T.C. İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

# EFL TEACHERS' VIEWS ON USEFULNESS OF ELT UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

## ŞAZİYE KARATAŞ

### KAPATILAN FATİH ÜNİVERSİTESİNDEN AKTARILAN

## YÜKSEK LİSANS ÖĞRENCİSİ

## EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ANABİLİM DALI İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ

#### DOÇ.DR.YAKUP ÇETİN

### TEZ DANIŞMANI

İSTANBUL-2016



T.C. İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ



## YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

# EFL TEACHERS' VIEWS ON USEFULNESS OF ELT UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

## ŞAZİYE KARATAŞ

## KAPATILAN FATİH ÜNİVERSİTESİNDEN AKTARILAN

## YÜKSEK LİSANS ÖĞRENCİSİ

## EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ANABİLİM DALI İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ

## DOÇ.DR.YAKUP ÇETİN

## TEZ DANIŞMANI

İSTANBUL-2016

513413002 öğrenci numaralı Şaziye KARATAŞ tarafından hazırlanan bu çalışma 16/06/2016 tarihinde aşağıdaki jüri tarafından Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi programında yüksek lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

#### <u>Tez Jürisi</u>

Doç.Dr.Yakup ÇETİN (Danışman) Fatih Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yrd.Doç.Dr.Mustafa BAHAR Fatih Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ Murat Hüdevendigar Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all my lecturers for their permanent support, motivation, enthusiasm, intellectual guidance and insightful comments during my MA study. I have learnt lots of things in academic sense thanks to them.

I would specifically like to express my sincere and deep gratitude to all the voluntarily participating EFL teachers for their effort and time devoted to this thesis research.

Last but not the least: I am deeply indebted to my precious family: my mother Nebiye, my father Mehmet, my elder sister Büşra, my younger brothers Mehmet Akif and Mücahit (my beloved little one) for their loving concern and spiritual support throughout my life. They have always encouraged and trusted me and never let me lose my hope in every step of my daily and academic life.

ŞAZİYE KARATAŞ

#### ABSTRACT

#### EFL TEACHERS' VIEWS ON USEFULNESS OF ELT UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

This study investigates EFL teachers' views on the undergraduate ELT curriculum in education faculties of the universities in Turkey. For this aim, quantitative and qualitative data were collected through a survey, the design and items of which were developed by the researcher regarding relevant literature along with the HEC's 1982, 1998 and 2006 English Language Teacher Education Programs. 207 English teachers graduated from ELT departments took part in the study. The participants were given a five-point Likert scale survey with forty items and asked to rate the contribution of each undergraduate course to their English language teaching profession. The participants were asked not to rate the courses they did not take in their undergraduate program. Thus, this study aimed at finding whether or not content knowledge, general pedagogic knowledge, pedagogic content knowledge and support knowledge learnt in undergraduate ELT department could effectively be used by English teachers while performing their profession. At the beginning of the survey, the participants were asked about their background, which was examined in order to see whether the background of the teachers had an influence on their views about to what extent they found the courses useful taught in undergraduate ELT program. At the end of the survey, the participants were asked to write the names or give descriptions of the courses they suggested to be included in ELT curriculum.

The findings of the survey revealed that as a field course "Teaching English to Young Learners", as a pedagogical content course "School Experience and Practice Teaching" and as a general culture course "Atatürk's Principles and The History of Revolutions" were viewed as the most "totally useful" courses by the participant EFL teachers in terms of their contribution to their English language teaching profession. It was also seen that the mean of field courses was higher than pedagogical content courses and culture courses respectively regarding the responses given by the participants. In addition, gender and professional development (in terms of attendance in ELT conferences and studying a postgraduate degree) of the participant EFL teachers had no effect on their responses. Moreover, 59 English teachers out of 207 gave answers to open-ended question part, which provided qualitative data to the researcher. Some courses were suggested to be included to ELT curriculum while certain courses as School Experience and Practice Teaching and Teaching Language Skills were offered to have some more extra hours. In the light of these findings, some suggestions were offered for undergraduate ELT program development. This study's results and findings are expected to give a hint to the policy-makers, program designers, faculty members to develop the present ELT programs and train more skilled ELT teachers.

**Key Words :** undergraduate ELT curriculum, EFL teachers, English Language Teacher Education Program, English language teaching profession

#### ÖZET

#### İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ LİSANS PROGRAMININ YARARLILIĞI HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Bu çalışmada İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Türkiye'deki üniversitelerin eğitim fakültelerinin İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programı hakkındaki görüşleri araştırılmıştır. Bu amaçla, dizaynı ve maddeleri ilgili literatür taranarak ve Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu'nun 1982, 1998 ve 2006 yıllarındaki İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programları incelenerek araştırmacı tarafından oluşturulan anket aracılığıyla nitel ve nicel veri toplanmıştır. İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans mezunu 207 İngilizce öğretmeni çalışmaya katılmıştır. Katılımcılara kırk maddeden oluşan beşli Likert tipi anket verilerek onlardan lisans programında aldıkları her bir dersin İngilizce öğretmenliği mesleğine katkısının ne oranda olduğunu belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Katılımcılardan lisans programında almadıkları derslerle ilgili görüş belirtmemeleri istenmiştir. Bu çalışma, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programında öğrenilen alan bilgisi, genel pedagojik bilgi, alanla ilgili pedagojik bilgi ve disiplinler arası bilgilerin yabancı dil öğretirken İngilizce öğretmenleri tarafından etkili bir şekilde kullanılıp kullanılamadığını araştırmayı hedeflemiştir. Ankette ilk olarak katılımcılara bazı kişisel bilgiler sorulmuştur ve katılımcıların İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programındaki dersleri ne dereceye kadar faydalı bulduğu hakkındaki görüşleri üzerinde bu bilgilerin etkisi olup olmadığı incelenmiştir. Anketin son bölümünde, katılımcılardan İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programına dahil edilmesini önerecekleri dersleri isimleriyle ya da tanımlamalarıyla yazmalarını istenmiştir.

Anketin bulguları alan bilgisi derslerinden "Çocuklara Yabancı Dil Öğretimi", pedagojik alan bilgisi derslerinden "Okul Deneyimi ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması" ve genel kültür derslerinden "Atatürk İlke ve İnkılapları" derslerinin katılımcılar tarafından yabancı dil öğretimi açısından "tamamen faydalı" olarak değerlendirildiğini göstermiştir. Aynı zamanda alan bilgisi derslerinin ortalamasının pedagojik alan bilgisi ve kültür derslerinin ortalamasından yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Buna ek olarak, cinsiyet ve katılımcıların mesleki gelişimlerinin (İngiliz Dili Eğitimi konferanslarına katılma ve lisansüstü eğitim alma açısından) katılımcıların verdikleri cevaplar üzerinde bir etkisinin olmadığı görülmüştür. Üstelik, 207 İngilizce öğretmeninden 59'u araştırmacıya nitel veri sağlayan açık uçlu soruya yanıt vermiştir. İngiliz Dili Eğitimi programına bazı derslerin eklenmesi önerilirken mevcut bazı derslerin de -Okul Deneyimi ve Uygulama Öğretimi ve Dil Becerilerinin Öğretimi gibi- ders saatinin artırılması önerilmiştir. Bu bulgular ışığında İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programının geliştirilmesi için önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Mevcut İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programını geliştirmek ve daha nitelikli öğretmen eğitimini gerçekleştirmek için bu çalışmanın sonuç ve bulgularının program tasarımcılarına ve öğretim üyelerine bir ipucu vermesi beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler : İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans müfredatı, İngilizce öğretmenleri, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Öğretim Programı, İngilizce Öğretmenliği mesleği

## LIST OF CONTENTS

| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT  | III |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT   | IV  |
| ÖZET   | V   |
| LIST OF CONTENTS   | VI  |
| LIST OF TABLES   | IX  |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS  | X   |
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION  | 1   |
| 1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY   | 1   |
| 1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM  | 3   |
| 1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS  | 4   |
| CHAPTER II: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK / LITERATURE REVIEW                   |     |
| AND RELATED RESEARCH   | 5   |
| 2.1. THE HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE                       |     |
| TEACHER EDUCATION IN TURKEY  | 5   |
| 2.1.1. Before The Tanzimat Period                                      | 5   |
| 2.1.2. The Tanzimat Period   | 6   |
| 2.1.3. The Republic Period   | 9   |
| 2.2. 1997 EDUCATION REFORM (ELT REFORM IN PRIMARY                      |     |
| AND SECONDARY LEVELS)  | 12  |
| 2.2.1. 1997 ELT Undergraduate Curriculum Reform In Universities        | 14  |
| 2.3. THE REQUIREMENT FOR RENEWING TEACHER                              |     |
| EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN 2006   | 15  |
| 2.3.1. The General Innovations Introduced By The New Teacher Education |     |
| Programs   | 17  |
| 2.3.2. Revision Of The 1997 ELT Curriculum                             | 19  |
| 2.4. ANADOLU UNIVERSITY DISTANCE EDUCATION FACULTY                     |     |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING UNDERGRADUATE                                |     |
| PROGRAM  | 23  |
| 2.4.1. Introduction Of The Program                                     | 23  |

| 2.4.2. The Reason For Launching IOLP Based On Distance Education          |      |
|---|------|
| System  | . 24 |
| 2.4.3. The Purpose Of IOLP  | . 24 |
| 2.4.4. The Application Of IOLP  | . 25 |
| 2.4.5. The Current Situation Of IOLP                                      | . 26 |
| 2.5. ELT TEACHER CERTIFICATION COURSES                                    | . 26 |
| 2.6. ELT TEACHER TRAINING CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS ALL                        |      |
| AROUND THE WORLD  | . 27 |
| 2.6.1. The Certificate In Teaching English To Speakers Of Other Languages |      |
| (CertTESOL)   | . 27 |
| 2.6.2. The Licentiate Diploma In TESOL (LTCL DipTESOL)                    | . 28 |
| 2.6.3. Certificate In English Language Teaching To Speakers Of Other      |      |
| Languages (CELTA)   | . 29 |
| 2.6.4. Diploma In Teaching English To Speakers Of Other Languages         |      |
| (DELTA)   | . 30 |
| 2.7. THE KNOWLEDGE BASE OF SECOND LANGUAGE                                |      |
| TEACHER EDUCATION   | . 31 |
| 2.7.1. Richard Day's Views  | . 32 |
| 2.7.2. Jack C. Richards' And Jon Roberts' Views                           | . 33 |
| 2.7.3. Lee Shulman's Views  | . 34 |
| 2.8. RECENT STUDIES RELATED TO THE EVALUATION OF ELT                      | ۱    |
| CURRICULUM  | . 35 |
| CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY                                     | . 44 |
| 3.1. DESIGN OF THE STUDY  | . 44 |
| 3.2. PARTICIPANTS   | . 45 |
| 3.3. DATA COLLECTION PROCESS  | . 45 |
| 3.4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS  | . 46 |
| 3.5. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE  | . 48 |
| CHAPTER IV: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION  | . 49 |
| 4.1. PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND INFORMATION                                 | . 49 |
| 4.2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION  | . 55 |
| 4.2.1. EFL Teachers' Views On To What Extent They Find The                |      |
| Undergraduate ELT Courses Useful In Their Profession                      | . 55 |

| 4.2.2. The Variables' (Gender And Professional Development) Effect On |    |
|---|----|
| EFL Teacher Participants' Views About How Useful They Find The        |    |
| Courses In ELT Undergraduate Program                                  | 61 |
| 4.2.3. Answers To Open-Ended Question In The Last Part Of The         |    |
| Questionnaire   | 64 |
| CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION   | 72 |
| 5.1. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION   | 72 |
| 5.2. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER                          |    |
| RESEARCH  | 73 |
| 5.3. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE                    |    |
| TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS  | 76 |
| APPENDICES  | 80 |
| REFERENCES  | 90 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE  | 98 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| 2-1: Changes in 2006 ELTEP   | . 23 |
|--|------|
| 2-2: Courses in IOLP   | . 26 |
| 2-3: Richards' and Roberts' views of the knowledge base of language teaching                               | . 34 |
| 4-1: Demographic information (gender, marital status and the number of the children the participants have) | . 49 |
| 4-2: University of graduation  | . 50 |
| 4-3: The department  | . 51 |
| 4-4: Teaching experience   | . 51 |
| 4-5: The institution   | . 52 |
| 4-6: Average class sizes   | . 52 |
| 4-7: Work load in a week   | . 53 |
| 4-8: Professional development (ELT conference)   | . 53 |
| 4-9: Professional development (post-graduate study)  | . 54 |
| 4-10: The participant teachers' views about field courses  | . 56 |
| 4-11: The participant teachers' views about pedagogical content courses                                    | . 58 |
| 4-12: The participant teachers' views about general culture courses  | . 60 |
| 4-13: The mean of the courses  | . 62 |
| 4-14: Participant EFL teachers' responses and gender variable  | . 62 |
| 4-15: Participant EFL teachers' responses and professional development variable (conference)               | . 63 |
| 4-16: Participant EFL teachers' responses and professional development variable (post graduate study)      | . 63 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|               |   | Anadoly University Computer Descende and Training Control                  |
|---------------|---|--|
| AUBAUM        |   | Anadolu University Computer Research and Training Centre                   |
| CBI           |   | Content-Based Instruction  |
| CEFR          |   | Common European Framework of Reference for Languages                       |
| CELTA         | : | Certificate in English Language Teaching to Speakers of<br>Other Languages |
| CertTESOL     | : | The Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other                   |
|               |   | Languages  |
| CLT           | : | Communicative Language Teaching  |
| DELTA         | : | Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages                 |
| EFL           | : | English as a Foreign Language  |
| EHEA          | : | European Higher Education Area   |
| ELP           |   | European Language Portfolio  |
| ELT           |   | English Language Teaching  |
| ELTEP         | : | English Language Teacher Education Program                                 |
| EME           | : | English-Medium Education   |
| EPOSTL        | : | European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages                       |
| ESL           | • | English as a Second Language   |
| ESOL          | • | English for Speakers of Other Languages                                    |
| EU            |   | European Union   |
| FLE           |   | Foreign Language Education   |
| GTM           |   | Grammar Translation Method   |
| HEC           |   | Higher Education Council   |
| IELTS         |   | International English Language Testing System                              |
| IOLP          |   | English Language Teaching Undergraduate Program                            |
| ITE           |   | Initial Teacher Education  |
| LTCL DipTESOL |   | The Licentiate Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of                  |
| LICEDIPILSOL  | • | Other Languages  |
| MA            | : | Master of Arts   |
| METU          | : | Middle East Technical University   |
| MI            |   | Multiple Intelligence  |
| MONE          |   | Ministry of National Education   |
| NGO           | : | Non-Governmental Organization  |
| PhD           | : | Doctor of Philosophy   |
| QCF           | • | Qualification and Credit Framework   |
| SLTE          |   | Second Language Teacher Education  |
| SPSS          |   | Statistical Package for Social Sciences                                    |
| TEFL          | : | Teaching English as a Foreign Language                                     |
| TESOL         | • | Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages                            |
| TEYL          | : | Teaching English to Young Learners   |
| TL            | : | Target Language  |
| UK            | : | United Kingdom   |
| YL            | : | Young Learner  |
| 1 L/          | • | I vang Louinoi   |

#### **CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

It is broadly accepted that globalization has a great effect on the multidimensional aspects of communities at numerous levels along with the language policies of a number of countries throughout the world (Tsui & Tollefson, 2007). The development of globalization is closely related to the power and predominance of the English language according to the some academics such as Bottery (2000) and Chang (2006). In a similar way, Chang (2006) emphasizes that globalization functions as a propulsive force so as to reinforce the position of English as a universal language.

With the influence of socio-political and economic events; English gradually became the lingua franca for commerce, tourism, banking, social media, science and technology and in the end; English was embedded into the education systems of a great number of countries, even in monolingual areas, in order to access to these information networks (Dogancay & Aktuna, 1998). Actually, the universal status and functions of English made the English language unique in monolingual areas, which indirectly forced governments for more spread through adopting educational policy (Tomlinson, 1999; Giddens, 2000). The effect of globalization on each country and the language policy varies; therefore, the significant question of how to react to the challenges brought about globalization on language policy has long been on the agenda of a great many countries as well as Turkey (Kırkgoz, 2008).

As English started to be known as a universal and well-recognized language throughout the world, the prominent role of English in the rapidly globalizing world has boosted, which resulted in teaching of English as a rising field (Karakas, 2012). In Turkey, where English with a crucial position in every aspect of life from economics and politics to education and science is now used as an international medium, teaching English is also ranking among the educational areas, which worth exploring within the broad educational system. The researches concerning with English Language Teaching (ELT) deal with numerous matters and all these issues are related to the education of English teachers to some extent (Coskun & Daloglu, 2010). As English is taught by non-native speakers to other non-native speakers most of the time (Kachru & Nelson, 2001), teacher training curriculum needs to be compatible with the essentials of the global purposes and put the learners in the centre of teaching and learning activities (Cullen, 1994 ; Murdoch, 1994). In fact, much of the stress has been given on the need to train well-qualified English teachers, which has a direct connection with the evaluation of English Language Teacher Education Programs (ELTEP) (Karakas, 2010). Thus, it is really significant for pre-service ELTEPs to possess an evaluation system which is structured; therefore, the required changes can be handled about the program (Coskun & Daloglu, 2010).

In a constantly developing world, curricula and education programs also evolve; in this way, the education system can keep up with the changes in both individuals and community. So as to accomplish this; planning, implementation and evaluation need to be done constantly. In this sequential process, evaluation is the most pivotal step since the continuity of the cycle completely relies on getting encouraging and positive feedback about the efficacy of systematically organized and implemented educational activities (Bilen, 1999; Ultanır, 2003).

Peacock (2009) emphasizes that evaluation of the educational programs lead to the professionalization on ELT field. This also contributes to the improvement of the program; therefore, standardized evaluation is viewed among the most important components of the educational programs (Rea-Dickins and Germanie, 1998).

Day (1991) points out that when compared with the other teacher education fields, English language teacher education is rather a new area of research; however, the evaluation of the programs has aroused enthusiasm among researchers; therefore, studies about ELTEPs has started to be published since then (Weir & Roberts, 1994). As Dollar et.al (2014) explicate that teacher education programs need to be evaluated regularly in order to increase the quality of teacher education.

#### **1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Teacher training is among the most conspicuous subjects of educational systems. It has a considerable importance directly affecting the quality of education (Hismanoglu, 2013). Several studies have also specified that teacher education influences not only teacher quality but also student achievement (see, for example, Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1999; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Rivkin, Hanushek & Kain, 2005; cited in Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013). As long as a teacher is well-trained in the light of the position of the art research, s/he is expected to teach their learners properly (Karaata, 2011). Therefore, the curricula of the education faculties that train teacher candidates need to be regulated and developed in a strategic way (Hismanoglu, 2013). As seen, teacher education programs have been viewed as an important component in educating the language teacher (Karaata, 2011). However, previous studies indicate that teachers often do not carry out their profession in relation to the principles taught to them at the undergraduate program of universities (Binnie-Smith, 1996; Almarza, 1996).

English language teacher education is both a crucial and hard process and above all, it is a necessity now due to rapidly globalizing world; thus, having a comprehensive teacher education program can lead to train highly-qualified English teachers. It was both in 1997 and 2006 that ELT program was reconstructed. However, in Turkey, even now, there may be still a lot of flaws in the program, which should be corrected and improved at once. Although some positive changes have been done in the new program, when compared to the education programs implemented in well- developed countries, it is still deficient to meet the needs of the teacher candidates in terms of many aspects (Karakas, 2012); therefore, policy makers, program designers, faculty members certainly should pay attention to the suggestions of English teachers working at schools now.

This study aims to examine the contribution of undergraduate courses to English language teaching profession according to English teachers' views. In order to improve the present ELT programs, the views and recommendations of English language teachers should be taken into consideration by program designers and policy makers.

#### **1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In order to analyze English teachers' views about ELT undergraduate program, some questions based on literature review and general attitudes of English teachers are outlined :

1. How useful do practising teachers see undergraduate courses in ELT departments?

2. Do certain factors (gender and professional development of the teachers) have any influence on their views about undergraduate courses?

3. In order to improve the effectiveness of the undergraduate courses, what changes should be done by program designers or policy makers in views of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers?

## CHAPTER II: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK / LITERATURE REVIEW AND RELATED RESEARCH

## 2.1. THE HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION IN TURKEY

Before the establishment of Republic, foreign language teaching covers the period between 1299 -foundation of the Ottoman Empire- and 1923 -proclamation of the Republic-, which is also divided into two terms in itself: Before the Tanzimat and after the Tanzimat Period. The Ottoman Empire was governed on the basis of religion till the Tanzimat Period and after the Tanzimat Period, Western states in all areas were modelled; this is the reason why this period is divided into two parts (Demirel, 2012).

#### 2.1.1. Before The Tanzimat Period

Before the Tanzimat period, Arabic was the most commonly used foreign language in the Ottomon Empire both in the schools for religious education aims and in the state affairs for political interactions (Sarıboga-Alagoz, 2006; Aygun, 2008).

There were two kinds of school based on religious principles in this period in the Ottoman Empire, which are named infants' schools (sıbyan mektepleri) and madrasahs (medreseler). In the infants' school, the significant goal was to teach the learners religious knowledge; neither teaching the native language -Turkish- nor teaching of any foreign language such as Arabic was elaborated. On the other hand, in the institutions named madrasahs, by no means, Turkish -the native language of the public- was taught; Arabic was instructed instead, which paved the way for second language teaching in the Ottoman Empire (Demirel, 2012).

