiences. As Smith and Sela (2005) suggested, teacher education is not only for empowering teaching competencies among student teachers, but also for contributing to further professional development of beginning teachers.

This study proved that there is an urgent need to enrich the teacher education programs by covering the key problems of the teaching profession; having a close contact with the Ministry of National Education and introducing the educational initiatives and curricula of the Ministry; including courses on the laws or regulations related to the teaching profession; emphasizing instructional difficulties that a teacher might encounter and teaching to overcome these difficulties; providing resources for professional development and life-long learning; signifying the issue of individual differences and more effective teaching; helping the candidates to gain a teacher identity by introducing the real aspects of the teaching profession in Turkey; and preparing the student teachers more realistically for the profession, which can be accomplished with more authentically-designed, supervised and implemented practice teaching courses.

As few studies have focused on practising teachers' views on their pre-service

preparation, the findings in this study could provide valuable information to all stakeholders responsible for teacher education and development activities. Firstly, it might enable Education Faculties to information about the perceptions on the benefits of the pre-service programs and might guide other institutions following alternative routes to train teachers. Accordingly, the programs might be reoriented and redesigned. Secondly, the Ministry of National Education could also obtain information about the current situation, and therefore might take measures to plan effective training activities around the current problems for beginning teachers in order to fill in the gaps between theory and practice. Finally, the beginning teachers themselves might be able to evaluate their progress and see how effectively they could benefit from a teaching society around themselves.

## Özet

### Giriş

Eğitim alanında yapılan birçok araştırma, öğrenci başarısı üzerinde en büyük etkiyi yaratan faktörün öğretmen olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır (Goldhaber, 2007; Nye ve Ark., 2004; Rivkin ve Aerk., 2005; Rockoff, 2004). Bu nedenle öğretmen eğitimi, eğitim sistemlerinin her zaman için en kritik sorunsalı olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Türkiye’de de öğretmen eğitimi, eğitim gündeminde hep önde gelen konulardan biri olmuş, sürekli değişen ihtiyaçlar ve yenilikçi eğitim uygulamaları, öğretmen eğitimi doğrudan etkilemiştir. Öğretmen yetiştiren kurumların sayısının ve kontenjanlarının giderek artması, öğretmen adaylarının gelişimini takip etmeyi ve mezunların deneyimlerinden gerektiği şekilde haberdar olmayı güçleştirmiştir. Bu nedenle bu çalışma, öğretmenlik hizmetine henüz başlamış öğretmenlerin hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimi hakkındaki görüşlerini saptamayı hedeflemiştir.

Türkiye’de öğretmen eğitime ve gelişimine hizmet eden iki temel kurum, hizmet-öncesi öğretmen adaylarının yetiştirilmesinden sorumlu Eğitim Fakülteleri ile hizmet-içi öğretmenlerin gelişiminden sorumlu Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı’dır. Türk öğretmen eğitiminin tarihsel gelişimine bakıldığında, cumhuriyetin ilk yıllarından itibaren neredeyse bütün hükümetlerin öğretmen eğitimi, öncelikli çalışma alanlarından biri olarak algıladığını görmekteyiz. Bu bağlamda öğretmen eğitime yönelik reformları beş temel döneme ayırabiliriz.

(1) 1924’te John Dewey’in Türkiye ziyareti ve Türk Eğitim Sistemi hakkındaki raporu ile öğretmen eğitiminin dönüşümünü sağlamaya yönelik önemli önlemler alınmış, bu önlemlerin yansıması olarak 1924–1954 yılları arasında ülke koşullarına özgü modeller denenmiştir (Binbaşıoğlu, 2005; Koçer, 1973; Öztürk, 2005; Turan, 2000; Türkmen, 2007; Uygun, 2008). Bu bağlamda, öğretmen yetiştiren okullar çeşitlendirilmiş ve yeni bir model olan *Köy Enstitüleri* modeli 1940’larda uygulamaya konmuştur. (Aysal, 2005; Doğan, 2005; Karaömerlioğlu, 1998; Kızılaslan, 2012; Koçer, 1973;

Öztürk, 2005; Seferoğlu, 2004; Tarman 2010; Turan, 2000; Türkmen, 2007; Uygun, 2003, 2008).