#### 2.1.2. The Tanzimat Period

With the start of Westernization movements in the Tanzimat period, firstly, French earned significance; therefore, French materials and even teachers were used in teaching the positive sciences. Actually, the initial attempts to teach a western language started with attempting to meet the need for military technology transferred from the west in the 18<sup>th</sup> century during the rise of the Ottoman period. In order to renew and modernize the Ottoman institutes, especially the military design, the teaching of a western language "French" -the most prestigious foreign language of that time- first began in military training institutions in 1773.

French was included in the curricula of Imperial School of Naval Engineering (Mühendishane-i Bahr-i Hümâyun) established in 1773 and Imperial School of Army Officer Engineering (Mühendishane-i Berr-i Hümâyun) founded in 1796 (Demirel, 2012). This development is also an example of teaching a western foreign language in military training institutions. Following these developments, French was included as a course in the educational programs of the School of Political Sciences (Mekteb-i Mülkiye) and Medical School (Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Adliye-i Şahane) (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012).

In addition to all these, new secondary schools were opened in 1896 and the foreign language as a course was included in the curriculum of these schools (Demirel, 2012).

The state made a decision to open a school to educate more foreign language teachers and in order to see how to realize this idea, in 1867, the Ottoman Empire got in touch with French government to ask for help in this matter (Tok, 2006). Eventually, in 1868, the Enderun schools, known as the "palace schools" in the Ottoman Empire, which were originally founded to educate the government officers, were renewed and modernized in the name of "Mekteb-i Sultani "(Galatasaray Lisesi or Lycee de Galatasaray), the opening of which was the milestone for foreign language teacher education (Demirel, 2012). Although the language of instruction was Arabic when Enderun schools were first established, Galatasaray Sultanisi began to give training in French and earned reputation in Europe in short time for its

high-quality education after the innovations. French was known as the lingua franca<sup>1</sup> of that period; therefore, the main purpose was to train the learners with a good command of French and in time, the students received courses to learn other foreign languages such as Armenain, Bulgarian, German, Greek, Italian and English as well (Tok, 2006).

Foreign language teacher training became an important matter for the state during the Tanzimat period. By the Ministry of National Education (MONE), proficient and talented young people were chosen and sent to France so as to receive education in French language and they were expected to teach the language to the young people when they returned to Turkey. Nonetheless, all these initiatives were unable to reach the desired purpose. Apart from that, in his doctoral dissertation, Tok (2006) also specifies that with the declaration of reforms, courses to teach foreign language were made a part of the educational programs, which was significant for taking steps to train more foreign language teachers for educational institutions.

The first official foreign educational institution using English as the means of instruction was Robert College, a secondary school with Anglo-American origins, which was founded in İstanbul in 1863 by Cyrus Hamlin, a missionary devoted himself to education (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012). This school was opened in order to spread American culture and its curriculum was very similar to the modern British schools' (Demirel, 2012). These missionary schools gave priority to the acceptance of Armenian, Jewish, Greek and Bulgarian students (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012).

Consistency and the quality of education provided in these American originated institutions progressively brought prominent prestige among other missionary schools. Eventually, English earned dominance over other foreign languages although French was the most favoured foreign language in that period. Besides, alumni of the Robert College could have exclusive and notable positions, which also folded the popularity of the college. Adopting English as a foreign language as the medium of instruction contributed the neutral and also desired

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The concept "lingua franca" means to "any lingual means of communication between people having diverse mother tongues, for whom lingua franca is a second language" (Samarin, 1987, p.371).

As seen in this definition, a lingua franca is a "contact language" between people sharing neither a common native language nor a common culture and therefore; for these people, the lingua franca is chosen for foreign language of communication (Firth, 1996, p.240).

political atmosphere in the schools (Washburn, 1909). Shortly after these developments, English was included as a course to the curriculum in the State Navy College (Bahriye Mektebi), School of Navy Engineering (Çarkçı Mektebi) and School of Foreign Languages (Elsine Mektebi) (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012).

While the foreign countries -especially France, England and the United States of America as well as Germany and Italia- were opening their missionary school in 1864, Turkish people also opened the first private school, Darüşşafaka, a Turkish college, which has been teaching foreign languages since it was established (Demirel, 2012).

It is clearly seen that Turkish education system meets with the English language in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, referred to the Tanzimat period of Turkish history, which plays a significant role in terms of marking the introduction of the Westernization acts in the education system (Kırkgoz, 2005). The Tanzimat period symbolizes modernization and innovation; therefore, the Ottoman Empire turned its face to the West, gave a start to change the education system according to the improvements and advancements of the West. Hence, attempts to involve Western languages into the Turkish education system began (Altundis, 2006).

It should also be noted that after 1908 Revolutions (Second Constitutional Period), teaching foreign languages in educational institutes gained a distinct importance; while French was a compulsory subject, German and English were among the elective language courses.

It is worth noting that in Turkey, the importance given to the foreign language learning and teaching increased proportionally considering political interactions with the other countries. While in the Tanzimat period, French as a foreign language gained considerable importance; in Constitutional Monarchy Period (Meşrutiyet Dönemi), German was the most commonly used foreign language. However, after Second World War II, English as a foreign language became prominent (Demirel, 2012).

#### 2.1.3. The Republic Period

A series of reforms -social, cultural and educational- were done with the leadership of Atatürk after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey to achieve the objectives set for an independent and modern country.

The most crucial educational reform was making the education accessible to everyone and unifying all schools at different levels - Islamic charities and minority groups were also included - with the Unification of Education (Tevhid-i Tedrisat) in 1924 (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012). Crucial developments also took place about the foreign language teaching. With the closure of the madrasahs, Arabic and Persian were excluded from the educational programs; instead of these foreign languages, the Western languages -German, French and English- were involved in the curriculum (Akyuz, 2012).

Atatürk pointed out the improvement of education as an urgent need since there were not any clear objectives and principles set out before. The views of Turkish pedagogical reformers as well as foreign experts were significant without doubt in order to make education revolution real. Most of these Turkish pedagogical reformers were educated in west-oriented schools during the Ottoman Empire; therefore, they were keen on at least one foreign language and they knew a lot about foreign language education system. After the establishment of the Republic, along with Turkish pedagogical reformers, foreign experts were also called to Turkey in order to benefit from their experience while reforming education, to which onefourth of the budget was allocated by the government, and John Dewey was one of these experts. It is worth emphasizing that the Republic established under the leadership of Atatürk attached importance to transferring scientific ideas and western culture as an example for the modern education.

As the alphabet was altered from Arabic to Latin in 1928, literacy was given more importance; therefore, foreign language teaching did not have a primary place at that time. As a concept, "foreign language teaching" was first mentioned in 1943 at the National Education Summit (Saricoban & Saricoban, 2012).

After the establishment of Turkish Republic, lots of significant developments and changes happened around the world, which entailed political interactions in order to keep pace with the developing world. While Turkey started to focus on the teaching of English as a foreign language, there was a significant increase in the number of the schools opened by the foreign governments (Demirel, 2012).

Gazi Teacher School was founded in 1926 to supply teacher demand at that time and Gazi Institute of Education was the first teacher training institute founded in 1946. French, English and German language departments were established respectively so as to train foreign language teachers (Demirel, 1991). There was certainly a need for a well-established foreign language teacher training program. In the history of Turkish education, Gazi Institute together with Capa Institute were the first foreign language teaching departments (Gunes, 2009). At first, in the 1950s, training more foreign language teacher candidates was the policy of these departments (Demircan, 2001). New foreign language teaching departments were founded after 1965 and in the 1967-1968 academic year, these foreign language teaching departments were regulated to provide 3-year education. Later, teacher education period was determined to be 4-year. In the meantime, Gazi Institute was titled as Gazi High Teacher School. Afterwards, the establishment of this institution paved the way for the foundation of Gazi University and the Faculty of Education in 1982 (Akyuz, 2009). Nonetheless, in the following years, it was realized that unplanned and random policies implemented for foreign language teacher training did not generate well-qualified education for foreign language teacher candidates, which was also specified in the Ministry of Education Commission Report in 1960 (Demircan, 2001). Furthermore, this report proposed that foreign teachers had to be replaced by Turkish teachers since they were not eligible enough to sustain this profession as it should have been. As recognized, in this period, the quantity rather than the quality was emphasized about the training of foreign language teachers (Nergis, 2011).

Developments after the Second World War resulted in increase in political interactions. Therefore, trying to keep up with the developments both in mass media and information and communication technologies required to know English, the international language all over the world (Akyuz, 2012). As a consequence, in order to realize this objective, the first state-funded secondary school called "Anatolian High School" in which English was a medium of instruction was opened in 1955 (Kırkgoz, 2005). Since that time, these institutions have been considered as a path to

have a prosperous future and get into distinguished universities. It was obligatory to acquire considerable high scores in the standardized test in order to get into Anatolian High Schools. Anatolian High Schools were different from other standard high schools since they used English as medium of instruction. Similar to private high schools, these schools had one-year preparatory class plus 3-year education, which met the parents' expectation of foreign language instruction for their children (Saricoban & Saricoban, 2012). Hence, in order to supply the demand of the parents, the government started to increase the number of these Anatolian High Schools (Kırkgoz, 2005). In this four-year education, students had intensive English courses in their first year in preparatory classes and in the following three years, for primary courses, especially for positive sciences, the medium of instruction was English till 2002. After all, the MONE gave a decision to replace the teaching of positive science courses through using Turkish as a medium of instruction instead of English (Saricoban & Saricoban, 2012). Not having enough qualified teachers to teach these courses in English and students being unsuccessful in the standardized test to get into university for their higher education were the reasons for this critic decision (Dogançay-Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005).

Not only in secondary education but also at the level of higher education, Turkey's attempts to globalize and modernize gave rise to the foundation of many English- medium universities. The first state university using English as a medium of instruction was Middle East Technical University (METU) established in 1956 and depended on the American model (Kırkgoz, 2005). In addition, in his book, "The Making of Modern Turkey (Making of the Middle East)", Ahmad (1993) clearly specifies that "For the children of the very rich who failed to enter the elite state universities, Professor Ihsan Dogramaci, the architect of the Higher Education Law, opened Bilkent, Turkey's first private university. Its model was the American campus and everything, including the cafeteria menu, was written in English." Actually, in the higher education institutes, arguments about English-Medium-Education (EME) started at the nationwide level in 1981. Enabling the students to learn scientific, cultural and technological information published in English together with developments around the world in their field of study was the primary purpose of EME (Kırkgoz, 2005). The Higher Education Law allowed private universities to give education using English as a medium of instruction in 1990 (Higher Education

Council, 2001b); therefore, Turkey's viewpoint about EME in higher education institutes has been broadened. At the present time, most of the private universities offer EME to their students. Additionally, a great number of state universities (using Turkish as a means of instruction) provide one-year intensive English program called preparatory classes for their students in order to make them competent and proficient in globalized foreign language. Later, in the following classes, learners take a course named "Reading and Speaking in English" so as to improve their general competence in English, which is succeeded by "English for Specific Purposes I and II" aiming to teach the learners the terminology of their own discipline (Dogançay-Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005).

As Robins (1986) touches on, Turkey has been significantly affected by the "globalization" forces through English language from the 1980s onwards. Since English is the most commonly spoken universal language all over the world, it has grown into the most prevalent means of interaction. Therefore, foreign language education policies in Turkey also elaborate on the teaching of English as a foreign language with this effect of globalization; because, today, the lingua franca of the world is English (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012). Besides, in his book "The Making of Modern Turkey (Making of the Middle East)", Ahmad (1993) states that "English had become the sine qua non<sup>2</sup> for a successful career in virtually any field; thus, parents struggled to have their children acquire a working knowledge of the language" (p.210).

# 2.2. 1997 EDUCATION REFORM (ELT REFORM IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS)

In Turkish education, the account of ELT lasted as mentioned above until 1997. In 1997, Turkish education system went through a great number of crucial changes at all levels of education in the English language teaching policy. These drastic changes were based on the MONE's attempts to reform Turkey's ELT system, which was not given much importance and randomly planned (Saricoban & Saricoban, 2012). Therefore, the MONE worked in cooperation with the Turkish

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The concept has Latin origins and refers to a necessary condition without which something is not possible. http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/sine-qua-non

Higher Education Council (HEC) to renew ELT practice (Kırkgoz, 2007). The reform was presented as "The Ministry of Education Development Project" -a large-scale curriculum innovation project in ELT practice- ,which targeted to promote more influential teaching of English in both state-owned and private educational institutions in Turkey.

With the 1997 curriculum reform, the duration of compulsory primary education extended from 5 to 8 years by embedding 3-year secondary education into primary education. Furthermore, the introduction of English to 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students was another innovation the reform brought (Saricoban & Saricoban, 2012). English was a regular school subject only at secondary school level beforehand. With the presentation of English to primary levels, English has grown into a standardized compulsory course for all of the learners involved in compulsory education in October 1997 (MONE, 1997a); therefore, the teaching of English to young learners (TEYLs) started (Kırkgoz, 2007). This situation was clearly and officially stated by the MONE as "Turkey's political and economic ambitions and the nation's desire to keep up with foreign countries, particularly with countries of the European Union (EU), are the major motivating forces underlying the decision to introduce English to young learners" (MONE, 1997b, p. 606). Hence, with this new policy implementation, exposing the learners to the foreign language more than before was intended; therefore, the students could have more competence in learning English (MONE, 2001).

The objectives of the new English curriculum were defined for educational institutions for all grades. The stated objectives of the new curriculum in the primary school level for English can be listed as follows :

- a. raise pupils' awareness of a foreign language,
- b. promote a positive attitude towards the learning of English language,
- c. increase pupils' interest and motivation towards the English language,

d. establish classroom situations in the context of games so that pupils can entertain while learning English,

e. set up dialogues and meaningful contextualized learning activities,

f. help pupils develop appropriate strategies (Kocaoluk & Kocaoluk, 2001).

In addition to all these, the fundamental objective of teaching English in secondary school level is specified as "boosting the learners' communicative competence through integrating four language skills" (MONE, 2001). Therefore, the concept of "communicative approach" was introduced to the education system (Kırkgoz, 2005). The main aim for adopting this policy is to improve the learners' communicative abilities in order to make them be prepared to use the target language (TL) effectively not only in classroom activities but also in real life. The new curriculum supports student-centred learning instead of conventional teacher-centred model. Teacher's role is specified as an organizer and facilitator in the learning process. In this model, teachers shoulder a variety of responsibility and students are expected to be active in the learning process as well. As seen, the new curriculum can be considered as a breakthrough in terms of ELT practise in Turkey (Kırkgoz, 2007).

#### 2.2.1. 1997 ELT Undergraduate Curriculum Reform In Universities

The new English curriculum in 1997 not only affected primary and secondary education but also the educational programs of teacher training in universities. This new policy aimed to both improve ELT programs and provide more qualified teachers to meet the demands of their learners. Therefore, education faculties also had to renew their 1982 curriculum (see Appendix A) to educate well-qualified teachers fulfilling the requirements of 21<sup>st</sup> century. After the approval of the new ELT undergraduate curriculum in 1998 (see Appendix B), departments of ELT teacher training were upgraded too; the hours for methodology classes, school experience and teaching practise courses increased and student-teachers were given opportunity to intern in both primary and secondary education levels, which provided more practise opportunity for the teacher candidates. Besides, TEYLs course was added into the programs of ELT departments (Kırkgoz, 2005).

With the new ELTEP, it was aimed to minimize the theoretical courses in teacher education programs and give more space for courses as "Teaching Education to Young Learners", "Approaches to English Language Teaching", "Drama Analysis and Teaching", "Instructional Technologies and Material Development", "Material Evaluation and Adaptation", "Short Story Analysis and Teaching" and the like. Additionally, 1998 ELTEP stressed on the teaching practicum more and opened 3 different courses named "School Experience I", "School Experience II" and "Teaching Practice"; therefore, teacher candidates, by getting more functional, realistic and hands-on experience in education institutions, had more opportunities to monitor real teaching practises in both primary and secondary schools (Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013).

This new undergraduate curriculum in ELT departments of universities paved the way for the standardization and the foundation of Turkish accreditation system for teacher training having roots from the British model (Tosun, 2001). In 1998-1999 academic year, this renewed ELT curriculum was piloted in six education faculties. Billing and Thomas (2000) made the assessment of the pilot study and their research indicated that the predetermined learning outcomes were achieved on a large scale.

## 2.3. THE REQUIREMENT FOR RENEWING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN 2006

In 1998-1999 academic year, teacher education programs were revised due to eight years of compulsory primary education.

In the eight years following this development, during academic events such as conferences, panels, workshops, symposiums organized by universities, non-governmental organizations (NGO) and the MONE, teacher education programs in education faculties were evaluated whether or not they could educate knowledgeable and competent teachers. Recommendations and suggestions based on scientific research data were put forward by the field experts to develop teacher training programs.

Besides, European Higher Education Area (EHEA), in which Turkey is one of the participating countries, also played a significant role in renewing teacher education programs. EHEA was initiated in March 2010 during the Budapest-Vienna ministerial conference. It was intended to provide more systematic, organized, compatible and comparable systems of higher education to the learners throughout the Europe via EHEA, which was the primary goal of Bologna Process since its initiation in 1999. Members of Bologna Process put great effort to create EHEA between the years of 1999 and 2000; and, it came true as wished during the Budapest-Vienna Declaration of March in 2010. Thus, reinforcing EHEA seems to be the aim of the member countries for the next decade.

The main objective of EHEA is to describe "learning outcomes" expected from undergraduate programs; therefore, firstly, it specifies the subjects to be taught to the learners and the methods along with the duration required for these predetermined subjects and lastly, it measures and evaluates the learning outcomes by using the same methods.

In this EHEA process, it has been thought that the education faculties should have some common minimum standards; thus, renewing teacher education programs has been considered as a necessity. Consequently, the HEC carried out a study to develop present teacher education programs and administrators along with teaching staff started to make necessary renewals in teacher education programs instead of changing them as a whole.

A working group consisting of 25 faculty members from education faculties was formed to renew the teacher education programs. This group of academics prepared a new draft for teacher education faculties, which was later submitted to Deans of Education faculties to get their opinions. Accordingly, "Education Faculties Curriculum Development Workshop" was organized between 5-11 March 2006 in 7-day-period. Therefore, with the views of these academics, the process of teacher education programs development became more participatory and democratic.

Taking into the comments and suggestions from faculty members into consideration, the renewal of teacher education programs was completed by "The Development Committee of Faculty of Education" and it was approved for practise on 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2006 by the HEC General Assembly.

Minor changes were made in some of the  $2^{nd}$ ,  $3^{rd}$  and  $4^{th}$  year courses' codes, credits and names regarding the views of faculty staffs and these teacher training programs were reapproved with their final draft on  $2^{nd}$  February, 2007.

Renewed teacher education programs were decided to be practised starting from  $1^{st}$  classes in 2006-2007 academic year and teacher candidates in their  $2^{nd}$ ,  $3^{rd}$  and  $4^{th}$  year continued to be educated with the previous curriculum.

Elective courses were determined according to students' interests and the number of faculty staff; however, alternative courses relevant to raising consciousness about the profession were suggested to the education faculties.

It was also suggested that general culture courses such as Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolutions might be taught in different semesters by the universities.

Moreover, it was proposed that "Teaching Technologies and Materials Design" course should be taught by lecturers with expertise on instructional design, educational technology, materials design or instructional technologies.

This was of great importance to emphasize that constructivist education philosophy<sup>3</sup> was taken as a basis in practising the new curriculum (HEC, 2006).

## 2.3.1. The General Innovations Introduced By The New Teacher Education Programs

The major innovations in teacher education programs administered since 2006-2007 academic year can be listed as :

a. Generally, teacher training programs cover 50% content knowledge and competence, 30% general pedagogic knowledge and competence and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Jean Piaget is the pioneer of Constructivism. Piaget (1967) holds that by using our existing schemes of thought and changing and expanding these schemes in time, we generate knowledge and meaning; briefly, in this life-long constructive process, we endeavor to organize, structure and finally restructure our experiences and ideas in view of these pre-formed schemes.

20% general cultural courses. However, these percentages may vary according to ELT departments of different universities.

b. Since the demand for teachers was met to a great extent, the practise of undergraduate minor programs to provide potential ELT teachers were cancelled. Therefore, teacher candidates have been trained in-depth in their specific field since then.

c. About 25% of the total credit to determine potential courses was given to the faculties and the number of the elective courses was increased.

d. One of the most significant characteristics of the new teacher education programs is the increase in the proportion of the general cultural courses. By means of this innovation, it has been aimed to educate a versatile teacher candidate with general world knowledge, competence about information communication technologies at a certain level and capable of conducting scientific research besides benefiting from the earlier researches, which are considered as the qualities of an intellectual person. A teacher with these qualities can be more successful in educating the learners by fulfilling the requirements of modern education. Therefore, courses such as Scientific Research Methods and Turkish Education History were included to the teacher training programs.

e. "Practices in Social Services" is the other new course included to the teacher education programs. This one-semester course is compulsory in all the departments of education faculties and the learners are expected to produce projects to contribute to the wellbeing of the society. Additionally, the students are encouraged to participate in scientific activities such as symposiums, panels, conferences, congresses as an audience, lecturer or organizer.

The new teacher education program has similarities to teacher training programs implemented in EU countries in terms of various perspectives.

These renewed teacher training programs aim to educate teachers who will teach how to learn and reconstruct knowledge instead of pure memorization besides triggering the critical thinking skills of the learners (HEC, 2006).

#### 2.3.2. Revision Of The 1997 ELT Curriculum

Turkmen (2007) stated in one of his articles that "The latest revision in elementary teacher education programs was made in 2006. According to the HEC, the need for this change was due to some problems arising from the application of 1998 program and also some necessary updates had to be done after the eight years."

In 2006-2007 academic year, the HEC made revisions in the curricula of the education faculties so as to meet not only the altering social, educational, political demands but the local, national and international requirements of the country as well (Coskun, 2008; OECD, 2005).

Salihoglu (2012) states that "as the rapid changes in the world urge educators to revise and extend their curriculum, teacher education should be no exception and in fact should be the first to be revised in order to plan the desired changes in advance."

In 2006, the curriculum of ELT in teacher education faculties was also renewed (see Appendix C) in order to keep up with the innovations in the language policy. Actually, the main reason behind mentioned language policy was Turkey's constant efforts to join EU and so as to abide by the ELT standards determined by the EU; therefore, the MONE has decided to alter some policy practises to be applied in different levels of education (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012). Accordingly, the second biggest renewal in Initial Teacher Education (ITE) was done in 2006 and the HEC (2006) justified the need for this redesign with these following statements :

a. to refine the teacher education programs in the light of the findings of scientific research studies

b. to define the "learning outcomes" of undergraduate programs according to the criteria of the EHEA

c. to cover the tenets of the Constructivist Approach introduced with the second program change in Basic Education in 2003.

The renewed teacher education program addresses the required academic knowledge about discrete angles of ELT consisting of curriculum design, choosing

applicable and convenient teaching materials for different levels, the logic behind language learning and language acquisition and how language can be taught to different age groups, for instance young learners (4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades) and teenagers (6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades).

The current English curriculum (2006 ELTEP) is also in favour of "Communicative Approach" as 1997 curriculum, in which the significance of meaningful communication is emphasized and instead of teacher-centred view, learner-centred view is adopted in learning/teaching process (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012).

In Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), enabling learners to communicate in the TL is the main goal. Students have to know linguistic forms, meanings and functions to realize this objective. The students need to be aware that many discrete forms can be employed to perform a language function and an individual language form can also serve a number of functions. The students are expected to select the most appropriate form considering the social context and the interlocutors. The students are supposed to be in charge of negotiating meaning. Having knowledge about the forms is not enough, communication is needed to master a language effectively. The teacher's role is to facilitate and promote communication in the classroom besides monitoring the learners' performance. Students' role is to negotiate meaning during TL communication. Since this method adopts student- centred view, students are considered more responsible in managing their learning process. Furthermore, in the learning process, students use the language through participating in communicative activities; for instance, role plays, games, problem-solving tasks and the like. Therefore, students work with pairs, triads, small groups or whole group. Real and true communication is targeted with using these activities. Teachers give opportunity to their learners in order to express themselves and share their ideas. The TL is expected to be used while clarifying the classroom activities to the learners as well. The TL is aimed at being used as a means of communication, instead of just as an object for school subject. From the very beginning, the learners are taught how to use four language skills. In terms of evaluation, not only accuracy-based but also fluency-based and integrative tests should be applied both formally and informally. Errors made by the learners should be viewed as a natural outcome of the improvement in communication skills (Richards & Rogers, 1986).

Besides these, the renewed curriculum inspires "learner autonomy" (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012), in which the learner accepts responsibility for his or her learning and with this acceptance of controlling, their own learning entails to develop a positive attitude to learning (Little, 1995). With the renewed ELT curriculum, assessment methods have also been altered. Instead of conventional "pencil-and- paper tests", "performance-based assessment" has begun to be used (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012). "Portfolios" are seen among the new evaluation tools considered a form of authentic and realistic assessment, which enhance the student's learning experience and self-understanding as a learner (Fernsten & Fernsten, 2005). Since portfolios elaborate on archiving a learner's language performance and progress, teachers and parents can have an opportunity to observe the student's development. This form of assessment is in accordance with the principles of CLT as well (Sarıcoban & Sarıcoban, 2012). The MONE states that the evaluation form must be harmonious with the teaching itself; therefore, the proposed evaluation tools are taken from European Language Portfolio<sup>4</sup>(ELP).

Kavcar (2002) anticipated that the required revision of the 1997 ELTEP to be implemented and he thought that in 1997 ELTEP, general culture and general knowledge courses -Turkish Educational History, Educational Psychology, Sociology and the like- seemed not to be given importance. After all, in the 2006 ELTEP, the mentioned courses above were included to the renewed teacher training program.

Crucial updates were done not only about the policy itself but also on the courses themselves. Some new courses were introduced and some removed, whereas some of the courses' class hours were increased or lessened and some of the courses' semesters were altered. These courses can be classified as Field Knowledge (FK), General Culture (GC) and Pedagogical Knowledge (PK) (Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013). 34 of these courses are considered as ELT field courses (e.g.Language Acquisition or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> It is clearly stated that The European Language Portfolio (ELP) was developed by the Language Policy Unit of the Council of the Europe to support the development of learner autonomy, plurilingualism, cultural awareness and competence and to allow users to record both their language learning achievements and their experience of learning and using languages (Council of Europe website).

Linguistics), 11 of these courses are viewed as general knowledge courses (e.g. Turkish or History) and 13 of these courses are regarded as pedagogical knowledge courses (e.g.Educational Psychology, Classroom Management or Special Education).

A total of 58 courses with 159 credits overall are required to be completed by the student-teachers according to the current ELTEP renewed by the HEC in 2006-2007 academic year (Salihoglu, 2012).

The renewed ELTEP is comprised of a good number of obligatory and a few elective courses. The 2006 ELTEP covers field knowledge (linguistic competence), teacher education (pedagogic competence), general knowledge and teaching practice courses (Altunya, 2006).

As compared to 1997 ELTEP, which was implemented between 1998-2006, in 2006 ELTEP, teaching methodology and practise constituents were emphasized more (Seferoglu, 2006).

In addition to all these, the renewed education program has its stems from Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). It supplies a universal base for language programs and defines not only language teaching but also language learning processes (Council of Europe, 2001). While the learners are expected to be autonomous, the teachers are expected to broaden their professional development according to the CEFR framework. European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) provided a basis in the planning part of the reconstruction of the ELTEP and the prerequisites of both teacher education programs and education faculties were taken into account while shaping the curriculum in the end (HEC, 2008).

The above account of the changes in 2006 ELTEP in terms of removed, added, re-sequenced and modified courses along with class hour changes can be clearly seen in Table 2-1 below (Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013) :

| н              |             |         | Turkish Phonetics and Stylistics  |  |
|----------------|-------------|---------|---|--|
| vec            | es          |         | Turkish Sentence Structure and Semantics  |  |
| Removed        | Courses     |         | Reading Skills I, II  |  |
| Sei            | ē           |         | Writing Skills I, II  |  |
|                | 0           |         | School Experience I   |  |
|                |             |         | Listening and Phonetics I, II   |  |
|                |             |         | Effective Communication   |  |
|                |             |         | Lexicology  |  |
|                |             |         | Turkish Educational History   |  |
| s              |             |         | Teaching Language Skills I, II  |  |
| rse            |             |         | Second Foreign Language   |  |
| no             |             |         | Drama   |  |
| Ŭ              |             |         | Practices in Social Services  |  |
| led            |             |         | Special Needs Education   |  |
| do             |             |         | Comparative Education   |  |
| Added Courses  |             |         | Turkish Educational System and School Management  |  |
| _              |             |         | Advanced Reading and Writing (reading and writing   | skills courses are merged in the 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> terms)  |
| cec            |             |         | Research Skills (from 6 <sup>th</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)  |  |
| Ē              |             |         | Linguistics I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> term)  |  |
| e              | 8           |         | Linguistics II (from 5 <sup>th</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)   |  |
| ənbə           | ŝ           |         |   |  |
| esedue         | ourse       |         | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)   |  |
| Re-sequenced   | Courses     |         |   | rm)  |
| Re-seque       | Course      |         | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te  |  |
| Re-seque       | Course      | ges     | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)   |
|                |             | anges   | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)   |
| Class Re-seque | Hour Course | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)   |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)   |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b>  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b>  |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II  |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b>  |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II  |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II   |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech  |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences   |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II   |
| Class          |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class hours<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology   |
| Class          |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning<br>Introduction to Linguistics I, II   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology<br>Linguistics I, II  |
| Class          |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning<br>Introduction to Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT  | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology<br>Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT I, II   |
| Class          |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning<br>Introduction to Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT<br>Planning and Evaluation   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology<br>Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT I, II<br>Testing and Evaluation   |
| Class          |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning<br>Introduction to Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT<br>Planning and Evaluation<br>Teaching English to Young Learners   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology<br>Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT I, II<br>Testing and Evaluation<br>Teaching English to Young Learners I, II |
| Class          |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning<br>Introduction to Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT<br>Planning and Evaluation<br>Teaching English to Young Learners<br>Short Story Analysis and Teaching Novel Analysis | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology<br>Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT I, II<br>Testing and Evaluation   |
|                |             | Changes | Language Acquisition (from 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>Approaches to Language Teaching I (from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> te<br>Research Skills (from 3 class hours from 6 <sup>th</sup> term to 2<br>Teaching English to Young Learners (from 3 class ho<br><b>1998 ELTEP</b><br>English Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading Skills<br>Advanced Writing Skills<br>Speaking Skills I, II<br>Introduction to Teaching<br>Introduction to English Literature I, II<br>Development and Learning<br>Introduction to Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT<br>Planning and Evaluation<br>Teaching English to Young Learners   | class hours to 4 <sup>th</sup> term)<br>urs to 4 class hours to 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> terms)<br><b>2006 ELTEP</b><br>Contextual Grammar I, II<br>Advanced Reading and Writing I, II<br>Oral Communication Skills I, II<br>Public Speech<br>Introduction Educational Sciences<br>English Literature I, II<br>Educational Psychology<br>Linguistics I, II<br>Approaches in ELT I, II<br>Testing and Evaluation<br>Teaching English to Young Learners I, II |

#### Table 2-1: Changes in 2006 ELTEP

## 2.4. ANADOLU UNIVERSITY DISTANCE EDUCATION FACULTY ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

#### **2.4.1. Introduction Of The Program**

English Language Teaching Undergraduate Program (IOLP) was a four-year undergraduate program in Anatolian University Distance Education Faculty. This undergraduate program was launched according to the protocol concerning ELT Teacher Training Program signed between the MONE and Anadolu University on February 28, 2000 and it was equivalent to ELT programs in Education Faculties in formal education. In this undergraduate program, it was planned that in the first two years, EFL teacher candidates were trained face-to-face and in the last two years, they were trained via distance education.

In 2000-2001 academic year, face-to-face training was done in total ten cities in Turkey; and later, in 2001-2002 academic year, this number increased to sixteen.

## 2.4.2. The Reason For Launching IOLP Based On Distance Education System

Education Faculties have contributed considerably to teacher training since 1982 in order to meet the demands of education system; however, they have had some difficulties in terms of both quality and quantity while trying to accomplish the desired aims. Consequently, while redundant teacher candidates were trained in some departments, in some departments as ELT, there was a great need for teachers, which seemed impossible to be met within a short period of time.

Besides, due to the application of eight year compulsory primary education and the shifting of English courses from secondary school level to 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades as of 1998, the need for English teachers increased more.

Despite the use of all the possibilities, the inability to meet the need for English teachers led the MONE to search for solutions. As a result, with the cooperation of the MONE and Eskisehir Anadolu University Distance Education Faculty, the "English Teacher Training Project" was launched and via a process of negotiations, the protocol was signed and put into effect.

#### 2.4.3. The Purpose Of IOLP

The main objective of IOLP was to train English teachers in the required quantity and quality without compromising the quality of education. In accordance with this purpose, EFL teacher candidates trained via this program were qualified for "English Language Teaching Bachelor's Degree Diploma" when they successfully completed their a four-year education at the undergraduate level and later, they were appointed as English teachers according to the MONE's legislation.

#### 2.4.4. The Application Of IOLP

A "blended learning model", in which both "formal" and "non-formal" education is integrated, was applied in IOLP. In the first two years, EFL teacher candidates were trained face-to-face; because, courses as reading, writing, speaking and grammar are taught more effectively in the interactive classroom atmosphere. The second part of blending learning model is distance education. At the end of these two years, the EFL teacher candidates having acquired the required language skills had courses about their professional development using computer technology through distance education.

In the first two years, face-to-face training was carried out in high schools assigned by the MONE. The training was given by English teachers (also called cooperative teachers) working at the MONE's schools or by instructors and faculty members working at Foreign Language Departments of Education Faculties if needed.

According to IOLP's testing system, four exams in total including two mid-term exams, a final exam and a make-up exam were held throughout academic year in the first two years. And, in the last two years, the exams of all the courses were made in the form of multiple choice tests. All the exams were organized by Anadolu University Computer Research and Training Centre (AUBAUM) in Eskisehir.

The courses in IOLP can be seen below in Table 2-2. 34 courses for total four- year training are specified as (Sakar, 2001) :

Table 2-2: Courses in IOLP

| 1 <sup>st</sup> Grade                              |                | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade                          |                      |
|--|----------------|--|----------------------|
|  | Face to Face   |  | Erre to Erre         |
| 1.English Grammar I                                | I dee to I dee | 1.English Grammar II                           | Face to Face         |
| 2.Reading Skills                                   | Face to Face   | 2. Advanced Reading Skills                     | Face to Face         |
| 3.Speaking Skills                                  | Face to Face   | 3.Advanced Writing Skills                      | Face to Face         |
| 4.Writing Skills                                   | Face to Face   | 4.Translation (Tr-Eng/Eng-Tr)                  | Face to Face         |
| 5.Introduction to Teaching                         | Distance       | 5.School Practice                              | Observation          |
| 6.Computer   | Distance       | 6.Turkish Writing and Speaking                 | Distance             |
|  |                | 7. Atatürk's Principles and History of         |                      |
|  |                | Revolutions                                    | Distance             |
|  |                | 8.Instructional Planning and Evaluation        | Distance             |
|  |                | 9. Human Development and Learning              | Distance             |
|  |                |  |                      |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade                              |                | 4t <sup>h</sup> Grade                          |                      |
| 1.Linguistics                                      | Distance       | 1.English Language Testing and Evaluation      | Distance             |
| 2.English Literature                               | Distance       | 2.Instructional Technology and Material        |                      |
| 3.Language Acquisition                             | Distance       | Development                                    | Distance             |
| 4.ELT Methodology                                  | Distance       | 3.Sociolinguistics                             | Distance             |
| 5.Research Skills                                  | Distance       | 4. Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching    | Distance             |
| 6.Methods and Approaches                           |                | 5. Analysis and Teaching of English Literature |                      |
| to ELT   | Distance       | (Short Story/Novel/Drama/Poetry)               | Distance             |
| 7.Classroom Management                             | Distance       | 6. Teaching English to Young Learners          | Distance             |
|  | Distance       | 7.Applied Linguistics                          | Distance             |
| 8.Psychological Counselling                        |                | 11 0   |                      |
| 8.Psychological Counselling<br>9.Turkish Phonetics |                | 8.Semantics                                    | Distance             |
|  | Distance       | 8.Semantics<br>9.Psycholinguistics             | Distance<br>Distance |

#### 2.4.5. The Current Situation Of IOLP

The students are no longer admitted to this undergraduate program since 2012-2013 academic year; because, the need for English teachers has been met on a large scale.<sup>5</sup>

#### 2.5. ELT TEACHER CERTIFICATION COURSES

The graduates of Faculties of Science and Literature (English Language and Literature, American Culture and Literature and Translation Studies) were enabled to become English teachers on condition that they received teacher certification courses between the years of 1982 and 1997 (Kavcar, 2002) and there still is not any regulation requiring a candidate of English language teacher to be graduated from Education faculties according to the MONE (Aydogan & Cilsal, 2007). It means that the graduates of Science and Literature faculties can be appointed as English teachers to state schools by the MONE although the primary goal of these faculties is not to train future teachers (Salihoglu, 2012).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> It is possible to reach this information from http://aop.eogrenme.anadolu.edu.tr/iolp/genel-bilgiler/Sayfalar/default.aspx.

## 2.6. ELT TEACHER TRAINING CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS ALL AROUND THE WORLD

There are teacher training certificate programs designed for individuals who wish to teach English as a second language or foreign language (ESL or EFL) in primary, secondary or adult contexts.

Some of ELT teacher training certificate programs are clearly accounted below :

## 2.6.1. The Certificate In Teaching English To Speakers Of Other Languages (CertTESOL)

The certificate in TESOL (CertTESOL) is one of the various Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) qualifications available commonly taken in the field of ELT. It is a professional development qualification accredited and awarded by Trinity College London in the field of teaching "English For Speakers Of Other Languages" (ESOL).

The Trinity CertTESOL is a TEFL or Teaching English To Speakers Of Other Languages (TESOL) certificate designed for those with limited or no experience in the field of teaching English. The candidates are equipped with fundamental skills and knowledge required to take up a first post as an ESOL teacher. The certificate program also provides the candidates with an introduction to theory, experience in English teaching, an awareness of challenges the learners face and the role of the teacher. It is appropriate for those with classroom experience and without any formal training in teaching as well.

The Trinity CertTESOL teaching qualification can be taken by all those for whom English is a first, second or foreign language. The admission requirements set out by the authorities can be listed as the candidates must be at least 18 years old and have an evidence of qualifications gained for entry to higher education in the United Kingdom (UK) (A levels) or equivalent. This certificate program is available in several countries throughout the world and a portion of the course is offered by some institutions in the form of distance learning. The candidates can take the course either full-time in a four or five-week period or part-time over several months to a year.

The professional qualification is awarded upon passing the course including handing in assignments about language skills and supervised teaching experience.

The CertTESOL is a universal program accepted by the British Council as a basic TESOL or TEFL qualification for teachers and it is also accredited in the UK at level 5 on the Qualification and Credit Framework (QCF).

#### **2.6.2.** The Licentiate Diploma In TESOL (LTCL DipTESOL)

The LTCL DipTESOL is another professional qualification awarded by Trinity College London in the field of teaching ESOL. This is often seen as a follow-up to the CertTESOL; therefore, experienced teachers can progress in their carrier by taking this advanced diploma.

As other professional qualification programs, there are some admission requirements to LTCL DipTESOL set out by the authorities as well. It is compulsory for all the candidates to have completed a course certified by Trinity College London. Moreover, they are required to have at least two years recent full-time ESOL teaching experience and competence to speak and write in English expected from a teacher of English at advanced levels.

The diploma is awarded on passing the course including four units; the written paper, coursework portfolio, interview and assessed teaching. All these components are supervised and assessed by Trinity examiners.

The LTCL DipTESOL is an international and widely recognized program accepted by major language teaching organizations such as British Council as an advanced TESOL or TEFL qualification for teachers and it is also accredited in the UK at level 7 on the QCF.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> It is possible to reach this information from htpp://www.trinitycollege.com/

## 2.6.3. Certificate In English Language Teaching To Speakers Of Other Languages (CELTA)

CELTA is one of the initial teacher training qualifications awarded by Cambridge English Language Assessment through validated Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications centres in the field of teaching EFL or ESL.

CELTA mainly elaborates on teaching English to adult learners; however, most of the techniques and methods can also be used for teaching young learners as well. After completing CELTA program, the candidates wishing to teach mostly young learners can take the Young Learner (YL) Extension to CELTA.

It is possible for the candidates to take the course full-time or part-time and face-to- face or online. A face-to-face, full-time course lasts about four or five weeks.

CELTA is designed for those with limited or no experience in the field of English teaching; therefore, it can be asserted that the program is more suitable for the candidates at the beginning of their career or teachers with little experience wishing to get an international qualification for their ELT skills. English teachers with another teacher training qualification and at least one-year ELT experience might be more suitable for another teacher training qualification as DELTA.

There are some course admission requirements set out by the authorities as well. The candidates must be over 18 years old and have an evidence of qualifications gained for entry to higher education (A levels) or equivalent. Besides, it is compulsory for the candidates to have English language skills equal to at least C1 level of the CEFR or 7.5 International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score.

Before the admission to the course, the candidates are required to complete a written task elaborating on some points about teaching English and language awareness. The applicant will be invited to an interview provided that the written task gives a clue about his/her potential to develop the required language skills to complete the course successfully. How the interview is conducted varies according to the language centres. It might be individual or in a group and might be face-to-face,

via SKYPE or on the telephone. The interview is a good chance to assess the candidates' potential and provide information about their language skills.

As for assessment, CELTA does not have a final exam; it is a continuous assessment course leading to professional development qualification certificate.

CELTA is one of the universal programs on teacher training qualifications and it is accredited at level 5 on the QCF.

## 2.6.4. Diploma In Teaching English To Speakers Of Other Languages (DELTA)

The certificate in DELTA is one of the various TEFL or TESOL qualifications commonly taken by experienced teachers in the field of ELT. It is a professional development qualification awarded by Cambridge English Language Assessment through validated Cambridge English Teaching Qualification centres either full-time or part-time and face-to-face or online by distance learning programs.

As the other professional qualification programs, there are some admission requirements set by the authorities as well. DELTA is designed for experienced teachers, who have usually taken an initial teaching qualification certificate and have at least one-year ELT teaching experience. Besides, it is compulsory for the candidates to have English language skills equal to at least C1 level of the CEFR.

The aims of the candidates are to advance in their professional development, apply for more prestigious roles, gain new insights about teaching knowledge, enhance their expertise in a specialist area, critically examine current practises in language teaching as a teacher and update their teaching practice.

DELTA consists of three modules elaborating on theory and practise both. These modules can be taken together or separately, in any order or time period. As a result, a module-by-module basis assessment is conducted. DELTA is one of the universal and widely recognized English language teaching qualification and it is accredited at Level 7 on the QCF.<sup>7</sup>

# 2.7. THE KNOWLEDGE BASE OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION

Learning how to teach is both continuous and developmental process; therefore, there is no end or completeness for teachers (Graves, 2009). Crandall (1999) asserts that as most of the teachers alter not only their institutions they work in but also their roles and responsibilities from time to time in their teaching lives, the educational program needs to "provide a flexible foundation upon which our graduates can build as they progress through the different stages of their careers".

In addition to this, there is a noticeable difference between the needs of novice teachers and experienced teachers. While the novice teachers are more worried about the managing of the classroom, experienced teachers have almost no problem about this and they elaborate on helping to keep the learners on task (Roberts, 1998).