(2) 1954'te özgün bir öğretmen yetiştirme modeli olan Köy Enstitüleri'nin kaldırılması ile ilkokul öğretmenleri lise düzeyindeki yatılı öğretmen okullarında, ortaokul öğretmenleri iki yıllık eğitim enstitülerinde, lise öğretmenleri ise dört yıllık yüksek öğretmen okullarında yetiştirilmeye başlanmıştır (Doğan, 2005; Kavcar, 2002; Türkmen, 2007; Yüksel, 2012).

(3) 1973'te Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu'nun yürürlüğe girmesiyle öğretmen yetiştiren kurumlar yeniden düzenlenmiş, tüm programlar yükseköğretim düzeyine çıkarılmış, ilkokul öğretmeni yetiştiren programlar iki yıllık eğitim enstitülerine dönüştürülmüştür (Doğan, 2005; Kartal, 2011; Kavcar, 2002; Tarman, 2010; Yüksel, 2012).

(4) 1981'de YÖK'ün (Yükseköğretim Kurulu) kurulması ile Türkiye'nin yüksek öğretim düzeyinde eğitim-öğretim yürüten bütün kurumları, üniversitelerin çatısı altında toplanmış, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı bünyesinde faaliyet göstererek öğretmen yetiştiren kurumlar üniversitelere transfer edilmiş, öğretmen yetiştirme sorumluluğu üniversitelerin eğitim fakültelerine verilmiştir. (Aydın & Başkan, 2005; Başkan ve Ark., 2006; Demirel, 1991; Güven, 2008; Kartal, 2011; Kavcar, 2002; Seferoğlu, 2004; Yüksel, 2012). Ancak eğitim fakültelerinin yanı sıra farklı alan mezunlarına öğretmenlik sertifikasyonu sağlayan alternatif programlar Türkiye'de hep var olmuştur (Seferoğlu, 2004; Şimşek & Yıldırım, 2001; Yıldırım & Ok, 2002).

(5) 1997'de Yükseköğretim Kurulu ile Dünya Bankası'nın desteği ile öğretmen eğitimi programları kalite standartlarının geliştirilmesi ve öğretmen eğitimi ihtiyaçlarının karşılanabilmesi için yeniden düzenlenmiştir. (Aydın & Başkan, 2005; Başkan ve Ark., 2006; Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003; Güven, 2008; Kartal, 2011; Kavcar, 2002; Yüksel, 2012).

Öğretmen eğitimini geliştirmeye yönelik alınan bu tür önlemlere rağmen Türkiye'nin öğretmen yetiştirme sorunu güncelliğini daima korumuştur. Çakıroğlu ve Çakıroğlu (2003) Türk öğretmen eğitiminin devam eden sorunlarını, (a) dış faktörlerden kaynaklanan sorunlar ve (b) öğretmen eğitimi programlarının yapısından kaynaklanan sorunlar olarak iki başlık altında özetlemişlerdir. Birinci grupta, ülkenin artan nüfusuna; artan öğretmen ihtiyacına; hükümetlerin istikrarsızlığından kaynaklanan politik durumlara; merkezi yönetim sorunlarına; düşük ücret, sosyoekonomik statü ve yoğun iş yükü gibi durumların öğretmenler üzerinde yarattığı olumsuz etkiye; öğretmen eğitimi programlarına; öğrenci seçimi ve kabul sistemine değinilmiştir. İkinci grupta ise eğitim programlarının işlevine ve programların gerçek hayatla ilişkilendirilmesinin önemine vurgu yapılmıştır. Benzer şekilde kimi yabancı eğitimciler de kuram ve uygulama arasındaki kopukluğu, öğretmen eğitiminin merkezi problemi olarak tanımlamışlardır (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hammerness, 2006; Korthagen ve ark., 2001).