The knowledge base of Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE) does not comprise of stable and rigid knowledge and skills; on the contrary, for SLTE curriculum, the content should address to learners' needs (Graves, 2009).

Schrier (1993) stresses that the frame of knowledge, skills and understanding required from a second language teacher has not been enough in today's rapidly globalizing world especially since the last two decades of the twentieth century. While content knowledge -knowledge of subject matter; such as grammar and pedagogy- was sufficient 20 years ago, currently, more competent and professional second language teachers are required.

There is not a unity about what the core knowledge base of second language education should be; however, there are some efforts to specify what language

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> It is possible to reach the resource from http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/

teachers should know. Some of the views about what an ideal foreign language teacher should possess are listed below.

#### 2.7.1. Richard Day's Views

In his article "Models and The Knowledge Base of Second Language Teacher Education", Day (1991) asserts that four types of knowledge should be involved in the knowledge base of SLTE, which are summed up below :

1. Content knowledge: This type of knowledge refers to the theme (subject matter) taught by ESL or EFL teachers in the class, not only English language itself with all its components -phonology, pragmatics, syntax and semantics- but also its cultural and literary aspects.

2. Common pedagogic knowledge: This kind of knowledge is of general teaching methods, techniques, practices along with the teaching strategies and teacher beliefs without elaborating on the subject matter itself. It heavily stresses classroom management, motivation of the learners and the like.

3. Pedagogic content knowledge: This type of knowledge is concerned with the expertise knowledge on presenting content knowledge in various ways that student- teachers can acquire it easily. It is about the way how a subject matter can be taught, what kind of difficulties might be encountered by the teacher candidates while teaching it, what misinterpretations impede the learning process and how to cope with all these problems; for instance, teaching four language skills, teaching English grammar, teaching the lexis of the TL, testing and evaluation on ESL/EFL, TESOL materials design, analysis and adaptation, TESOL educational program and curriculum design and evaluation and the like.

4. Support knowledge: This is the knowledge of multidisciplinary interactions informing about the way of teaching and learning of English; for instance, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and the like. It is worth adding that Day along with his colleague, Conklin, (1992) inquired 57 ESL teacher training departments at the master's degree to classify their obligatory and elective courses regarding these four types of knowledge and they saw that there were

different opinions among the participants about how much emphasis should be given on these four kinds of knowledge.

#### 2.7.2. Jack C. Richards' And Jon Roberts' Views

Jon Roberts (1998), in his book "Language Teacher Education", suggests that the knowledge base of teaching absolutely comprises of a system of knowledge bases. In his framework, he covers six types of language teacher knowledge.

Similar to Roberts' framework, Richards (1998) outlines six areas of content making up the knowledge base of language teaching.

These two views are beyond the bounds of conventional frame, which means they do not only focus on subject matter competence -knowledge of the TL- and general pedagogic knowledge. These two frameworks belonging to Richards' and Roberts' also elaborate on pedagogic content knowledge -knowing how to teach-, contextual knowledge about the institution, students and how that specific context influences both teaching and learning foreign language. Besides, pedagogical reasoning, decision-making skills, communication skills are also included. Richards proposes improving specific goals for every particular domain of content, which actually constitutes the core of the SLTE curriculum (Graves, 2009).

Richards' and Roberts' views of the knowledge base of language teaching can be seen in Table 2-3 below :

Table 2-3: Richards' and Roberts' views of the knowledge base of language teaching

| Richards (1998)   | Roberts (1999)                                  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Domains of content  | Types of language teacher knowledge             |  |  |  |  |
| -Theories of teaching                                     | -Content knowledge                              |  |  |  |  |
| (that guide SLTE program, teachers' personal theories)    | (of TL systems, text types)                     |  |  |  |  |
| -Teaching skills  | -Pedagogical content knowledge                  |  |  |  |  |
| (essential general repertoire, language teaching specific | (how to teach/adapt content to learners)        |  |  |  |  |
| repertoire)   | -General pedagogic knowledge                    |  |  |  |  |
| -Communication skills                                     | (classroom management, repertoire of ELT        |  |  |  |  |
| (general communication skills, TL proficiency)            | activities, assessment)                         |  |  |  |  |
| -Subject matter knowledge                                 | -Curricular knowledge                           |  |  |  |  |
| (specialized concepts, theories and disciplinary          | (of the official curriculum and resources)      |  |  |  |  |
| knowledge)  | -Contextual knowledge                           |  |  |  |  |
| -Pedagogical reasoning and decision-making skills         | (of learners, school and community)             |  |  |  |  |
| (both when preparing and during teaching)                 | -Process knowledge                              |  |  |  |  |
| -Contextual knowledge                                     | (interpersonal and team skills, observation and |  |  |  |  |
| (how society, community and institution affect and shape  | inquiry skills, language analysis skills)       |  |  |  |  |
| teaching)   |   |  |  |  |  |

#### 2.7.3. Lee Shulman's Views

Shulman, in his article titled "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of The New Reform", (1997) suggests that if teacher knowledge were to be organized into some kind of a handbook or an encyclopedia, the probable headings would be :

a. content knowledge,

b. general pedagogic knowledge referring to fundamentals about classroom management, assessment, which are actually far beyond the subject matter,

c. curriculum knowledge, concerned with specialized teaching materials serving as a means to teach the subject better to the learners,

d. pedagogical content knowledge referring to the special mixture of content and pedagogy, which is uniquely dependent on the teachers' individual pattern of professional understanding,

e. knowledge of their learners and their characteristics,

e. knowledge of educational contexts referring to the learners, the classroom, the school environment, financing of school districts, the institution (the school), the culture of the institution and the society, and f. knowledge of educational ends, aims and values along with their historical and philosophical bases.

Shulman (1987) argues that pedagogical content knowledge is the most significant one, which needs special interest from the teachers since it holds the understanding of pedagogy blending it with the subject matter. Pedagogical content knowledge is different from content knowledge not only with this aspect but also with its organization, representing and adapting topics, problems and issues regarding interests and abilities of learners.

## 2.8. RECENT STUDIES RELATED TO THE EVALUATION OF ELT CURRICULUM

Since English is a predominant language all over the world, the need for English teachers has increased and English language teacher education has gained importance. As a result, the evaluation of ELT undergraduate programs attracted the researchers' attention. The account of some of the studies about ELT program evaluation is given below.

Yavuz & Topkaya (2013) conducted a research study to explore teacher educators' evaluations of 2006 ELTEP in terms of its content, procedures and rationale. An open-ended questionnaire consisting of 6 questions was the data collection tool developed by the researcher. 18 ELT department teacher educators working at five different state universities took part in the study. In the findings section, both positive and negative issues voiced by the teacher educators were revealed. It was put forward that while teacher educators were contended with some of the changes such as modification and addition of some courses and increasing teaching hours of TEYLs and Literature and Language Teaching, they criticized the new program with respect to the sequence, structure, content, procedure and removal of the courses; as an example, the teacher educators raised serious concerns about the top-down and centralized program restructuring movement since they never attached importance to the opinions, experiences and practices of the program's end-users as teacher educators, teacher and student-teachers. Some of the suggestions were offered to the policy-makers through the study.

Karakas (2012) conducted a review study cited many times by the other researchers on the same theme about the restructured 2006 ELT curriculum by elaborating on both its strengths and weaknesses specified through the analyses of the educational program. This review study was based on the relevant theories, previous studies and the comparison of the current program with the previous ELTEP. His research paper revealed that the program had more weaknesses than its strengths. It was put forward that the program was sufficient in terms of its pedagogical and theoretical components; however, there were some weaknesses as being out-of-date and insufficient in terms of having less culture specific and practice courses. At the end of his paper, he listed his suggestions that a well-defined philosophy of teacher education should be adopted in order to update the program, culture-specific courses should be offered, the hours allocated for micro-teaching activities should be increased, reflective practice component should be integrated within the program and the teacher trainees' views should be taken into consideration.

In her study, Hismanoglu (2012) aimed to seek prospective EFL teachers' views about the ELTEP, which has been implemented in all education faculties in Turkey since 2007. 72 undergraduate students attending ELT department in Akdeniz University participated in her study. The researcher utilized the questionnaire designed by Demirel (2011). The questionnaire consisted of three parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, some demographic information questions were asked. Second part of the questionnaire included three sub-headings with 45 items in total. sub- heading, teacher candidates were asked to evaluate the curriculum In the first by rating to what degree they agreed with the items prepared in 4-point Likert scale. In the second sub- heading, student-teachers were asked to rate how often instructors used the teaching principles, methods and techniques specified. In the third subheading, the prospective teachers were asked to rate how often instructors used the testing and evaluation techniques. Lastly, in the third part of the questionnaire, the participants were required to rate to what degree they agreed the items about acquisition of the educational attainments targeted through the curriculum. The findings of the study revealed that (a) the current curriculum addressed to the interests and need of the English teacher candidates on a large scale, (b) it was appropriate for learners' development level, (c) it was clear and concise, (d) it

contributed to the learners' background knowledge, (e) it enabled the prospective teachers to develop distinct solutions to the problems they met, (f) it was learnercentred, (g) it enabled permanent learning, (h) it required to use information and communication technologies effectively and (i) it enabled the development of group work skills. On the other hand, the study elicited that (a) the current curriculum failed to develop the prospective English teachers' higher thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem solving and creative thinking at the desired level and (b) it did not increase the attendance and interest of the students.

In his study, Salihoglu (2012) aimed to investigate the student-teachers' and their educators' beliefs on the effectiveness of ELTEP through using the Peacock's (2009) evaluation model designed for language teaching departments and Coskun and Daloglu's (2010) study for evaluation in a Turkish context. 200 senior students and 21 instructors from the ELT department were the participants of the study. The data was obtained via four different means. The first data collection tool was Peacock's (2009) moderately adapted student questionnaire consisting of 22 items centred on the issues such as the link between the courses taught, adequate training of student-teachers, teaching skills, up-to-datedness regarding the context, being reflective and so on. The second data collection tool was the same questionnaire in which the items were paraphrased for the instructors. The third one was a focus group discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of ELT curriculum. The last data collection tool was a semi-structured interview consisting of 15 questions prepared by Peacock (2009) about the basic principles of ELT program and the evaluation of the curriculum, which was answered by instructors. The findings of student and lecturer questionnaires revealed that teacher candidates and instructors both held similar beliefs about the effective and ineffective constituents of the ELT program. They agreed on that the ELT curriculum was influential on teaching the future teachers how to teach English, preparing and using materials about foreign language teaching, training in teaching skills and the up-to-datedness of the educational program implemented in education faculties now. As for the negative aspects of the ELT curriculum, it was found that the program was not effective in avoiding overlapping information among courses taught according to the views of both teacher candidates and lecturers. Besides that, it was also revealed that one third of the teacher trainees were not satisfied with the program's adequate training in

English component. The results from the focus group interview indicated that while the linkage between the courses, some of the lecturers' expertise in adjusting their teaching to the teacher trainees' level of understanding and some courses' success in combining theory to practice were the strengths of the ELT curriculum, the overuse of student presentations, the deficiency of opportunities for using teaching language skills, the shortage of proficiency courses and the lack of clearly stated philosophy were the weaknesses of the program. Salihoglu (2012), in this study, revealed his findings by comparing them with Peacock's (2009) and Coskun & Daloglu's (2010) research results.

Hismanoglu (2012) conducted a research study on a different aspect of ELT curriculum when compared with the other studies. His research study aimed to explore whether the renewed ELTEP put into practice in 2006 helped to boost future EFL teachers' awareness on CEFR, which pointed out European standards in foreign language teaching. 72 participants from ELT department of a state-owned university took part in the study conducted in 2011-2012 academic year. The data collection tool was a questionnaire developed by Kir (2011) for her doctoral dissertation titled "Language Teacher Education Within The Context of CEFR and Applications in Turkey"; however, the researcher adapted the questionnaire according to his context of study. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. In the first part, the researcher asked about some personal information. In the second part, 11 items prepared in 5-point Likert scale was rated by the participants regarding their level of agreement on the subject of the CEFR's integration with the new ELTEP. In the last part, twenty items about general teacher characteristics acquired through a CEFR specific program were rated by the participants regarding their level of agreement. The results of the study indicated that the participants were somehow acquainted with CEFR or the CEFR related subjects. Besides that, the teacher candidates were in the opinion that CEFR should be taken into account in ELTEP and obligatory or elective courses about CEFR should be included in the ELT curriculum.

Altan (2012) offered a suggestion that ELT teacher educators should be motivated to include the theory of Multiple Intelligence (MI) into their programs and the theory should be a component of the courses taught in ELT departments. He stated in his paper that "if the image of the learners change, so should that of the ELT teachers" (p.63); therefore, in order to encourage the prospective English teachers to use MI in their classrooms, the courses taught to EFL teacher candidates in ELT departments should also integrated with MI theory.

In her study, Kiziltan (2011) investigated the attitudes of pre-service English language teachers towards 'Language Acquisition' course in ELTEP and their awareness about the significance of this course in their teaching career. Moreover, her study discussed the appropriate term in which the course should be taught to the pre-service EFL teachers, which can give recommendations to the foreign language curriculum planners. As a problem of the study, Kiziltan put forward that although 'Language Acquisition' course is significant for EFL teacher candidates, the student- teachers taking this course in the fourth semester might not be aware of the significance of this course within ELT curriculum when compared with the students in their third and fourth year. Besides, Kiziltan asserted that the students are not ready for the 'Language Acquisition' course since they are taught only one linguistic course in the third semester before taking this course, which might cause the learners to find the content of the course demanding and hinder their comprehension competence. As a result of this, the student teachers' attitudes might be negative towards this course. In order to find out solutions to the research questions, total 324 students in ELT department at Ondokuz Mayıs University were given a questionnaire which checked their attitude towards 'Language Acquisition' course. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. First part of the questionnaire consisted of 20 questions in five-point Likert scale type to see the students' general perspectives on 'Language Acquisition' course and determine the appropriate place for this course within ELT curriculum. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for the evaluation of the data. In second part of the questionnaire, the students were asked some open-ended questions about the course. The results indicated that the pre-service teachers of English thought that language acquisition courses were important for their teaching profession. However, they believed in the importance of taking some prerequisite courses on linguistics before taking this 'Language Acquisition' course in order not to meet any comprehension problems stemming from not having any background knowledge. In addition, Kiziltan offered some suggestions for 'Language Acquisition' course at the end of her study and she stated that the appropriate time for 'Language Acquisition' course is the 5<sup>th</sup> semester.

Coskun & Daloglu (2010) conducted a research study about the evaluation of 2006 ELT program. The main purpose of this study was to attract attention to the significance of the evaluation of teacher education programs and revealed the components of the pre-service ELT program in need of improvement or sustenance from both faculty members' and student-teachers' perspectives through using Peacock's latest evaluation model in a Turkish context. The participants were 55 last year English teacher candidates and 3 university instructors from ELT department; because, 2006 ELT program had been administered just for four years and these student-teachers had studied most of the courses in 2006 ELT curriculum apart from the ones in 8<sup>th</sup> semester. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in data collection. Questionnaires, interviews and document analysis were used so as to triangulate the data. The questionnaire consisted of 22 items in 3-point Likert scale, which depended on Peacock's reviewed study about what components are needed for adequate education of a foreign language teacher. The questionnaire was designed to see whether 2006 ELT curriculum included some of the crucial features of an ELTEP. After the questionnaires, among the willing participants randomly 10 student-teachers were selected for a focus group interview. During the focus-group interview, the questions discussed were: "What are the program aspects that are needed to be improved and sustained and what suggestions the student-teachers can give for the improvement of ELT program". Later, the participants were asked to classify the courses in the program addressing linguistic, pedagogic or managerial competences. Besides this, semi-structured interviews were realized with 3 instructors from the department. The findings revealed that participating instructors and student-teachers had similar ideas about some of the components of the ELT program; however, they had different views on the balance among the pedagogic and linguistic competences in the curriculum. While the teacher candidates were not satisfied with the pedagogic aspects of the new ELT curriculum because of its lack of practice opportunities, the lecturers criticized the linguistic components of the program. Coskun and Daloglu offered some suggestions for the improvement of the program at the end of the paper.

Ogeyik (2009) conducted a study in order to evaluate the restructured ELT curriculum according to the student-teachers' perspectives. Survey developed by the researcher was used as a data collection tool. The participants were 53 third-year

student in ELT department. Ogeyik conducted this study only on third year students since the new curriculum had been on practice only for three years at the education faculties in Turkey. The questionnaire included 28 items in four parts. Three-point responses were used. The first three sections were rated as disagree, undecided, agree while the last section was rated as sufficient, partially sufficient and insufficient. The findings of the study were grouped under four headings: general evaluation of the content of the curriculum, evaluation of the course contents, evaluation of the course characteristics and evaluation of the sufficiency of the courses regarding teaching profession. In the first part, the students were asked to rate whether the curriculum was consistent with the students' requirements, teaching profession, social benefits, social objectives and students' autonomy. In the second part, the participants were asked to specify their opinions about whether the courses in the new curriculum were integrated with theoretical and practical knowledge or they are based on abstract information and mostly research oriented or they refer to any cognitive elicitation and teaching-learning activities. In the third part, the student-teachers were asked to evaluate the characteristics of the courses whether they were available for engagement in language skills, language-related fields, cultural competency, raising awareness for teaching profession, using learning strategies, learner centeredness and increasing teaching proficiency. In the last part, the courses were listed as: ELT methodology courses, classroom management, TEYLs, Teaching Language Skills, Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development, English Language Testing and Evaluation, Teaching Technologies and Material Evaluation, Linguistic courses, Literature courses and Translation courses. The students were questioned to rate these courses to what degree they were sufficient regarding teaching profession. The overall data obtained from the study was that the teacher candidates were contented with the practical components of the new program and they were in the opinion that the new curriculum could contribute to the development of teaching competences and linguistic competences; however, it lacked adequate culture specific courses.

Salli-Copur (2008) studied on the effectiveness of the FLE (Foreign Language Education) program and the competence of its graduates in her doctoral dissertation. The participants were FLE graduates of METU from 2002 to 2006. The study mainly aimed to investigate to what extent the graduates perceived themselves

professional and competent as EFL teachers and to what degree they found the components of FLE program successful in assisting them to gain these required competencies. Moreover, the study also aimed at reaching the employers of these graduates so as to investigate how component these graduates were perceived and how successful METU FLE undergraduate program was viewed in helping its graduates attain the required teacher competencies. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected via questionnaires and interviews. The findings of the study revealed that although the FLE graduates perceived themselves professional in many of the HEC's competence areas according to the results of the questionnaire, the interview indicated a need for improvement for language knowledge competence, classroom management, instruction, assessment, use of spoken English. Besides, it was also seen that the level the participants teach, the type of institution they work at and their teaching experience affected their views about their strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, while some of the employers were highly satisfied with the FLE graduates' competence in language and content knowledge, some of them stressed a requirement for development in both language knowledge and use. Even though the FLE undergraduate program in METU was accounted to have a positive role on the professional development of the teacher candidates as a whole, some courses along with five components of the program need revision. Regarding these findings, some suggestions were made for FLE undergraduate program development.

Seferoglu (2006) aimed to investigate EFL teacher candidates' reflections on both the methodology and practice components of a pre-service ELTEP in Turkey. A qualitative case study method was followed by the researcher. The participants were 176 senior student-teachers from ELT department of METU. Through searching patterns and themes related to each research question, the data was analysed. The findings of the study revealed that the participants were in the opinion that there was not always a close link between the materials used in the courses and the practical applications in real classroom settings. The student-teachers also stated that they did not have enough opportunities for micro-teaching and practice teaching. Seferoglu's qualitative case study was also among the studies cited many times by the other researchers in the field. Erozan (2005), in her doctoral dissertation, emphasized that courses based on practice, micro-teaching activities and teaching practice should be given added strength in the ELT curriculum. In her study, she used "course evaluation questionnaires", interviews and observation as data collection tools. Besides this, she also analysed the content of the courses, the materials used and the assessment tools.

In this study, in order to investigate English language teachers' views about ELT undergraduate program, three research questions were developed and the results and findings of this study were discussed in the light of recent studies carried out.

#### **CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY**

In this part, detailed information about the design of the study, participants, data collection process, data collection tools and data analysis process will be presented.

#### **3.1. DESIGN OF THE STUDY**

This study aims to investigate English teachers' -graduated from ELT departments- views about the ELT curriculum in education faculties of Turkish universities.

The participants were asked to rate the contribution of undergraduate courses to their English teaching profession from 5 (totally useful) to 1 (totally useless). Therefore, it was aimed to find out whether or not English teachers effectively could benefit from the theoretical and practical courses they learnt in ELT undergraduate program in their professional career. The answers provided by the teachers were analysed for their frequencies. Besides this, the teachers were also required to write the names or give descriptions of the courses they suggest to be included in ELT curriculum, which provided qualitative data to the researcher.

Teachers' background information was also asked in the first part of the questionnaire, which was examined to see whether or not the background of the teachers impact their views about how useful they find the courses in undergraduate ELT curriculum.

The study was not conducted in a specific setting; therefore, convenience sampling was used in this study. Some part of the data was collected by visiting the schools randomly after getting permission from City National Education Directorate. However, in order to save time and energy the data was also obtained online by sending the questionnaire to English teachers through using social media tools.

In the light of the obtained data, the purpose of the study was to offer suggestions to policy makers about what improvements should be done in ELT departments of Turkish universities according to the views of the participant EFL teachers in order to provide student-teachers with high quality of EFL education.

#### **3.2. PARTICIPANTS**

At the beginning of this study, 254 teachers formed the participant population. Later, this number went down to 207; because, 36 of English teachers were either the graduates of Faculties of Science and Literature (English Language and Literature, American Culture and Literature or Translation Studies) or from the other departments in which English was the medium of instruction in their undergraduate program. Therefore, they were not included in the study since they were not familiar with the courses taught in ELT departments. Additionally, 11 of English teachers planned to fill in the questionnaires later in their homes and return it to the researcher; however, some were not present for personal reasons at the time and some of the teachers who promised to answer the questionnaire later did not return their questionnaires. As a result, 207 participants' answers to questionnaire were analysed in the end.

All the 207 English teachers involved in the research study were the graduates of ELT departments of the universities' education faculties.

#### **3.3. DATA COLLECTION PROCESS**

The data collection procedure began with writing a petition to the City National Education Directorate to obtain permission to conduct the research study. This petition included a brief explanatory about the research study along with the questionnaire. After getting the permission in about three weeks, the data collection began.

The questionnaire was also sent to the English teachers through using social media tools. Actually, 84.05% of the data were obtained online.

#### **3.4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS**

Nunan (1992) specifies that surveys are carried on in order to get a snapshot of situations, notions, perspectives, or events at a certain period of time and he adds that questionnaires and interviews are the most frequently used survey data collection tools. Through statistical analyses, the results of the surveys are expressed in numbers to provide both the researcher and reader with a broad view of the study (cited in Saglam, 2007).

In this study, the questionnaire which is a form of survey research was developed and administered by the researcher. The design and items of the questionnaire were formed regarding related literature and the HEC's previous and renewed current ELT curriculum. The questionnaire was designed as a tool to obtain information about the teachers' views concerning the contribution of undergraduate ELT courses to their English language teaching profession.

The questionnaire was presented to two ELT experts in the field to ascertain whether or not the items were clearly stated and addressed to the purpose. After the experts approved the questionnaire items, it was ready to be used in the research.

All the participants were teachers of English; however, to prevent any possible misunderstandings of the survey items, all questionnaires were delivered in Turkish (see Appendix D) although they were planned to be delivered in English (see Appendix E).

In order for data collection to begin, the researcher contacted to the administrators of the schools, who granted permission for the study. Since it was thought that handing out the questionnaires to the administrators of the schools would result in a low amount of feedback, the questionnaires were delivered in person to the English teachers by the researcher. Information was given to the English teachers; then, they were requested to take part in the study and if they accepted to join the study, the researcher clearly explained the objectives of the study and went through the questionnaire with the teachers in order to avoid any possible lack of understanding or misunderstanding about the items in the questionnaire. Besides, at the beginning of the questionnaire; the name of the research study, the purpose of the study, what was required from the participant, how the participant

could fill in the questionnaire, the contact number along with the researcher's name and e-mail was written. The same procedure was implemented in online questionnaires sent to English teachers as well. It is important to emphasize that all the participants were assured that the answers they would give to the questionnaire would only be used for research objectives and be kept confidential to the others.

In the first part of the questionnaire, some personal information questions were asked to the participants. The participants were required to specify "their gender, their marital status, the number of children if they have, the university and departments they were graduated from, their graduation year, the institutions -nursery school, primary school, secondary school, Anatolian high school, vocational and technical high school, science high school, university, private course- they are working at, their experience in teaching, an average number of students in their classes, their work load in a week, whether or not they participated in ELT conferences before (if they took part in ELT conferences, they were asked to specify the number of the conferences they attended) and whether or not they took postgraduate -Master of Arts (MA) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)- education (and if they did, in which field they studied).

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of three subheadings with forty items in total. The participants were asked to rate the field courses, pedagogical content courses and general culture courses taken in a 4-year undergraduate ELT department (the data was taken by examining 1982, 1997 and 2006 educational programs) considering the contribution of them to their profession from 5 (totally useful) to 1 (totally useless), which gave quantitative data to the researcher.

As mentioned, the informing about the study and the first part of the questionnaire were delivered in Turkish in order to prevent any possible misinterpretation. However, the names of the courses were written in both Turkish and English along with some explanations; for instance, "Second Foreign Language (German, French etc.)" to be more clear for the participants. Besides, the participants were required not to rate the courses they had not taken in their undergraduate program.

The purpose of these parts in the questionnaire was to investigate both the contribution of undergraduate courses to English language teaching profession according to English teachers' views and whether or not the participants' background influenced their views.

In the last part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to write the names or give descriptions of the courses they suggested to be included in ELT curriculum. Approximately one third of the participants wrote their suggestions, which gave qualitative data to the researcher.

#### **3.5. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE**

In this research study, both quantitative and qualitative data were obtained through the questionnaire. Therefore, different analyses were conducted for the interpretation of the data.

The data acquired from the questionnaire "EFL Teachers' Views About The Undergraduate ELT Courses" was put into SPSS software in order to do analyses. Frequency analysis was used with the intention of understanding the distribution of English teachers' responses to background information questions and their ratings to the items prepared in Likert-type in the second part of the questionnaire consisting of three subheadings. As might be expected, since there were forty items along with the personal information questions in the questionnaire, in order not to make them hard to distinguish from each other and to see the results clearly, it was decided to do frequency analysis. Besides, Mann-Whitney test was conducted so as to see whether there is any statistically significant difference in the participant EFL teachers' responses with regard to their gender and professional development.

The answers (teachers' suggestions of courses to be included in ELT curriculum) given in the last part of the questionnaire provided qualitative data to the study, which helped to learn about English teachers' possible expectations of ELT curriculum in universities.

#### **CHAPTER IV: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In this part, the results of the survey will be reported and the findings of the study will be discussed in accordance with the research questions.

#### 4.1. PARTICIPANTS' BAKGROUND INFORMATION

The statistical results of participants' background information are presented in detail in this section. In order to determine the background information of EFL teacher participants, who took part in the study, frequency analyses were conducted and results are presented below.

| Groups            |         | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Gender            | Female  | 162       | 78,3    | 78,3          | 78,3               |
|                   | Male    | 45        | 21,7    | 21,7          | 100,0              |
|                   | Total   | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |                    |
| Marital           | Single  | 109       | 52,7    | 52,7          | 52,7               |
| Status            | Married | 98        | 42,3    | 42,3          | 100,0              |
|                   | Total   | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |                    |
| The Number of     | 1       | 42        | 20,3    | 66,7          | 66,7               |
| Children The      | 2       | 16        | 7,7     | 25,4          | 92,1               |
| Participants Have | 3       | 5         | 2,4     | 7,9           | 100,0              |
| -                 | Total   | 63        | 30,4    | 100,0         |                    |
|                   | Missing | 144       | 69,6    |               |                    |
|                   | Total   | 207       | 100,0   |               |                    |

 

 Table 4-1: Demographic information (gender, marital status and the number of children the participants have)

As seen in Table 4-1, 162 (78,3%) female and 45 (21,7%) male EFL teachers participated in the study. Of these participants, 109 (52,7%) were single while 98 (47,3%) were married. 42 (20,3%) have only a child, 16 (7,7%) have 2 children and 5 (2,4%) have 3 children, which means that only 63 (30,4%) of the participants have children.

|                 | Groups                 | Frequency | Percent   | Valid Percent | Cumulative  |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
|                 | Abant İzzet Baysal     | 6         | 2,9       | 2,9           | Percent 2,9 |
|                 | Akdeniz                | 3         | 1,4       | 1,5           | 4,4         |
|                 | Anadolu                | 44        | 21,3      | 21,4          | 25,7        |
|                 | Atatürk                | 5         | 21,5      | 2,4           | 28,2        |
|                 | Balıkesir              | 1         | ,5        | ,5            | 28,6        |
|                 | Boğaziçi               | 8         | ,e<br>3,9 | 3,9           | 32,5        |
|                 | Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart | 5         | 2,4       | 2,4           | 35,0        |
|                 | Çukurova               | 7         | 3,4       | 3,4           | 38,3        |
|                 | Dicle                  | 2         | 1,0       | 1,0           | 39,3        |
|                 | Dokuz Eylül            | 11        | 5,3       | 5,3           | 44,7        |
|                 | Erciyes                | 5         | 2,4       | 2,4           | 47,1        |
| a               | Gazi                   | 23        | 11,1      | 11,2          | 58,3        |
| University Name | Girne                  | 1         | ,5        | ,5            | 58,7        |
| Ž               | Hacettepe              | 3         | 1,4       | 1,5           | 60,2        |
| sity            | İnönü                  | 1         | ,5        | ,5            | 60,7        |
| ers             | İstanbul               | 7         | 3,4       | 3,4           | 64,1        |
| iu              | Kocaeli                | 5         | 2,4       | 2,4           | 66,         |
| $\square$       | Lefke Avrupa           | 1         | ,5        | ,5            | 67,0        |
|                 | Marmara                | 16        | 7,7       | 7,8           | 74,8        |
|                 | Mersin                 | 1         | ,5        | ,5            | 75,2        |
|                 | Muğla Sıtkı Koçman     | 1         | ,5        | ,5            | 75,7        |
|                 | Necmettin Erbakan      | 2         | 1,0       | 1,0           | 76,7        |
|                 | ODTÜ                   | 5         | 2,4       | 2,4           | 79,         |
|                 | Ondokuz Mayıs          | 6         | 2,9       | 2,9           | 82,0        |
|                 | Selçuk                 | 7         | 3,4       | 3,4           | 85,4        |
|                 | Trakya                 | 4         | 1,9       | 1,9           | 87,4        |
|                 | Uludağ                 | 22        | 10,6      | 10,7          | 98,         |
|                 | Yıldız Teknik          | 4         | 1,9       | 1,9           | 100,0       |
|                 | Total                  | 206       | 99,5      | 100,0         |             |
|                 | Missing                | 1         | ,5        |               |             |
|                 | Total                  | 207       | 100,0     |               |             |

#### Table 4-2: University of graduation

The statistical results show that the participants of the study were graduates of 28 different universities. Of these participants, 44 (21,3%) of EFL teachers were graduates of Anadolu University, 23 (11,1%) of EFL teachers were graduates of Gazi University, 22 (10,6%) of them were graduates of Uludağ University and 16 (7.7%) were graduates of Marmara University. Therefore, it seems obvious that almost half of the participants were graduates of these 4 universities. Actually, according to the HEC's data, the number of teacher candidates that graduate from these universities are much more than the others.

| Groups     |   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|------------|---|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
|            | English<br>Language<br>Teaching (ELT)                                   | 201       | 97,1    | 97,1          | 97,1                  |
| The        |   |           |         |               |                       |
| Department | English<br>Language<br>Teaching<br>Undergraduate<br>Programme<br>(IÖLP) | 6         | 2,9     | 2,9           | 100,0                 |
|            | Total   | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |                       |

Table 4-3: The department

201 (97,1%) of the participants were graduated from English Language Teaching (ELT) departments of the universities, which means that they had formal training in their bachelor's degree. 6 (2,9%) were graduated from English Language Teaching Undergraduate Program (IOLP), which means that they got formal training in their first two years of the university and then they got distance education in their  $3^{rd}$  and  $4^{th}$  years.

Table 4-4: Teaching experience

| Groups     |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
|------------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|
|            |             |           |         |               | Percent    |
|            | 1-4 years   | 91        | 44,0    | 44,0          | 44,0       |
|            | 5-8 years   | 50        | 24,2    | 24,2          | 68,1       |
| Teaching   | 9-13 years  | 40        | 19,3    | 19,3          | 87,4       |
| Experience | 14 and more | 26        | 12,6    | 12,6          | 100,0      |
|            | Total       | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |            |

The participants of the study were asked to fill in their teaching experience and then, their answers to this item were grouped into 4 while analysing the results. Among the answers given by EFL teachers; 91 (44%) have 1-4, 50 (24,2%) have 5-8, 40 (19,3%) have 9-13 and 26 (12,6%) have 14 and more years of teaching experience. Therefore, it is clear that almost half of the participants are at the beginning of their professional career.

| Groups          |                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|
|                 |                |           |         |               | Percent    |
|                 | Nursery        | 2         | 1,0     | 1,0           | 1,0        |
|                 | Primary        | 31        | 15,0    | 15,0          | 15,9       |
|                 | Secondary      | 79        | 38,2    | 38,2          | 54,1       |
|                 | Anatolian H.S  | 43        | 20,8    | 20,8          | 74,9       |
|                 | Science H.S    | 3         | 1,4     | 1,4           | 76,3       |
|                 | Vocational H.S | 32        | 15,5    | 15,5          | 91,8       |
| The Institution | University     | 9         | 4,3     | 4,3           | 96,1       |
|                 | Private Course | 8         | 3,9     | 3,9           | 100,0      |
|                 | Total          | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |            |

Table 4-5: The institution

According to the statistical results; out of 207 EFL teachers 2 (1,0%) of them work at a nursery school, 31 (15,0%) at a primary school, 79 (38,2%) at a secondary school, 43 (20,8%) at an Anatolian high school, 3 (1,4%) at a science high school, 32 (15,5%) at a vocational high school, 9 (4,3%) at a university and 8 (3,9%) of the participants work at a private course. Therefore, it can be clearly seen that EFL teachers working at secondary school, Anatolian high school, vocational high school and primary school respectively form most of the participants.

Table 4-6: Average class sizes

| Groups        |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|
|               |             |           |         |               | Percent    |
|               | 5-15        | 26        | 12,6    | 12,6          | 12,6       |
|               | 16-25       | 68        | 32,9    | 32,9          | 45,4       |
| Average class | 26-35       | 89        | 43,0    | 43,0          | 88,4       |
| size          | 36-45       | 18        | 8,7     | 8,7           | 97,1       |
|               | 46 and more | 6         | 2,9     | 2,9           | 100,0      |
|               | Total       | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |            |

In the questionnaire; the participants were asked to fill in their average class sizes and then, their answers to this question were grouped into 5 while analysing this item. According to the statistical results; out of 207 participants 26 (12,6%) of them have 5-15 students in their classes, 68 (32,9%) have 16-25, 89 (43,0%) have 26-35, 18 (8,7%) have 36-45 and 6 (2,9%) have 46 and more students in their classes. Therefore, it can be asserted that most of the participants have 26-35 students in their classes, which is usual regarding the context of the study.

| Groups    |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
|           | 6-16        | 5         | 2,4     | 2,4           | 2,4                   |
| Work load | 17-24       | 67        | 32,4    | 32,4          | 34,8                  |
| in a week | 25-30       | 118       | 57,0    | 57,0          | 91,8                  |
|           | 31-40       | 14        | 6,8     | 6,8           | 98,6                  |
|           | 41 and more | 3         | 1,4     | 1,4           | 100,0                 |
|           | Total       | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         |                       |

Table 4-7: Work load in a week

The participants were asked to fill in their work load per week and later, their answers to this item were grouped into 5 while analysing the results. As seen in the table, out of 207 participants, 5 (2,4%) of them have 6-16 hours of classes per week, 67 (32,4%) have 17-24, 118 (57,0%) have 25-30, 14 (6,8%) have 31-40 and 3 (1,4%) have 41 and more hours of English classes per week. Thus, it is clearly seen that most of the participants have 25-30 hours of English classes per week, which is very common regarding the context.

| Groups                        |         | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Have you over                 | Yes     | 168       | 81,2    | 81,2          | 81,2                  |
| Have you ever<br>attended ELT | No      | 39        | 18.8    | 18,8          | 100,0                 |
| conference?                   | Total   | 207       | 100,0   | 100,0         | 100,0                 |
| The Number of                 | 1-3     | 84        | 40,6    | 52,5          | 52,5                  |
| ELT                           | 4-6     | 38        | 18,4    | 23,8          | 76,3                  |
| Conferences The               | 7-9     | 8         | 3,9     | 5,0           | 81,3                  |
| Participants                  | 10-15   | 21        | 10,1    | 13,1          | 94,4                  |
| Attended                      | 16+     | 9         | 4,3     | 5,6           | 100,0                 |
|                               | Total   | 160       | 77,3    | 100,0         |                       |
|                               | Missing | 47        | 27,7    |               |                       |
|                               | Total   | 207       | 100.0   |               |                       |

Table 4-8: Professional development (ELT conferences)

168 (81,2%) of EFL teachers have attended at least one ELT conference for their professional development while 39 (18,8%) of them have never attended an ELT conference before. According to the statistics; 84 (52,5%) of EFL teachers have attended 1-3, 38 (23,8%) of them have participated in 4-6, 8 (5,0%) of the teachers have attended 7-9, 21 (13,1%) of them participated in 10-15 and 9 (5,6%) attended 16 or more conferences. Although 8 of EFL teachers remarked that they had attended an ELT conference, they did not give any specific number. It cannot be denied that such ELT conferences, seminars, workshops or in-service training contribute a lot to the professional development of the teachers.

| Groups                       |   | Frequency | Percent    | Valid   | Cumulative |
|------------------------------|---|-----------|------------|---------|------------|
|                              |   |           |            | Percent | Percent    |
| Have you done your           | Yes   | 34        | 16,4       | 16,4    | 16,4       |
| postgraduate study           | No  | 173       | 83,6       | 83,6    | 100,0      |
| (MA or PhD)?                 | Total                                       | 207       | 100,0      | 100,0   |            |
|                              | - English Language<br>Teaching              | 15        | 7,2        | 44,1    | 44,1       |
|                              | - Linguistics                               | 2         | 1,0        | 5,9     | 50,0       |
|                              | - Applied Linguistics                       | 2         | 1,0        | 5,9     | 55,9       |
|                              | - English Language and<br>Literature        | 1         | ,5         | 2,9     | 58,8       |
|                              | - German Language<br>Teaching               | 1         | ,5         | 2,9     | 61,8       |
| The postgraduate study field | - Teaching Turkish as a<br>Foreign Language | 1         | ,5         | 2,9     | 64,7       |
| -                            | - Curriculum and<br>Instruction             | 4         | 1,9        | 11,8    | 76,5       |
|                              | - Educational<br>Administration             | 5         | 2,4        | 14,7    | 91,2       |
|                              | - Classroom<br>Management                   | 1         | ,5         | 2,9     | 94,1       |
|                              | - Special Education                         | 1         | ,5         | 2,9     | 97,1       |
|                              | - Women and Gender<br>Studies               | 1         | <b>,</b> 5 | 2,9     | 100,0      |
|                              | Total                                       | 34        | 16,4       | 100,0   |            |
|                              | Missing                                     | 173       | 83,6       | ,-      |            |
|                              | Total                                       | 207       | 100,0      |         |            |

 Table 4-9: Professional development (post-graduate study)

As seen in the table, only 34 (16,4%) of the participants have done their postgraduate study (MA or PhD) while 173 (83,6%) of them have undergraduate academic degree. Of these 34 EFL teachers 15 (44,1%) have done their postgraduate study in ELT, 2 (5,9%) in Linguistics, 2 (5,9%) in Applied Linguistics, 1 (2,9%) in English Language and Literature, 1 (2,9%) in German Language Teaching and 1 (2,9%) in Teaching Turkish as a Second Language. It seems that these 22 (64,7%) out of 34 EFL teachers preferred to study on languages in their postgraduate, too. Besides, 4 (11,8%) have done their postgraduate study in Curriculum and Instruction, 5 (14,7%) in Educational Administration, 1 (2,9%) in Classroom Management and 1 (2,9%) in Special Education. It is obvious that these 11 (32,4%) out of 34 EFL teachers preferred to study on pedagogical content courses after their bachelor's degree. Only 1 (2,9%) out of 34 EFL teachers preferred to study on a quite different

field, Woman and Gender Studies, in his/her postgraduate study. It is significant to point out that doing a postgraduate study, especially in the field, contributes a lot to the professional development of the teachers.

#### 4.2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To ease understanding and achieve clarity, the findings related to the research questions are discussed separately in relation to the different parts of the instrument and the results along with the discussion are presented below in this section.

## 4.2.1. EFL Teachers' Views On To What Extent They Find The Undergraduate ELT Courses Useful In Their Profession

The second part of the questionnaire aimed to report the participant EFL teachers' views on to what extent ELT undergraduate courses are useful regarding their teaching profession. The participants' views about the undergraduate courses were examined in three parts: field courses, pedagogical content courses and general culture courses.

In order to analyse the participants' views about the undergraduate courses, descriptive statistics were conducted and the items' medians were calculated. These statistics are shown in Table 4-10, 4-11 and 4-12.