Türk öğretmen eğitimine ilişkin problemlere birçok rapor ve makalede yer veril-

miştir (Aydın & Başkan, 2005; Binbaşıoğlu, 1995; Bulut ve ark., 1995; Doğan, 2005; Demirel, 1991; Gürşimşek ve ark., 1997; Karagözoğlu & Murray, 1988; Karagözoğlu, 1991; Koçer, 1973; Seferoğlu, 1996; Seferoğlu, 2004, 2006; Uygun, 2005); fakat çalışma gurubu olarak öğretmenlik hizmetine henüz başlamış öğretmenlere yer verilen araştırma sayısı oldukça azdır. Ulusal bağlamda hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimini incelemeye yönelik yapılan araştırmalar (Senemoğlu, 2011; Seferoğlu, 2004, 2006) genellikle eğitim fakültelerinde öğrenim görmekte olan öğretmen adayı öğrenciler ile yürütülmüş; ancak öğretmenliğe başlamış mezunların görüşlerine pek başvurulmamıştır. Bu noktadan hareketle bu çalışma, göreve yeni başlamış öğretmenlerin hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimine yönelik algılarını saptamayı hedeflemiştir. Çalışmanın iki temel araştırma sorusu mevcuttur: (1) Aday öğretmenler Türkiye'deki hizmet-öncesi öğretmen yetiştirmeden sağladıkları faydaları nasıl değerlendirmektedirler? (2) Bu algılar bazı demografik değişkenlere göre farklılık göstermekte midir?

### **Yöntem**

Araştırma deseni olarak, tarama yöntemi benimsenmiş, Türkiye'nin rastgele seçilmiş 8 ilinde (Konya, Batman, Ordu, Niğde, Erzurum, Muğla, Kütahya, Ankara) görev yapmakta olan toplam 465 aday öğretmenin, hizmet-öncesi dönemde aldıkları eğitimi anket yoluyla değerlendirmeleri sağlanmıştır. Veriler, frekans dağılım tabloları, yüzdelere, aritmetik ortalamalar, standart sapma, t-testi, ANOVA ve ki kare katsayısı gibi betimleyici ve çıkarısal istatistik yöntemleri kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Uygulanan anketin *Cronbach's Alpha* katsayısı .94 olarak kaydedilmiştir.

### **Tartışma ve Sonuç**

Çalışmanın genel sonuçları, hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitimiyle ilgili yansıtılan görüşlerin yeterince olumlu olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Öğretmenlik mesleğine hazırlanma sürecine ilişkin bulgulara göre, katılımcıların % 40'ı hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlik uygulamalarından belli oranda, % 18'i ise önemli oranda faydalandıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Geriye kalan grup ise bu uygulamalardan yeterince faydalanmadıklarını düşünmektedir. Öte yandan, katılımcıların sadece % 67'si hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlik uygulamaları sırasında bir kılavuz öğretmenden danışmanlık hizmeti alabildiğini ifade etmiştir. Bu iki bulguya yönelik olarak eğitim fakültesi mezunları ile alternatif programlardan mezun olanlar arasında yapılan karşılaştırmalarda, eğitim fakültesi mezunlarının lisans öğrenimleri sırasındaki öğretmenlik uygulamalarından faydalanma algılarının daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca eğitim fakültesi mezunlarının % 31'inin, alternatif programlardan mezun olanların ise % 42'sinin hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlik uygulamaları sırasında bir kılavuz öğretmenle çalışma şansı yakalayamadığı saptanmıştır.