It is important to note that all of the participants (207) did not rate all the 40 items in the questionnaire. They only rated the courses they took in their bachelor's degree. In each item, the total number of the participants who rated the courses is also specified. The items' medians were obtained over these numbers.

| Field Courses   | Tota<br>Use | ally<br>less | Ver<br>Use | y Little<br>ful | Part<br>Use | tially<br>ful | Use | ful   | Total<br>Usefi |       | Total | Median |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-----|-------|----------------|-------|-------|--------|
|   | F           | %            | F          | %               | F           | %             | F   | %     | F              | %     |       |        |
| Teaching English to<br>Young Learners                                     | 4           | 2,06         | 5          | 2,58            | 15          | 7,73          | 41  | 21,13 | 129            | 66,49 | 194   | 5,00   |
| Teaching Language<br>Skills (Reading,<br>Writing, Listening,<br>Speaking) | 2           | 2,30         | 2          | 2,30            | 5           | 5,75          | 26  | 29,89 | 52             | 59,77 | 87    | 5,00   |
| Oral Communication<br>Skills  | 5           | 2,51         | 7          | 3,52            | 19          | 9,55          | 52  | 26,13 | 116            | 58,29 | 199   | 5,00   |
| Listening and<br>Pronunciation  | 2           | 2,33         | 8          | 9,30            | 4           | 4,65          | 23  | 26,74 | 49             | 56,98 | 86    | 5,00   |
| Methods and<br>Approaches to ELT  | 6           | 2,90         | 11         | 5,31            | 19          | 9,18          | 60  | 28,99 | 111            | 53,62 | 207   | 5,00   |
| ELT Methodology   | 5           | 2,51         | 11         | 5,53            | 21          | 10,55         | 63  | 31,66 | 99             | 49,75 | 199   | 4,00   |
| Communicative<br>Skills and<br>Public Speaking                            | 0           | 0,00         | 6          | 3,24            | 28          | 15,14         | 59  | 31,89 | 92             | 49,73 | 185   | 4,00   |
| Drama   | 1           | 1,23         | 6          | 7,41            | 13          | 16,05         | 22  | 27,16 | 39             | 48,15 | 81    | 4,00   |
| Teaching<br>Vocabulary  | 6           | 3,31         | 3          | 1,66            | 21          | 11,60         | 64  | 35,36 | 87             | 48,07 | 181   | 4,00   |
| Teaching Grammar  | 5           | 2,70         | 8          | 4,32            | 26          | 14,05         | 69  | 37,30 | 77             | 41,62 | 185   | 4,00   |
| Materials Analysis<br>and Development in<br>Language Teaching             | 9           | 4,57         | 13         | 6,60            | 23          | 11,68         | 72  | 36,55 | 80             | 40,61 | 197   | 4,00   |
| Translation   | 7           | 3,45         | 11         | 5,42            | 32          | 15,76         | 71  | 34,98 | 82             | 40,39 | 203   | 4,00   |
| Advanced Reading  | 10          | 5,00         | 8          | 4,00            | 32          | 16,00         | 76  | 38,00 | 74             | 37,00 | 200   | 4,00   |
| Lexical (Vocabulary)<br>Competence  | 3           | 3,57         | 7          | 8,33            | 8           | 9,52          | 35  | 41,67 | 31             | 36,90 | 84    | 4,00   |
| English Language<br>Testing and<br>Evaluation                             | 14          | 6,86         | 14         | 6,86            | 28          | 13,73         | 76  | 37,25 | 72             | 35,29 | 204   | 4,00   |
| Computer and<br>Technology Assisted<br>Language Teaching                  | 15          | 9,09         | 15         | 9,09            | 25          | 15,15         | 56  | 33,94 | 54             | 32,73 | 165   | 4,00   |
| Advanced Writing  | 12          | 6,00         | 15         | 7,50            | 35          | 17,50         | 75  | 37,50 | 63             | 31,50 | 200   | 4,00   |
| Language<br>Acquisition   | 13          | 6,53         | 19         | 9,55            | 35          | 17,59         | 75  | 37,69 | 57             | 28,64 | 199   | 4,00   |
| Contextual Grammar  | 17          | 8,90         | 24         | 12,57           | 38          | 19,90         | 74  | 38,74 | 38             | 19,90 | 191   | 4,00   |
| Linguistics   | 21          | 10,14        | 40         | 19,32           | 47          | 22,71         | 62  | 29,95 | 37             | 17,87 | 207   | 3,00   |
| Sociolinguistics  | 26          | 16,88        | 21         | 13,64           | 49          | 31,82         | 38  | 24,68 | 20             | 12,99 | 154   | 3,00   |
| Literature and<br>Language Teaching                                       | 28          | 15,56        | 32         | 17,78           | 53          | 29,44         | 44  | 24,44 | 23             | 12,78 | 180   | 3,00   |
| English Literature  | 41          | 19,90        | 46         | 22,33           | 52          | 25,24         | 42  | 20,39 | 25             | 12,14 | 206   | 3,00   |
| Scientific Research<br>Methods  | 30          | 17,05        | 35         | 19,89           | 58          | 32,95         | 35  | 19,89 | 18             | 10,23 | 176   | 3,00   |

#### Table 4-10: The participant teachers' views about field courses (Listed regarding to "totally useful" item)

As demonstrated, Table 4-10 shows the participants' views about to what degree they find the field courses in ELT undergraduate program useful in terms of their ELT profession. The table was ordered regarding the "Totally Useful" item.

The first five field courses rated as "totally useful" by the participants are Teaching English to Young Learners (66,49%), Teaching Language Skills (59,77%),

Oral Communication Skills (58,29%), Listening and Pronunciation (56,98%) and Methods and Approaches to ELT (53,62%). Besides, of these twenty-four field courses the last three rated as "totally useful" by the participants are Literature and Language Teaching (12,78%), English Literature (12,14%) and Scientific Research Methods (10,23%) respectively.

TEYL course was integrated into the curriculum of the ELT departments of education faculties in 1998 when English was introduced as a regular school subject for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades in primary schools (Kirkgoz, 2008). With this new policy, young learners were intended to be provided a longer exposure to the foreign language (MONE, 2001). In order to realize this new policy, as Kirkgoz (2008) touches upon, undergraduate teacher education programs were restructured so as to improve the teacher education courses quality by increasing the number and hours of methodology courses in the program. The findings of this study also demonstrate that nearly all the participant EFL teachers (87,62%) rated either "useful" or "totally useful" items for this course and TEYL is viewed as the most totally useful undergraduate ELT course by the participants. Therefore, it is clear that TEYL course added to both 1997 and 2006 ELTEPs is the most favoured one by the participant EFL teachers regarding their English teaching profession.

The course "Teaching Language Skills" elaborating on the teaching of reading, writing, listening and speaking skills to the learners is one of the newly added courses as seen in Table 2-1. As put by Salihoglu (2012), 2006 ELTEP aims at offering EFL teacher candidates to gain experience in observation and discussion upon peer teaching through some courses as Teaching Language Skills. The findings of the study reveal that Teaching Language Skills course was rated either "useful" or "totally useful" by nearly all 87 (89,66%) EFL teacher participants (since it is a newly added course in 2006 ELTEP, it was only rated by the new graduates of ELT department) having taken this course in their undergraduate program.

Besides, 199 in 207 EFL teacher participants rated the course Oral Communication Skills and while 168 (84,42%) of them rated the course either "useful" or "totally useful", 116 (58,29%) rated this course as "totally useful"; therefore, this course is viewed as the third most totally useful course by the participants. Actually, Speaking Skills I-II course in 1998 ELTEP was modified

as three separate courses named Oral Communication Skills I-II and Communicative Skills and Public Speaking in 2006 ELTEP.

Listening and Pronunciation is also one of the newly added courses as seen in Table 2-1; therefore, it was rated only by 2006 ELTEP graduates. 72 (83,72%) out of 86 EFL teacher participants having taken this course rated as either "useful" or "totally useful" while 49 (56,98%) of them rated this course as "totally useful". Although reading, writing and speaking skills were emphasized in 1982 and 1998 ELTEPs, listening along with pronunciation, one of the most important language skills, was started to be given strength only with 2006 ELTEP.

Since "Literature and Language Teaching", "English Literature" and "Scientific Research Methods" do not directly focus on teaching and learning of English in the classroom settings, these courses rank in the last three of all field courses.

| Pedagogical<br>Content Courses                   | Totally<br>Useless |      | Very Little<br>Useful |       | Partially<br>Useful |       | Useful |       | Totally<br>Useful |       | Total | Median |
|--|--------------------|------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|
|  | F                  | %    | F                     | %     | F                   | %     | F      | %     | F                 | %     |       |        |
| School Experience<br>and Practice<br>Teaching    | 8                  | 3,94 | 6                     | 2,96  | 15                  | 7,39  | 67     | 33,00 | 107               | 52,71 | 203   | 5,00   |
| Teaching<br>Technologies and<br>Materials Design | 7                  | 3,65 | 16                    | 8,33  | 30                  | 15,63 | 51     | 26,56 | 88                | 45,83 | 192   | 4,00   |
| Classroom<br>Management                          | 13                 | 6,44 | 21                    | 10,40 | 22                  | 10,89 | 58     | 28,71 | 88                | 43,56 | 202   | 4,00   |
| Measurement and Evaluation                       | 14                 | 6,86 | 16                    | 7,84  | 39                  | 19,12 | 70     | 34,31 | 65                | 31,86 | 204   | 4,00   |
| Instruction<br>Principles and<br>Methods         | 11                 | 5,42 | 22                    | 10,84 | 33                  | 16,26 | 75     | 36,95 | 62                | 30,54 | 203   | 4,00   |
| Psychology of<br>Education                       | 5                  | 2,46 | 21                    | 10,34 | 37                  | 18,23 | 82     | 40,39 | 58                | 28,57 | 203   | 4,00   |
| Psychological<br>Counselling                     | 6                  | 6,90 | 8                     | 9,20  | 21                  | 24,14 | 28     | 32,18 | 24                | 27,59 | 87    | 4,00   |
| Special Education                                | 13                 | 7,83 | 24                    | 14,46 | 39                  | 23,49 | 50     | 30,12 | 40                | 24,10 | 166   | 4,00   |
| Introduction to<br>Educational<br>Sciences       | 15                 | 7,43 | 38                    | 18,81 | 51                  | 25,25 | 67     | 33,17 | 31                | 15,35 | 202   | 3,00   |

Table 4-11: The participant teachers' views about pedagogical content courses (Listed regarding to "totally useful" item)

As seen, Table 4-11 demonstrates the participants' views about to what extent they find the pedagogical content courses useful in ELT undergraduate program in terms of their present profession. The table was ordered regarding "Totally Useful" item.

The statistical results show that of these nine pedagogical content courses, the first three rated as "totally useful" by the participants are School Experience and Practice Teaching (52,71%), Teaching Technologies and Materials Design (45,83%) and Classroom Management (43,56%). Besides, only 40 (24,10%) and 31 (15,35%) of the participants found Special Education and Introduction to Educational Sciences courses as "totally useful" respectively.

As seen in Table 2-1, 1998 ELTEP stressed the teaching practicum more by introducing three courses namely "School Experience I" ( $2^{nd}$  term), "School Experience II" ( $7^{th}$  term) and "Teaching Practice" ( $8^{th}$  term) when compared to 2006 ELTEP, in which teaching practicum is present only in the  $4^{th}$  year.

Lange (1991) recommends a theory-and-practice-from-the-start approach, which means that both theory and practice integrated with each other must be undergone from the onset of the educational program instead taking theoretical and academic courses first and then progressing towards to the practice in schools. As Karakas (2012) points out that since 1998 ELTEP adopted theory-and-practice-from-the-start approach, when it was valid in education faculties, teacher candidates, at an earlier period, had a chance to drop out the undergraduate program on condition that they thought teaching was unsuitable for themselves as a career. The findings of this study also indicate that nearly all the participants (85,71%) rated the items "useful" or "totally useful" for School Experience and Practice Teaching course. Therefore, it would be better to increase the time for classroom observation and teaching practice for EFL teacher candidates.

Moreover, with the renewal of the undergraduate education programs in 2006, it was proposed that Teaching Technologies and Materials Design course should be taught by lecturers with expertise on instructional design, educational technology, materials design or instructional technologies along with the content knowledge of the field (HEC, 2006). As the statistical results show that most of the

EFL teacher participants (72,39%) in this study rated the items either "useful" or "totally useful" for this course. Hence, it can be inferred that this course is viewed as useful by EFL teacher participants in today's constantly developing information and educational technology world regarding their ELT profession as teachers.

Besides, 88 (43,56%) of the participants viewed Classroom Management course as "totally useful" regarding their teaching profession. However, as Karakas (2012) suggested, there is only one course addressing the teacher candidates' classroom management skills in 2006 ELTEP. Since the course "Classroom Management" is perceived as "totally useful" by the participants in this study, as Karakas (2012) points out, the courses about managing classroom discipline should have more places in the teacher education programs.

| General Culture      | Totally |       | Very Little |       | Partially |       | Useful |       | Totally |       | Total | Median |
|----------------------|---------|-------|-------------|-------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| Courses              | Useless |       | Useful      |       | Useful    |       |        |       | Useful  |       |       |        |
|                      | F       | %     | F           | %     | F         | %     | F      | %     | F       | %     |       |        |
| Atatürk's Principles | 40      | 19,90 | 40          | 19,90 | 40        | 19,90 | 42     | 20,90 | 39      | 19,40 | 201   | 3,00   |
| and The History of   |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| Revolutions          |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| Turkish              | 38      | 20,00 | 30          | 15,79 | 33        | 17,37 | 55     | 28,95 | 34      | 17,89 | 190   | 3,00   |
| Second Foreign       | 19      | 22,89 | 12          | 14,46 | 20        | 24,10 | 19     | 22,89 | 13      | 15,66 | 83    | 3,00   |
| Language (German,    |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| French etc.)         |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| Practices in Social  | 15      | 17,86 | 13          | 15,48 | 16        | 19,05 | 28     | 33,33 | 12      | 14,29 | 84    | 3,00   |
| Sciences             |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| Comparative          | 20      | 27,78 | 6           | 8,33  | 11        | 15,28 | 25     | 34,72 | 10      | 13,89 | 72    | 3,00   |
| Education            |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| Turkish Educational  | 20      | 26,67 | 19          | 25,33 | 17        | 22,67 | 11     | 14,67 | 8       | 10,67 | 75    | 2,00   |
| System and School    |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| Management           |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |
| History of Turkish   | 18      | 23,68 | 25          | 32,89 | 22        | 28,95 | 8      | 10,53 | 3       | 3,95  | 76    | 2,00   |
| Education            |         |       |             |       |           |       |        |       |         |       |       |        |

Table 4-12: The participant teachers' views about general culture courses (Listed regarding to "totally useful" item)

In Table 4-12 above, the participants' views about how useful they find the general culture courses can be clearly seen. The table was ordered regarding "Totally Useful" item.

The findings of this part of the questionnaire demonstrate that of these seven general culture courses, the first three rated as "totally useful" by the participants are Atatürk's Principles and The History of Revolutions (19,40%), Turkish (17,89%) and Second Foreign Language (15,66%). On the contrary, the last two courses rated as "totally useless" regarding their contribution to their English teaching profession by the participants are History of Turkish Education (23,68%) and Turkish Educational System and School Management (26,67%).

Actually, one of the most important features of 2006 teacher education programs was the increase in the proportion of general cultural courses. With this innovation, it was intended to train a versatile teacher candidate with the knowledge of various disciplines along with general world knowledge, which are regarded among some qualities of an intellectual person (HEC, 2006). Moreover, Day (1991) and Conklin (1992) emphasizes four types of knowledge types a teacher should have, one of which is support knowledge. Karakas (2012) also pointed to the general culture courses' immersion as one of the strengths of the new ELTEP.

However, in this study, the results indicate that a level of dissatisfaction was found in general culture courses by EFL teacher participants. Indeed, apart from Atatürk's Principles and The History of Revolutions together with Turkish, the other general culture courses are newly added compulsory courses in 2006 ELTEP (see Table 2-1). It seems obvious that in-service English teachers having participated in this study are in favour of more useful general culture courses about various disciplines addressing to the teaching and learning of English in ELT undergraduate programs of education faculties.

## 4.2.2. The Variables' (Gender And Professional Development) Effect On EFL Teacher Participants' Views About How Useful They Find The Courses In ELT Undergraduate Program

Through this study, it was also aimed to search for whether or not the variables, gender and professional development (in terms of ELT conferences and post-graduate study) of EFL participant teachers, make any difference on their views about to what extent they find the courses useful in ELT departments.

In order to analyze the results, at first, the mean of the field, pedagogical content and general culture courses was calculated and then, Mann-Whitney test was conducted so as to see whether or not there is a relation between EFL participant teachers' responses and their gender and professional development. These statistics are shown at tables 4-13, 4-14, 4-15 and 4-16.

It is important to note that since all the participants (207) did not rate all the 40 items in the survey (they only rated the courses they took in their undergraduate program), only the participants having rated all the items were included while analyzing the results.

Table 4-13: The mean of the courses

|      | Field Courses | Pedagogical<br>Content<br>Courses | General Culture Courses |
|------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Mean | 3,85          | 3,78                              | 2,87                    |

In Table 4-13, the mean of the field, pedagogical content and general culture courses is demonstrated. According to the statistical results, the mean of all field courses is 3,85 while the mean of pedagogical content and general culture courses is 3,78 and 2,87 respectively.

Table 4-14: Participant EFL teachers' responses and gender variable

| -           | Gender | N  | Mean<br>Rank | U       | Z    | Р    |
|-------------|--------|----|--------------|---------|------|------|
|             | Female | 45 | 27,90        |         |      |      |
| field       | Male   | 11 | 30,95        |         |      |      |
|             | Total  | 56 |              | 220,500 | -557 | ,577 |
|             | Female | 60 | 36,28        |         |      |      |
| pedagogical | Male   | 11 | 34,45        |         |      |      |
| content     | Total  | 71 |              | 313,000 | -271 | ,787 |
|             | Female | 56 | 32,91        |         |      |      |
| culture     | Male   | 10 | 36,80        |         |      |      |
|             | Total  | 66 |              | 247,000 | -591 | ,555 |

|             | Have you ever<br>attended ELT<br>conferences? | N        | Mean<br>Rank | U       | Z      | Р    |
|-------------|---|----------|--------------|---------|--------|------|
| C 11        | Yes   | 35       | 26,24        |         |        |      |
| field       | No<br>Total                                   | 21<br>56 | 32,26        | 288,500 | -1,338 | ,181 |
|             | Yes   | 47       | 33,40        |         |        |      |
| pedagogical | No  | 24       | 41,08        |         |        |      |
| content     | Total   | 71       |              | 442,000 | -1,486 | ,137 |
|             | Yes   | 44       | 30,93        |         |        |      |
| culture     | No  | 22       | 38,64        |         |        |      |
|             | Total   | 66       |              | 371,000 | -1,539 | ,124 |

Table 4-15: Participant EFL teachers' responses and professional development variable (conference)

| Table | 4-16: | Participant | EFL     | teachers'  | responses | and | professional | development |
|-------|-------|-------------|---------|------------|-----------|-----|--------------|-------------|
|       |       | variable (p | ost-gra | aduate stu | dy)       |     |              |             |

|             | Have you done your<br>post-graduate study<br>(MA or PhD)? | N        | Mean<br>Rank   | U       | Z      | Р    |
|-------------|---|----------|----------------|---------|--------|------|
| field       | Yes<br>No   | 7<br>49  | 28,64<br>28.48 |         |        |      |
|             | Total   | 49<br>56 | 20,40          | 170,500 | -0,25  | ,980 |
|             | Yes   | 8        | 28,56          |         |        |      |
| pedagogical | No  | 63       | 36,94          |         |        |      |
| content     | Total   | 71       |                | 192,500 | -1,084 | ,278 |
|             | Yes   | 6        | 29,17          |         |        |      |
| culture     | No  | 60       | 33,93          |         |        |      |
|             | Total   | 66       |                | 154,000 | -581   | ,561 |

As seen in Tables 4-14, 4-15 and 4-16, there is not any statistically significant difference in the participant EFL teachers' responses with regard to their gender and professional development (in terms of ELT conferences or post-graduate study).

The difference in the participant EFL teachers' responses with regard to their teaching experience as a variable was not calculated since ten courses (see Table 2-1) in the survey were taken only by the teachers graduates of 2006 ELTEP.

## 4.2.3. Answers To Open-Ended Question In The Last Part Of The Questionnaire

In the last part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to recommend potential courses to be included in ELT undergraduate program through the question addressed to the participants as "What other courses do you think should be included in the ELT curriculum? Please, write their names and if possible give descriptions."

This part of the questionnaire was not obligatory; therefore, only the participants wishing to offer their suggestions completed this section. 59 EFL teacher participants out of 207 gave answers to this question and suggested courses to be included in ELT curriculum. The respondents' teaching experience along with the institution they are working at are also specified. The responses received from the participants were neither reduced nor simplified. The participants' answers to this question are presented below :

"I think a course about the 'daily phrases' should be included in ELT curriculum." (*a teacher with 7-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"A course on 'improving communicative skills' should be included in educational programs of the universities." (a teacher with 10-year experience working at a secondary school)

"The question in my mind is that: How can we integrate Turkish and English all together? If our learners do not have a good command of their native language, which is Turkish, what kind of solutions to teach the target language can be suggested in this situation? In short, how can we solve this language matter?" (*a teacher with 1-year experience working at a primary school*)

"Teaching Information and Communication Technologies to student- teachers is significant. Besides this, all the teacher candidates should be given an opportunity to be educated on abroad for a while." (*a teacher with 3-year experience working at a secondary school*) "In my opinion, 'Oral Communication Skills' course must be taught in all terms." (*a teacher with 6-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"I think the student-teachers in education faculties should be taught about the regulations on primary and secondary level schools. In addition to this, the teacher candidates should be informed about the school culture." (*a teacher with 15-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"In my opinion, instead of including a new course to the ELT curriculum, sending the student-teachers on abroad, where English is spoken as a native language, would be more beneficial." (*two teachers with 1 and 7-year experience working at a secondary and an Anatolian high schools respectively*)

"Prof. Dr. Mustafa Zülküf ALTAN, who works as a faculty member in ELT department in Erciyes University, mentioned about 'entrepreneur teaching' in our school years; and, I think this might be taught as a course to student-teachers." (a teacher with a-year experience working at an Anatolian high school)

"The hours of 'School Experience and Teaching Practice' courses must be increased." (*eight teachers with experiences between 2-13 years working at primary, secondary, Anatolian and vocational high schools*)

"In my opinion, the current courses should be renewed in accordance with the education system and the circumstances of the schools throughout the country. Besides this, more competent faculty members should educate the teacher candidates." (*a teacher with 10-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"I want to express my opinion about teaching English at primary and secondary level schools instead of suggesting a course to ELT departments. In my opinion, English should be taught by using Content-Based Instruction (CBI), which would be more beneficial for our learners." (*a teacher with 14-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

"The student-teachers in education faculties should be taught how to cope with the teaching English in large classes." (a teacher with 7-year experience working at a secondary school) "The English teacher candidates should be informed about the 'Cultural Differences'." (a teacher with 8-year experience working at an Anatolian high school)

"Teacher candidates in ELT departments should be taught about how to integrate Information Technologies actively while teaching English." (*a teacher with 20-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'Communicative Approach' should be given as a separate course in ELT departments." (*a teacher with 8-year experience working at a science high school*)

"A course named 'Foreign Language Teaching to Learners with Mental or Behavioural Disorders' should be included in ELT departments. Besides this, in my opinion, 'Material Development for Smart Boards' is also another course to be included." (*a teacher with 8-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'Critical Thinking' must be taught as a course to the English teacher candidates." (*a teacher with a-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

"A course on 'social gender' should be included in educational programs." (*a teacher with 5-year experience working at a science high school*)

"A course in which the student-teachers can gain the required skills about motivating their learners to learn a foreign language and teach their students learning strategies should be included in ELT curriculum." (*two teachers with 2 and 10-year experience working at secondary and vocational high schools respectively*)

"A course whose content focuses on educational activities to be used in real classroom setting to the student-teachers should be included." (*a teacher with 3-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"In my opinion, these courses should be included in ELT curriculum: 'Intercultural Communication', Individual Differences in Language Teaching', 'Teaching English to Adult Learners', 'Internet-based Education', 'Introduction to The History of Philosophy." (*a teacher with 3-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'Musical Skills' should be included as a course in ELT departments." (a teacher with 6-year experience working at a secondary school)

"Added strength should be given to drama course in ELT departments." (a teacher with 25-year experience working at an Anatolian high school)

"Listening courses should be given added strength through increasing the course hours." (*a teacher with 10-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"'Advanced speaking and listening' should be included as course." (*a teacher* with a-year experience working at a secondary school)

"The HEC and the Ministry of National Education should work in cooperation while developing teacher education programs. Besides this, teaching practice courses should be given added strength regarding the circumstances of schools throughout the country. As an example, in eastern part of Turkey, the students at primary level do not have a good command on their native language; therefore, how can we teach a foreign language to such students?" (*a teacher with a-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'Project writing and management for EU programs' should be included as a course in ELT departments." (*a teacher with 9-year experience working at a primary school*)

"I think the education systems of the EU countries might help in all areas about the education." (a teacher with 18-year experience working at an Anatolian high school)

" 'Skills-Based Teaching and Gifted-Children Teaching' courses should be included in the curriculum of ELT departments." (*a teacher with 14-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"Actually, the courses seem very nice 'in name only'. However, there is a big problem in practice of the theoretical knowledge taught to teacher candidates in ELT departments of education faculties. Besides this, more stress should be given to 'contextual grammar' course. Increasing the course hours of 'speaking' and 'listening' would also be beneficial for teacher candidates." (*a teacher with 12-year experience working at a vocational high school*)

"Pronunciation besides listening should be given added strength through the increasing the course hours." (a teacher with 11-year experience working at a secondary school)

"Teacher candidates in ELT departments should be taught how to design web sites and online games to be used in real classroom settings for their learners in order to fulfil the requirements of the modern education. As known, nowadays, the children spend most of their time with their tablet PCs or smart phones." (*a teacher with 3-year experience working at a primary school*)

" 'Intercultural Communication' might be taught as a course to the studentteachers in ELT departments. In addition to this, the time allocated for 'listening' and 'speaking' courses must certainly be increased." (a teacher with 3-year experience working at a secondary school)

"More stress should be given to practice-oriented courses. Moreover, increasing the 'speaking' hours course is certainly necessary for English teacher trainees." (*a teacher with 11-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'Story-telling for young learners' might be included as a course to the ELT curriculum." (*a teacher with 4-year experience working at a primary school*)

" 'Inclusive Education' should be included to the curriculum of ELT departments." (*a teacher with 8-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"As a self-criticism, even English teachers sometimes have difficulty in speaking English fluently. Therefore, the time allocated for speaking hours in ELT departments should certainly be increased." (*a teacher with a-year experience working at a primary school*)

"A course about the well-developed European countries' perspective on second/foreign language teacher education might be included in ELT curriculum." (*a teacher with 2-year experience working at a primary school*)

" 'Academic Writing' should be included as a course in ELT curriculum." (a teacher with 4-year experience working at a secondary school)

"It is thought that English cannot be taught in Turkey, which is actually a misconception. Therefore, a course in which English teacher trainees can have an opportunity to study on English teaching methods and techniques in other countries can be included in ELT curriculum. Besides this, I think this course should be taught by more competent faculty members." (*a teacher with 5-year experience working at a primary school*)

"'Realistic Classroom Management for Turkish Context' should be included as a course in ELT curriculum." (a teacher with 7-year experience working at a secondary school)

"Instructional Technology and Material Design course should be taught by providing an opportunity for student-teachers to practise in real classroom settings." (*a teacher with 12-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'English use in social media' might be included as a course in ELT curriculum." (a teacher with 10-year experience working at a secondary school)

" 'English For Specific Purposes (ESP) -especially business or vocational English-' and 'Teaching English for Adults' can be included in ELT departments." (*a teacher with 4-year experience working at a vocational high school*)

" 'History of Philosophy' would be a useful course for the teacher candidates." (*a teacher with 17-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"In our university years, we -as English teacher candidates- were taught that an ideal class size should be 25, an English corner must certainly be in our classes and while the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) was the most primitive one, CLT was the most modern one. However, when I started to teach English, I experienced quite different things. Class sizes are at least 40 in most of the state schools. Besides this, students with different academic success study in the same class. Therefore, in my opinion, the courses taught to teacher trainees in ELT departments should address to real Turkish education context. Moreover, the student-teachers should be trained about classroom management." (a teacher with 5-year experience working at a secondary school)

"An online course in which the applications of methods and techniques used while teaching English in well-developed European countries such as Germany, France or Canada are specified might be included to ELT curriculum. Besides this, a course in which four language skills are taught in an integrative way using distinctive functional activities might be beneficial for English teacher candidates. In addition, practice teaching about materials design using the technological devices in universities' computer labs might be included to ELT curriculum." (*a teacher with 5-year experience working at a secondary school*)

"In my opinion, these courses should be included in ELT curriculum: 'English Language History, Mythology, Latin and Ancient Greek, Text linguistics and Comparative Linguistics and Etymology'." (*a teacher with 12-year experience working at an Anatolian high school*)

" 'Language Learner Psychology in Classroom' would be a useful course for teacher candidates." (a teacher with 10-year experience working at a secondary school)

"A course in which the student-teachers can learn about the daily, weekly, monthly and yearly routines i.e. taking attendance, preparing community of practice reports to be done by teachers in state schools should be included in all teacher education programs. It is not possible to experience these routines in teaching practice courses since they are done by the class teacher himself/herself." (*a teacher with 15-year experience working at a vocational high school*)

The data gathered through the open-ended question was presented above and supported by direct quotations from the participants to reveal English teachers' general views about ELT curriculum and their suggestions of courses to be included in the curriculum. These obtained data which consist of the participants' suggestions may help to improve the current ELT programs. Actually, some of the participants' recommendations are already included in the syllabus of the courses. It is possible to conclude after so many years that either the participants do not remember the content of the undergraduate courses once they took or they did not receive the appropriate training. As an example, a couple of teachers suggested including "Communication Skills" in the ELT curriculum. It is possible to state that either the time spent on "Communication Skills" was insufficient or the course objectives were not realized. Therefore, it is necessary that Faculty and ELT departments directors with the help of Quality Assurance Service ensure that the objectives of every course is realized at the end of the semester.

## **CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION**

## **5.1. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Since English has risen as a universal language and lingua franca in the world, the demand for English language teachers has grown incredibly in the last thirty years (Salli-Copur, 2008). Therefore, language teacher education has also gained importance in the light of these developments. Day (1991) points out that English language teacher education is rather a new area of research; however, the evaluation of ELT programs has attracted the attention of the researchers (Weir & Roberts, 1994). As Beretta (1992) states "The evaluation of language education will be an increasingly serious, professional concern to the benefit of everyone involved in language education."

The account of past studies about ELT program evaluation were given in Chapter II. In this study, different from the past studies, in-service EFL teachers graduated from ELT departments of education faculties were required to evaluate ELT undergraduate program by rating the usefulness of each course they had taken in their undergraduate program regarding their language teaching profession. For this research study, quantitative and qualitative data were gathered through a survey, the layout and the items of which were developed by the researcher regarding both relevant literature about the program evaluation and the HEC's 1982, 1997 and 2006 ELTEPs. Items (the names of the undergraduate courses) in the study aimed to investigate whether EFL teachers, while performing their profession, effectively could make use of content knowledge, pedagogic content knowledge, general pedagogic knowledge and support knowledge they learnt through the courses in undergraduate ELT departments according to their views. With the questions asking about the participants' background, it was intended to search whether the background of the teachers had an effect on the participants' views about the undergraduate courses' contribution to their language teaching profession. At the end of the survey, qualitative data were collected through asking the participants to write the names or give descriptions of the courses they suggested to be included in ELT curriculum. The policy-makers, program designers and faculty members may take

the suggestions into consideration since regular evaluation of the program is a pivotal process as pointed by Rea-Dickins and Germaine (1998).

The findings of the study reveal that as a field course "Teaching English to Young Learners", as a pedagogical content course "School Experience and Practice Teaching" and as a general culture course "Atatürk's Principles and The History of Revolutions" were viewed as the most "totally useful" courses by the EFL teacher participants regarding these courses' contribution to their English language teaching profession. In light of the ratings given to each course by EFL teacher participants, the statistical results demonstrate that the mean of the field courses was higher than pedagogic content courses and culture courses respectively. Only three variables -gender, participants' attendance frequency in ELT conferences and participants' having a post-graduate education- were analyzed whether these variables could have an effect on EFL teacher participants' views about ELT undergraduate courses and it is seen that there was not any statistically significant correlation between teachers' responses to the items and their gender as well as professional development through ELT conferences or post-graduate education. Besides, 59 out of 207 EFL teacher participants either recommended the names or gave descriptions of the courses to be included in ELT curriculum. While some teachers suggested the names of culture-specific courses to be included to ELT curriculum, some pointed that practice teaching, speaking along with listening and pronunciation skills should be given added strength through increasing the hours assigned to these courses. Moreover, project writing and management for EU programs, providing an opportunity for all EFL teacher candidates to be a foreign language teaching assistant on abroad as an intern, critical thinking skills, English use in social media, gifted children teaching, getting training for inclusive education, English for specific purposes, intercultural communication are among the remarkable suggestions offered by the participant EFL teachers.

## 5.2. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study aims to investigate the contribution of undergraduate courses taught in ELT departments to English language teaching profession according to EFL

teachers' views. Therefore, the main purpose is to underline the strengths of the program and give recommendations to compensate for the weaknesses in order to educate well-qualified English teachers. It is also expected that this study will guide policy makers, program designers and faculty members about the functionality of the program administered in education faculties. However, there are some limitations in the study and future research is necessary in order to give a better idea about the new evaluations of ELT curriculum.

The data was collected in 5-month period in 2015-2016 academic year from 207 English teachers; therefore, the time span to collect data could be extended to do a long-term longitudinal study and reach more participants.

The other limitation the researcher met during the study was about the staff in the schools. In some schools, there was a shortage of English teachers and the staff working as English teachers were graduates of different departments of universities irrelevant to English language. This situation, in the long term, causes unsuccessful foreign language teaching. Teachers graduated from the departments related to the foreign language teaching should be appointed to the schools instead of having the temporary staff work as teachers.

In this study, the researcher took only the English teachers' views; however, by reaching people from different backgrounds such as faculty members implementing ELTEP or student-teachers trained in education faculties at present, more comprehensive study could be conducted. The views of other people related with ELT field could give more hints to the policy-makers about evaluation of the program.

The views of the participants were collected through a survey of program evaluation prepared as five-point Likert scale. The items were rated by the teachers according to their views; therefore, the answers given by the participants are the only data relied. Besides that, at the end of the survey, the participants were also asked to write the names or give descriptions of the courses they suggested to be included in ELT curriculum and 59 out of 207 participants gave answers to this open-ended question. Although important results were obtained with this survey, interviews with the participants could give more inclusive understanding about their views. Thus, a further study on the experienced teachers' views can be supported through interviews, which will provide more comprehensive data about ELT curriculum evaluation. Actually, Saglam (2007) states in her doctoral thesis that "In each research study, it is important to strengthen the validity and the reliability of the findings. This is done by triangulation, which is also called cross-checking the data. Triangulation is the use of multiple sources of evidence in a research study. In order to control bias in research studies, triangulation is a viable tool that is used". In sum, using a various of data collection tools provides the researchers to get more reliable results in their studies.

Moreover, the English teachers were the graduates of different universities; accordingly, the training they received might have affected their views about the courses taught in ELT departments. This is also one of the limitations of the study voiced by the English teachers having participated in the study. The scope of a future study may concentrate on participants who graduated from the same university in the same and different years.

In this study, all the participants were the graduates of ELT departments. A further study can be conducted with the graduates of Faculties of Science and Literature related to English language such as English Language and Literature, American Culture and Literature or Translation Studies in order to get their views about the teacher certification courses on English Language Teaching they took after their graduation. This kind of research may give data to the researchers about to what degree the courses taught in pedagogic training are useful for English language teaching profession.

This study focused on English language teachers' views about the ELT curriculum implemented in Turkey. A similar study can be conducted in different contexts in different countries. In this sense, English teachers in different countries can also be asked to evaluate the undergraduate ELT curriculum administered, which can provide an opportunity to the researchers to compare the program of the other countries.

These suggestions can lead to more comprehensive study about the evaluation of the ELT curriculum; because, regular evaluation of the educational programs is a vital point as emphasized by Rea-Dickins and Germaine (1998).

## 5.3. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The findings of the present study may be used by program designers or policy-makers for the improvement of the educational program or for revising the courses taught in ELT departments of education faculties. The suggestions listed in terms of the findings are:

1. As Karakas (2012) emphasizes in his review study, since educating English language teachers is both a hard and crucial process, teacher educators should have a say to evaluate the program; thus, program designers, policy makers and decision makers should all pay attention to the suggestions and curriculum evaluations of teacher educators since they implement the program. Their opinions can assist to shape the ELTEP regarding the content knowledge, common pedagogic knowledge and pedagogic content knowledge (Yavuz & Topkaya ; 2013).

2. It is a particularly important point to note that Yavuz & Topkaya (2013) states in their research that it is foreseeable that ITE, including English language teacher education, will once again undergo some changes. The reason behind their idea is that Turkey has recently experienced another great top-down educational restructuring which caused 8-year compulsory schooling to extend to 12 years (Official Gazette, 2012: 28261) and with this new change, English as a foreign language has started to be taught from 2<sup>nd</sup> grade instead of 4<sup>th</sup> grade. Even for this reason alone, the courses taught in ELTEP should be revised by program designers.

3. One of the participants, in open-ended part of the questionnaire, stated that "Teaching English to Adults should be included as a course in ELT curriculum". Kavcar (2002), in his study, voiced the same idea. He asserts that although the current ELTEP includes courses for teaching English to young learners, the teacher trainees do not have the adequate ability to relate their pedagogic knowledge to adolescent or adult learners. Although the ELTEP has been restructured in 2006, the renewed one does not also address to how to teach English to adolescents or adult learners. Since an ELT graduate can be appointed to any type of institution apart from primary or secondary school, s/he needs to be competent to teach adult learners as well.

4. The unique aim of education faculties is to educate well-qualified teachers and according to Ustunluoglu (2008; p.329), "Specialization for different levels, primary, secondary and university would produce better-qualified teachers." Therefore, it is certainly necessary to provide the EFL teacher candidates to experience practice teaching in different institutions. The current ELTEP should be revised regarding this aspect.

5. The course hours allocated for 'School Experience and 'Practice Teaching' are thought to be insufficient by EFL teacher participants of the study and some EFL teachers are in the opinion that the practice-teaching should be taught 3<sup>rd</sup> term onwards; therefore, as Salli-Copur (2008) and Karakas (2012) assert that it would be more useful to increase the length and amount of teaching practice courses to provide EFL teachers with more opportunities for micro-teaching activities in their training schools.

6. Two of EFL teacher participants, in open-ended part of the questionnaire, stated that "Intercultural Communication should be taught as a course to the student-teachers in ELT departments. Karakas (2012) also touches upon the significance of culture-specific courses as they complement and form a crucial part of teachers' subject matter.

7. Six of the participants suggested increasing the course hours for speaking, four of the participants emphasized the importance of listening and pronunciation while one of them stressed the significance of academic writing as a course. Since the candidates are not tested with speaking, listening or writing in the university entrance exam, some do not perceive themselves competent in language skills. Therefore, preparatory classes should be mandatory for EFL teacher candidates in order for them to gain the required language skills from the outset of ELT undergraduate program.

8. Although the number and hours of elective courses have been increased to some extent with 2006 ELTEP, there should be more elective courses addressing to the needs and interests of the student-teachers.

9. Five of the general culture courses were added with the introduction of 2006 ELTEP as seen in Table 2-1. However, these courses were not favoured and found useful enough by the participants of this study; therefore, it might be better to add courses including the knowledge of various disciplines such as psycholinguistics, text linguistics or academic writing related to teaching and learning of English for boosting student-teachers' support knowledge.

10. Three of EFL teacher participants suggested student-teachers should be provided with an opportunity to be educated on abroad for a while. It would be better to supply more opportunities for successful student-teachers to intern as a foreign language assistant on abroad in their undergraduate degree.

11. One of the participant EFL teachers stated in the last part of the questionnaire that "The HEC and the Ministry of National Education should work in cooperation while developing teacher education programs". In Yavuz & Topkaya's study (2013), the participants also raised the same point - the communication gap between the education faculties, the HEC and the MONE. Even though Education faculties, under the charge of the HEC, educate teachers to work for the MONE, they all work independently from each other (Yavuz, 2007). Neither schooling programs nor curricula are handled effectively by the HEC and the MONE. Though the teachers who will work for the MONE are trained through the teacher education programs developed by the HEC (MONE, 2008; HEC, 2011); teacher competencies concerning knowledge, skills and attitudes are described distinctly by these two institutions. Neglecting the ideas of teacher educators and student-teachers along with the teachers at school, top-down teacher education programs are handed to the education faculties to be applied, which is the basic criticism voiced (HEC, 2007). Besides this, descriptions for undergraduate courses are not clear; therefore, lecturers decide what will be taught and how it will be taught regarding their priorities and as a result, successful implementation of the teacher education programs is put into risk (HEC, 2007). Thus, cooperation and coordination should be ensured among education faculties, the HEC and the MONE (cited in Yavuz & Topkaya; 2013).

12. In Salihoglu's study (2012), the participants both the student-teachers and lecturers mentioned the overlapping information among the courses in ELT undergraduate programs. In this study, EFL teacher participants also pointed out that the student-teachers should be provided with opportunities to put into practice what

is learnt in theory. Thus, it is considerable to integrate theory with practice so as to avoid overlapping information among the courses.

13. Seven of the participant EFL teachers stressed the significance of using technology while teaching English. Thus, it would be a better idea to promote faculty members in ELT departments to integrate information technologies actively while teaching their own courses in order to be a role model for student-teachers. Additionally, the hours allocated for "Teaching Technologies and Materials Design" course should be increased as well; because, only one-term course is not sufficient to fulfil the requirements of the modern education.

14. As for the primary and secondary schools' English language curriculum, Cetin (2014) suggests EFL teachers working for the MONE in state and private schools to teach vocabulary of the TL mostly instead of emphasizing strongly on skills i.e. reading, listening, speaking, writing, grammar. Especially, teaching of the most frequently used 1000 vocabulary from General Service List will help learners gain the required skills and competencies related to the TL. Cetin (2014) bases his idea upon Lexical Approach and Nation's (2001) studies; according to which it is possible to understand 84,3% of the conversations, 82,3% of the novels, 75,6% of the newspapers and 73,5% of the academic texts through the most frequent used 1000 words in English.

As seen in the account of implications, teacher education is not only about teachers and their education. It is definitely beyond these two components. There are more critical issues and questions going far beyond their boundaries (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). It is also significant to note that educating well-qualified EFL teachers leads to successful instruction in English.