Hizmet-öncesi öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının öğretmenlik mesleğinin çeşitli boyutlarına ilişkin sağladığı katkılara ilişkin algılara bakıldığında, katılımcı öğretmen-



lerin lisans programlarından yeterince fayda göremedikleri boyutlar şunlar olmuştur: Öğretmenlik mesleğiyle ilgili kanun ve yönetmelikleri hakkında bilgi verme, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın eğitim programlarını tanıtmaya, öğretmen adaylarının mesleki gelişimini destekleyecek kaynaklar sunma, öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin güçlüklerin üstesinden gelme, öğretimi planlama, öğrenci başarısını değerlendirme ve öğrencilere rehberlik etme.

Çalışmanın çıkarılmalı istatistik bulgularına bakıldığında, katılımcılarca ortaya konan algıların, hizmet-öncesi dönemde yürütülen öğretmenlik uygulamalarının yoğunluğuna, lisans öğrenimi sırasında bir kılavuz öğretmenden danışmanlık alıp almama durumuna ve katılımcıların öğretmenlik alanlarına göre farklılık gösterdiği belirlenmiştir. Bu bağlamda, anaokulu öğretmenleri, Türkçe ve Matematik/Fen alanlarındaki öğretmenlere göre hizmet-öncesi eğitimlerine yönelik daha olumlu görüş yansıtılmışlardır. Öte yandan, lisans öğrenimleri sırasında daha fazla yoğunlukta öğretmenlik uygulaması gerçekleştirdiklerini düşünen öğretmenlerin, hizmet-öncesi öğretmen yetiştirme hakkındaki görüşleri diğer gruplara nazaran daha olumlu olmuştur. Son olarak, lisans öğrenimi sırasındaki öğretmenlik uygulamalarında aktif olarak bir kılavuz öğretmenle çalışma şansına sahip olan öğretmenlerin, hizmet-öncesi programlarla ilgili nispeten daha olumlu görüşlere sahip oldukları gözlenmiştir.

Katılımcıların anketin açık uçlu maddesine yazdıkları yorumlara bakıldığında, en çok şikâyet edilen durumun birleştirilmiş sınıflarda eğitim-öğretim yürütmek olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun dışında, öğretmenlik mesleğinin gerçekleri karşısında yaşanan hayal kırıklıkları, moral ve destek ihtiyacı, kuram ve uygulama arasındaki kopukluk, gerçek sınıf ortamı ile hizmet-öncesi programlarda yapılan uygulamalar arasındaki uyumsuzluk da sıkça ifade edilen hususlar olmuştur.

Bu çalışma, ortaya koyduğu bulgularla, alan yazında da sıkça belirtildiği gibi, Türkiye'nin mevcut öğretmen eğitiminin önemli boyutlarına ve sınırlılıklarına işaret eden bir çalışma olmuştur. Bütünsel bir bakışla, azımsanmayacak sayıda öğretmenin lisans öğrenimleri sırasında yürüttükleri öğretmenlik uygulamalarından yeterli faydayı sağlayamadıkları görülmüştür. Asıl çarpıcı nokta ise kimi eğitim fakültesi mezunlarının bile bu uygulamalar sırasında herhangi bir kılavuz öğretmenden danışmanlık alamamış olmaları veya aktif olarak kılavuz öğretmenlerle işbirliğinde bulunamamış olmalarıdır. Bu oranın alternatif programlardan yetişen öğretmenler arasında daha da arttığı görülmektedir.

Genel sonuçlar hizmet-öncesi öğretmen eğitiminin mesleğinin ilk yıllarındaki öğretmenlerin ihtiyaçlarına yeterince cevap verecek nitelikte olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır. Programların fazlaca teorik oluşu veya uygulamaya dönük çalışmaların çok sınırlı kalışı bu durumun temelinde yatan sorun olarak görülebilir. Bu nedenle öğretmen eğitimi programlarının ivedi olarak içerik ve uygulama açısından çağın gereklerine göre revize edilmesi gerekmektedir. Bu da ancak öğretmenlik mesleğinin temel sorunlarını kapsayan; Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ile yakın bir bağ kurmuş, Bakanlığın eğitim-öğretimi geliştirmeye yönelik girişimlerinden ve eğitim programlarından haberdar



olan; öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin kanun ve yönetmelikler hakkında bilgileri içeren; öğretmenlerin hizmet sırasında karşılaşılabileceği güçlüklerin ve bu güçlükleri aşmada yardımcı olacak stratejilerin vurgulandığı; öğretmen adaylarına hem kişisel hem de mesleki gelişim imkânlarının ve hayat boyu öğrenme kaynakların sağlandığı; etkili öğretmenlik konusunun ve eğitimde iyi örneklerin sıkça işlendiği; adayların öğretmen kimliği oluşturma sürecinde desteklendiği; öğretmenlik mesleğinin gerçek hayata dair boyutlarının göz ardı edilmediği; öğretmen adaylarının daha gerçekçi ortamlarda iyi seçilmiş kılavuz öğretmenlerin rehberliğinde daha sağlıklı danışmanlık alarak öğretmenlik uygulamaları yürüttüğü bir hizmet-öncesi program ile mümkün olacaktır.

## References

- Aydın, A. & Başkan, G. A. (2005). The problem of teacher training in Turkey. *Biotechnol. and Biotechnol. Eq.*, 19 (2), 191-197.
- Aysal, N. (2005). Anadolu'da Aydınlanma Hareketinin Dogusu: Koy Enstituleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, Mayıs-Kasım, 267-282.
- Başkan, G. A., Aydın, A. & Madden, T. (2006). Türkiye'deki öğretmen yetiştirme sistemine karşılaştırmalı bir bakış. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15, 35-42.
- Binbaşıoğlu, C. (1995). *Türkiye'de Eğitim Bilimleri Tarihi [History of Educational Sciences in Turkey]*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Binbaşıoğlu, C. (2005). *Türk Eğitim Düşüncesi Tarihi [History of Turkish Educational Thought]*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Bulut, S., Demircioğlu, H. & Yıldırım, A. (1995). Science and math education in middle and high schools: Problems and suggestions. Paper presented at the Second National Science Education Symposium, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Caires, S., Almeida, L. & Vieira, D. (2012). Becoming a teacher: Student teachers' experiences and perceptions about teaching practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (2), 163-178.
- Çakıroğlu, E. & Çakıroğlu, J. (2003). Reflections on teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26 (2), 253-264.
- Darling-Hammond, L & Bransford, J. (2005). (Eds). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Demirel, O. (1991) Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirmede karşılaşılan güçlükler. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 6, 25-30.
- Doğan, C. (2005). Türkiye'de sınıf öğretmeni yetiştirme politikaları ve sorunları. *Bilig*, 35, 133-149.
- Goldhaber, D. (2007). Everyone's doing it, but what does teacher testing tell us about

- teacher effectiveness? *Journal of Human Resources* 42 (4), 765–794.
- Good, T. L., McCaslin, M., Tsang, H. Y., Zhang, J., Wiley, C. R. H., Bozack, A. R. & Hester, W. (2006). How well do 1st-year teachers teach: Does type of preparation make a difference? *Journal of Teacher Education* 57 (4), 410–431.
- Gürşimşek, I., Kaptan, F. & Erkan, S. (1997). General view of teacher education policies of Turkey. Paper presented at the 49th AACTE Annual Meeting, in Phoenix, Arizona.
- Güven, I. (2008). Teacher education reform and international globalization hegemony: Issues and challenges in Turkish teacher education. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 3 (1), 8-17.
- Hammerness, K. (2006). From coherence in theory to coherence in practice. *Teachers College Record*, 108 (7), 124–65.
- Karagözoğlu, G. (1991). Teacher education reform in Turkey. *Action in Teacher Education*, 13, 26-29.
- Karagözoğlu, G., & Murray, K. B. (1988). Profile of new teachers in the Turkish educational system, *Contemporary Education*, 59, 173-177.
- Karaomerlioğlu, M. A. (1998). The village institutes experience in Turkey. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 25 (1), 27–47.
- Kartal, M. (2011). Türkiye'nin alan öğretmeni yetiştirme deneyimleri ve sürdürülebilir yeni model yaklaşımları. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, 50-57.
- Kavcar, C. (2002). Cumhuriyet döneminde dal öğretmeni yetiştirme. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 35 (1-2), 1-14.
- Kızılaslan, İ. (2012). Teaching in rural Turkey: Pre-service teacher perspectives. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (2), 243-254.
- Koçer, H. A. (1973). Eğitim reformları açısından öğretmen yetiştirme problemi. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 6 (1), 1-19.
- Korthagen, F. A., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Langerwarf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project. Retrieved on February 21, 2008 from [www.edschools.org](http://www.edschools.org)
- Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S. & Hedges, L. (2004) How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26, 237–257.
- Öztürk, C. (2005). *Türkiye'de Düünden Bugüne Öğretmen Yetiştiren Kurumlar [Teacher Education Institutions in Turkey]*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Rivkin, S., Hanushek, E. A. & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73 (2), 417–458.
- Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. **American Economic Review**, 94 (2), 247–252.
- Rosaen, C. L. (2003). Preparing teachers for diverse classrooms: Creating public and private spaces to explore culture through poetry writing. *Teachers College Record*, 105 (8), 1437-1485.

- Seferoğlu, G. (2004). A study of alternative English teacher certification practices in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 30 (2), 151-159.
- Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education program in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 32 (4), 369-378.
- Seferoğlu, S. S. (1996). Exploring elementary school teachers' perceptions of professional development: The Turkish case. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2011). How Effective are initial primary teacher education curricula in Turkey? Student teachers, faculty, and teachers let us know. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1 (1), 35-47.
- Şimşek, H. & Yıldırım, A. (2001). The reform of pre-service teacher education in Turkey, in R. G. Sultana (Ed.) *Challenge and Change in the Euro-Mediterranean Region: Case Studies in Educational Innovation*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Smith, K. & Sela, O. (2005). Action research as a bridge between pre-service teacher education and in-service professional development for students and teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 28 (3), 293-310.
- Tarman, B. (2010). Global Perspectives and Challenges on Teacher Education in Turkey. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3 (17), 78-96.
- Turan, S. (2000). John Dewey's report of 1924 and his recommendations on the Turkish educational system, revisited. *History of Education*, 29 (6), 543-555.
- Türkmen, L. (2007). The History of Development of Turkish Elementary Teacher Education and the Place of Science Courses in the Curriculum. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 3 (4), 327-341.
- Uygun, S. (2003). Türkiye'de öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin bir sözlü tarih araştırması [An oral history research concerning profession of teaching in Turkey]. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ankara University Institute for Education Sciences.
- Uygun, S. (2005). Türkiye'de geçici öğretmen istihdamı sorunu. Paper presented at the 14<sup>th</sup> National Congress of Educational Sciences, Denizli, Turkey.
- Uygun, S. (2008). The impact of John Dewey on the teacher education system in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (4), 291-307.
- Yıldırım, A. & Ok, A. (2002). Alternative teacher certification in Turkey: problems and issues, in R. G. Sultana (Ed.) *Teacher Education in the Euro-Mediterranean Region: Case Studies in Educational Innovation*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Yüksel, I. (2012). The current developments in teacher education in Turkey on the threshold of European Union. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2 (8), 49-56.
- 18<sup>th</sup> NECR (National Education Council Report). (2010). Ankara: Turk-Eğitim Sen. Retrieved on June 6, 2013 from [www.turkegitimsen.org.tr](http://www.turkegitimsen.org.tr)