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix A :

| Course  | Gr  | ade I | Gra | Grade II |     | de III | Grad | le IV |
|---|-----|-------|-----|----------|-----|--------|------|-------|
| Semesters   | 1st | 2nd   | 3rd | 4th      | 5th | 6th    | 7th  | 8th   |
| English Grammar I-II-III-IV-V-VI                                | 4   | -     | 2   | 2        | 2   | 2      | _    | -     |
| Reading and Analysing Texts I-II-III-IV                         | 4   | -     | 3   | 3        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Speaking I-II-III-IV  | 4   | 4     | 4   | 4        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Writing I-II-III-IV-V-VI  | 3   | 3     | 2   | 2        | 2   | 2      | -    | -     |
| Phonetics I-II  | 2   | 2     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Turkish Grammar I-II  | 2   | 2     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Introduction to Linguistics I-II                                | -   | -     | -   | -        | 3   | 3      | -    | -     |
| Structure of English I-II                                       | -   | -     | 2   | 2        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Translation English-Turkish I-II-III-IV-<br>V-VI- VII- VIII     | 2   | 2     | 2   | 2        | 2   | 2      | 2    | 2     |
| Translation Turkish-English I-II-III-IV-<br>V-VI- VII- VIII     | -   | -     | 2   | 2        | 2   | 2      | 2    | 2     |
| History of English Literature I-II-III-IV-<br>V-VI              | -   | -     | 2   | 2        | 2   | 2      | 2    | 2     |
| English History and Geography I-II                              | -   | -     | 2   | 2        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| History of English Language I-II                                | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | 2    | 2     |
| Comparative Turkish-English Grammar<br>I-II                     | -   | -     | -   | -        | 3   | 3      | -    | -     |
| Selections from English Literature I-II                         | -   | -     | -   | -        | 3   | 3      | -    | -     |
| Semantics I-II  | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | 2    | 2     |
| Selections from Contemporary English<br>Literature I-II         | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | 3    | 3     |
| Introduction to Education                                       | 3   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Educational Sociology   | -   | 3     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Educational Psychology  | -   | -     | 3   | -        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Educational Programs and Teaching<br>Methods                    | -   | -     | -   | 3        | -   | -      | -    | -     |
| Testing and Evaluation in Education                             | -   | -     | -   | -        | 3   | -      | -    | -     |
| Educational Technology  | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | 3      | -    | -     |
| Educational Counselling   | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | 3    |       |
| Management in Education   | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    | 3     |
| Approaches in teaching English                                  | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    |       |
| Applications in teaching English                                | -   | -     | -   | -        | -   | -      | -    | 1     |
| Turkish Language I-II-III-IV-V-VI- VII-<br>VIII                 | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1        | 1   | 1      | 1    | 1     |
| Turkish History and Revolutions I-II-III-<br>IV-V-VI- VII- VIII | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1        | 1   | 1      | 1    | 1     |
| Electives- PE or Fine Arts I-II-III-IV-V-<br>VI- VII- VIII      | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1        | 1   | 1      | 1    | 1     |
| Total   | 27  | 27    | 27  | 27       | 25  | 25     | 23   | 19    |

## English Language Teacher Education Curriculum 1983-1984

Kavak et.al.(2007, p.141)

Appendix B :

## English Language Teacher Education Curriculum: 1997 Reform

| COURSES -   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 <sup>ST</sup> TERM                              | 2 <sup>ND</sup> TERM                              |
| English Grammar I                                 | English Grammar II                                |
| Speaking I  | Speaking II                                       |
| Reading I   | Reading II  |
| Writing I   | Writing II  |
| Turkish I: Writing                                | Turkish I: Speaking                               |
| Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolution I  | Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolution II |
| Introduction to Teaching                          | School Experience I                               |
|   | Elective  |
| 2 <sup>ND</sup> Y                                 | EAR   |
| 3 <sup>RD</sup> TERM                              | 4 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                              |
| Advanced Reading I                                | Advanced Writing II                               |
| Introduction to English Literature I              | Introduction to English Literature II             |
| Language Acquisition                              | Approaches and Methods in ELT                     |
| Computer  | Introduction to Linguistics I                     |
| Turkish Phonetics and Morphology                  | Turkish Syntax and Semantics                      |
| Human Development and Learning                    | Instructional Planning and Evaluation             |
| 3 <sup>RD</sup> Y                                 | EAR   |
| 5 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                              | 6 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                              |
| Introduction to Linguistics II                    | Research Skills                                   |
| Analysis and Teaching of Short Stories            | Teaching English to Young Learners                |
| English-Turkish Translation                       | Analysis and Teaching of Novels                   |
| ELT Methodology I                                 | ELT Methodology II                                |
| Instructional Technology and Material Development | Classroom Management                              |
| 4 <sup>TH</sup> Y                                 | EAR   |
| 7 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                              | 8 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                              |
| English Language Testing and Evaluation           | Turkish-English Translation                       |
| Analysis and Teaching of English Drama            | Analysis and Teaching of English Poetry           |
| Material Evaluation and Adaptation                | Psychological Counselling                         |
| Coursebook Evaluation                             | Teaching Practice                                 |
| School Experience II                              |   |
|   | Total Credits: 143                                |

Sali (2008, p.279)

Appendix C :

|  | – 1 <sup>ST</sup> YEAR                           |
|--|--|
| 1 <sup>ST</sup> TERM                             | 2 <sup>ND</sup> TERM                             |
| Contextual Grammar I                             | Contextual Grammar II                            |
| Advanced Reading and Writing I                   | Advanced Reading and Writing II                  |
| Listening and Pronunciation I                    | Listening and Pronunciation II                   |
| Oral Communication Skills I                      | Oral Communication Skills II                     |
| Turkish I: Writing                               | Lexical Competence                               |
| Computer I                                       | Turkish II: Speaking                             |
| Effective Communication                          | Computer II                                      |
| Introduction to Education                        | Educational Psychology                           |
| 2 <sup>ND</sup>                                  | YEAR   |
| 3 <sup>RD</sup> TERM                             | 4 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                             |
| English Literature I                             | English Literature II                            |
| Linguistics I                                    | Linguistics II                                   |
| Approaches to ELT I                              | Approaches to ELT II                             |
| English-Turkish Translation                      | Language Acquisition                             |
| Oral Expression and Public Speaking              | Research Methodology                             |
| History of Turkish Education                     | ELT Methodology I                                |
| Teaching Principles and Methods                  | Instructional Technology and Material Design     |
|  |  |
| 3 <sup>RD</sup>                                  | YEAR   |
| 5 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                             | 6 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                             |
| Teaching English to Young Learners I             | Teaching English to Young Learners I             |
| ELT Methodology II                               | Turkish-English Translation                      |
| Teaching Language Skills I                       | Teaching Language Skills II                      |
| Literature and Language Teaching I               | Literature and Language Teaching II              |
| Second Foreign Language I                        | Second Foreign Language II                       |
| Drama  | Assessment and Evaluation                        |
| Classroom Management                             | Practices in Social Services                     |
| 4 <sup>TH</sup> 1                                | YEAR   |
| 7 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                             | 8 <sup>TH</sup> TERM                             |
| ELT Materials Adaptation and Development         | English Language Testing and Evaluation          |
| Second Foreign Language III                      | Comparative Education                            |
| Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolution I | Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolution I |
| Psychological Counselling                        | Turkish Education and School Administration      |
| School Experience                                | Teaching Practice                                |
| Special Education                                | Elective II                                      |
| Elective I                                       | Elective III                                     |
|  | Total Credits: 159                               |

## Current English Language Teacher Education Curriculum (2007)

Sali (2008, p.280)

### Appendix D :

## İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERININ İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ LİSANS PROGRAMI HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERINİ İNCELEME ÇALIŞMASI

#### ÇALIŞMANIN AMACI :

Ülke genelindeki üniversitelerde "İngiliz Dili Eğitimi" lisans programında öğretmen adaylarının almış olduğu derslerin öğretmenlik mesleğine katkısının belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Bu anket de bu amaçla geliştirilmiş bir data toplama aracıdır. Bu veri toplama aracında eğitim fakültelerinin İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programında sekiz yarıyıl süresince öğretmen adaylarına verilen dersler değerlendirilmeleri için maddeler halinde sıralanmıştır.

### **KATILIMCIDAN İSTENEN :**

Bu anket aracılığı ile İngilizce öğretmenlerinin lisans döneminde üniversitelerde aldıkları derslerin mesleklerine ne derecede katkısı olduğu değerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan istenen lisans dönemindeki aldıkları her bir dersi mesleki açıdan ne oranda faydalı bulduklarını değerlendirmeleridir.

Öğretmenlerin paylaştıkları bilgiler gizli tutulacak, bireysel yanıtları hiçbir şekilde açıklanmayacak ve sadece araştırma amacıyla kullanılacaktır.

#### ANKETİN DOLDURULMA ŞEKLİ :

Her bir maddede katılımcı lisans döneminde almış olduğu o dersin içeriğinin mesleki bilgisine katkısını 5'li likert tipi ölçeğe göre karar verip anket üzerinde işaretleyecektir. Bu ölçekteki sayılar şu anlamları ifade etmektedir :

1 : TAMAMEN FAYDASIZ4 : FAYDALI2 : FAYDASI ÇOK AZ5 : TAMAMEN FAYDALI3 : FAYDASI AZ (KISMEN FAYDALI)

## **ILETİŞİM** :

Aşağıdaki yollardan benimle iletişime geçebilirsiniz. 0531 361 95 10 numaralı telefondan bana ulaşabilirsiniz. karatassaziye@hotmail.com adresine elektronik posta gönderebilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya ayırdığınız zaman ve değerli katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Şaziye KARATAŞ

## 1. LÜTFEN BU KISMI DOLDURUNUZ.

| Cinsiyetiniz: Bay Bayan   |  |   |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Medeni Durumunuz: Evli Bekar  |  |   |   |  |   |
| Varsa sahip olduğunuz çocuk sayısı:   |  |   |   |  |   |
|   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Mezun olduğunuz üniversite ve bölüm:  |  |   |   |  |   |
| Mezuniyet yılınız:  |  |   |   |  |   |
| Öğretmenlik deneyiminizin süresi nedir?   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Çalıştığınız Kurumun Türü: Anaokulu İlkoku  | 1  | Ortaok  | ul  |  |   |
| Anadolu Lisesi Fen Li   | sesi   | Meslek  | Lisesi  | ]  |   |
| Üniversite Özel K   | Lurs   |   |   |  |   |
| Bir sınıfta ortalama kaç öğrenciniz var?  |  |   |   |  |   |
|   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Haftalık ders yükünüz kaç saat?   |  |   |   |  |   |
| Daha önce "English Language Teaching" alanında seminer  | ve konfera   | nslara katılo   | dınız mı?   | Evet   | Hayır   |
| Eğer katıldıysanız alanınızla ilgili kaç konferansa katıldını   | z?   |   |   |  |   |
| Lisansüstü eğitim (yüksek lisans/doktora) yaptınız mı? E  | vet  | Hayır   |   |  |   |
| Eğer lisansüstü eğitim aldıysanız hangi bölümde yaptınız?   |  |   |   |  |   |
| 2. Aşağıda İngiliz Dili Eğitimi süresince aldığınız lisans<br>İngilizce öğretmenliği mesleğinize katkısının ne oranda<br>döneminde almamış olduğunuz derslerle ilgili lütfen he1 : TAMAMEN FAYDASIZ<br>2 : FAYDASI ÇOK AZ4 : FAY<br>5 : TAM   | olduğunu (<br>rhangi bir i   | değerlendi<br>işaretleme  | riniz. <u>Lisaı</u>   | <u>15</u>  |   |
| 3 : FAYDASI ÇOK AZ<br>3 : FAYDASI AZ (KISMEN FAYDALI)   |  | IDALI   |   |  |   |
|   |  |   |   |  |   |
| A. ALAN BİLGİSİ DERSLERİ :  |  |   |   |  |   |
| 1. Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)  | 1  | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5   |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1   | 2<br>2  | 3<br>3  | 4  | 5   |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1   | 2<br>2  | 3   | 4 4  | 5<br>5  |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> </ol>  | 1<br>1<br>1  | 2<br>2<br>2   | 3<br>3<br>3   | 4<br>4<br>4  | 5<br>5<br>5   |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1  | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2   | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3  | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4   | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5  |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi (Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1   | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2   | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3  | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4   | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                                    |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi (Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1                               | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2   | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3   | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4  | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                               |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi (Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> <li>Dilbilim (Linguistics)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1                     | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2                                    | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3  | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4   | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                     |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi (Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> <li>Dilbilim (Linguistics)</li> <li>Çeviri (Translation)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1           | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2                          | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3   | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4  | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi (Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> <li>Dilbilim (Linguistics)</li> <li>Çeviri (Translation)</li> <li>Anlatım Becerileri</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1                     | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2                                    | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3  | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4  | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                     |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi (Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> <li>Dilbilim (Linguistics)</li> <li>Çeviri (Translation)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1           | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2                          | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3   | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4  | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi ( Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> <li>Dilbilim (Linguistics)</li> <li>Çeviri (Translation)</li> <li>Anlatım Becerileri<br/>(Communicative Skills and Public Speaking)</li> </ol>   | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1                | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2                | $     \begin{array}{r}       3 \\     $ | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4   | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5                |
| <ol> <li>Bağlamsal Dilbilgisi (Contextual Grammar)</li> <li>İleri Okuma (Advanced Reading)</li> <li>İleri Yazma (Advanced Writing)</li> <li>Dinleme ve Sesletim (Listening and Pronunciation)</li> <li>Sözlü İletişim Becerileri (Oral Communication Skills)</li> <li>Sözcük Bilgisi ( Lexical -Vocabulary- Competence)</li> <li>İngiliz Edebiyatı (English Literature)</li> <li>Dilbilim (Linguistics)</li> <li>Çeviri (Translation)</li> <li>Anlatım Becerileri<br/>(Communicative Skills and Public Speaking)</li> <li>Dil Edinimi (Language Acquisition)</li> </ol> | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 | 2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2 | $     \begin{array}{r}       3 \\     $ | $ \begin{array}{c}     4 \\     4 $ | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5 |

| 15. Çocuklara Yabancı Dil Öğretimi               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Teaching English to Young Learners)             |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16. Dil Becerilerinin Öğretimi                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Teaching Language Skills)                       |   |   |   |   |   |
| (Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking)       |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17. Edebiyat ve Dil Öğretimi                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Literature and Language Teaching)               |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18. Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Materyal İnceleme ve | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Geliștirme                                       |   |   |   |   |   |
| (Materials Analysis and Development in Language  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Teaching)  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 19. Bilgisayar Destekli İngilizce Öğretimi       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Computer and Technology Assisted Language       |   |   |   |   |   |
| Teaching)  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20. Kelime Öğretimi (Teaching Vocabulary)        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. Dilbilgisi Öğretimi (Teaching Grammar)       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Toplumdilbilim (Sociolinguistics)            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Scientific Research Methods)                    |   |   |   |   |   |
| 24. Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Ölçme                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ve Değerlendirme                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| (English Language Testing and Evaluation)        |   |   |   |   |   |

1 : TAMAMEN FAYDASIZ 2 : FAYDASI ÇOK AZ 3 : FAYDASI AZ (KISMEN FAYDALI) 4 : FAYDALI 5 : TAMAMEN FAYDALI

## B. EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ DERSLERİ

|  | 1 | n |   | n | 1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. Okul Deneyimi ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (School Experience and Practice Teaching)      |   |   |   |   |   |
| 26. Eğitim Bilimine Giriş                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Introduction to Educational Sciences)         |   |   |   |   |   |
| 27. Eğitim Psikolojisi                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Psychology of Education)                      |   |   |   |   |   |
| 28. Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Instruction Principles and Methods)           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 29. Sınıf Yönetimi (Classroom Management)      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. Ölçme ve Değerlendirme                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Measurement and Evaluation)                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 31. Rehberlik (Psychological Counselling)      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. Özel Eğitim (Special Education)            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. Öğretim Teknolojileri ve Materyal Tasarımı | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Teaching Technologies and Materials Design)   |   |   |   |   |   |

:

1 : TAMAMEN FAYDASIZ 2 : FAYDASI ÇOK AZ

3 : FAYDASI AZ (KISMEN FAYDALI)

4 : FAYDALI 5 : TAMAMEN FAYDALI

## C. KÜLTÜR DERSLERİ

| 34. Türkçe (Turkish)                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35. Türk Eğitim Tarihi                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (History of Turkish Education)           | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. İkinci Yabancı Dil                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | 1 | Z | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| (Second Foreign Language)                |   |   |   |   |   |
| (German, French etc.)                    |   |   |   |   |   |
| 37. Topluma Hizmet Uygulamaları          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Practices in Social Services)           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 38. Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Atatürk's Principles and The History of |   |   |   |   |   |
| Revolutions)                             |   |   |   |   |   |
| 39. Karşılaştırmalı Eğitim               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Comparative Education)                  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 40. Türk Eğitim Sistemi ve Okul Yönetimi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Turkish Educational System and School   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Management)                              |   |   |   |   |   |

:

3. (Eğer varsa) İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans programına konulmasını önerebileceğiniz dersler :

a.

b.

c.

Appendix E :

## THE STUDY ON EFL TEACHERS' VIEWS ABOUT THE UNDERGRADUATE ELT COURSES

## THE OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:

In this study, it is aimed to determine the contribution of ELT undergraduate courses to English language teaching profession according to the EFL teachers' views. This questionnaire is a data collection tool developed for this research purpose.

#### THE PARTICIPANT IS REQUIRED TO :

By means of this questionnaire, the undergraduate courses the EFL teachers took in their undergraduate study will be evaluated considering their contribution to English language teaching profession. The participant is required to rate each course regarding to what extent it is useful in terms of English language teaching profession according to his/her views.

You can be sure that the information you have shared will be kept confidential to others and will only be used for research objectives.

#### HOW TO FILL IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

In each item, the participant is required to rate the undergraduate courses' contribution to their English teaching profession in light of the content of the course according to his/her view. The numbers used in the scale mean :

1 : TOTALLY USELESS 2 : VERY LITTLE USEFUL 3 : PARTIALLY USEFUL

4 : USEFUL 5 : TOTALLY USEFUL

#### CONTACT

You can contact me with one of these below. my phone number: 0531 361 95 10 my e-mail address: karatassaziye@hotmail.com

Thank you very much for allocating your precious time for my study.

Şaziye KARATAŞ

## 1. PLEASE FILL IN THIS PART.

| Gender: Male Female  |
|--|
| Marital Status: Married Single                                   |
| The number of children if you have:                              |
| The university and department you were graduated from:           |
| Your graduate year:  |
| Your teaching experience:  |
| Your institution: Nursery School Primary School Secondary School |
| Anatolian High School Science High School Vocational High School |
| University Private Course  |
| The average number of students in your classes:                  |
| Your work load in a week:  |
| Have you ever attended ELT conferences? Yes No                   |
| The number of ELT conferences if you have attended:              |
| Have you studied your postgraduate degree (MA or PhD)? Yes No    |
| The name of the field if you have done your postgraduate study:  |

# 2. The undergraduate courses in ELT departments were listed below. Please rate the courses regarding their contribution to your English language teaching profession. <u>Please, do not rate the course you did not take in your undergraduate study.</u>

:

| 1 : TOTALLY USELESS    | 4 : USEFUL         |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| 2 : VERY LITTLE USEFUL | 5 : TOTALLY USEFUL |
| 3 : PARTIALLY USEFUL   |                    |

### A. FIELD COURSES

| 1. Contextual Grammar                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Advanced Reading                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Advanced Writing                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Listening and Pronunciation               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Oral Communication Skills                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Lexical (Vocabulary) Competence           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. English Literature                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Linguistics                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Translation                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Communicative Skills and Public Speaking | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Language Acquisition                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Drama                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Methods and Approaches to ELT            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. ELT Methodology                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Teaching English to Young Learners       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| 16. Teaching Language Skills (R, W, L and S)                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. Literature and Language Teaching                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Materials Analysis and Development in Language Teaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Computer and Technology Assisted Language<br>Teaching   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Teaching Vocabulary                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. Teaching Grammar  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Sociolinguistics  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Scientific Research Methods                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. English Language Testing and Evaluation                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1 : TOTALLY USELESS 2 : VERY LITTLE USEFUL

3 : PARTIALLY USEFUL

4 : USEFUL

5 : TOTALLY USEFUL

## **B. PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT COURSES** :

| 25. School Experience and Practice Teaching    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. Introduction to Educational Sciences       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. Psychology of Education                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. Instruction Principles and Methods         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. Classroom Management                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. Measurement and Evaluation                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. Psychological Counselling                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. Special Education                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. Teaching Technologies and Materials Design | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### 1 : TOTALLY USELESS

2 : VERY LITTLE USEFUL

3 : PARTIALLY USEFUL

4 : USEFUL 5 : TOTALLY USEFUL

:

## C. CULTURE COURSES

| 34. Turkish                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35. History of Turkish Education                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. Second Foreign Language (German, French etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. Practice in Social Services                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. Atatürk's Principles and The History of       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Revolutions                                       |   |   |   |   |   |
| 39. Comparative Education                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. Turkish Educational System and School         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Management  |   |   |   |   |   |

## **3.** Please write the name or give the description of the courses you suggest to be included in ELT curriculum.

a.

b.

c.

## REFERENCES

- Akyuz, Yahya. *Türk Eğitim Tarihi [ History of Turkish Education ]*. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing, 2012.
- Alagoz, Nuray Sariboga. *A comparison of ELT programmes in Turkey and Holland*. Unpublished master's dissertation. Anadolu University . Eskisehir, 2006.
- Almarza, Gloria Gutiérrez. "Student foreign language teacher's knowledge growth."
   Freeman, Donald and Jack C. Richards. *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. Ed.
   C. Richards. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 50-78.
- Altan, Mustafa Zulkuf. «Introducing the theory of multiple intelligences into English Language Teaching Programs.» *Pamukkale University Journal of Education Faculty* 32 (2012): 57-64.
- Altundis, Ebru. Educational background of teachers of English ad the problems of English language teaching related to the educational background of teachers. Unpublished master's dissertation. Kayseri: Erciyes University, 2006.
- Altunya, Niyazi. *Gazi Education Institute Gazi School of Secondary School Teacher and Institute of Education (1926 - 1980)*. Ankara: Gazi University, 2006.
- Anadolu University English Language Teaching Undergraduate Programme . *General Information* . Retrieved November 12, 2015, from http://aop.eogrenme.anadolu.edu.tr/iolp/genel-bilgiler/Sayfalar/default.aspx. Eskisehir : Anadolu University
- Aydogan, Ismail and Zehra Cilsal. "Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin yetiştirilme süreci: Türkiye ve diğer ülkeler [ The process of educating foreign language teachers: Turkey and the other countries ]." *Erciyes University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences* 22 (2007): 179-197.
- Aygun, Serkan. Foreign language education in Turkey and Common European Framework. Unpublished master's dissertation. Istanbul: Beykent University, 2008.
- Beretta, Alan. "Evaluating second language education." Evaluation of Language Education: An Overview. Ed. J Charles Alderson and Alan Beretta. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. 4-24.
- Bilen, Muruvvet. *Plandan Uygulamaya Öğretim [Instruction from Theory to Practice ]*. Ankara: Ani Publishing , 1999.
- Billing, David and Harold Thomas. "Evaluating a transnational university quality assessment project in Turkey." *Higher Education Policy* 2000.

- Binnie-Smith, Deborah. "Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom." Freeman, Donald and Jack C. Richards. *Teacher Leaning in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 197-216.
- Bottery, Mike. Education, Policy and Ethics . London : Continuum , 2000.
- Cambridge English Language Assessment. "CELTA, DELTA." Retrieved October 18, 2015, from http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/tr/
- Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus . Retrieved September 9, 2015, from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/sine-qua-non
- Cetin, Yakup. «İngilizcede en çok kullanılan 1000 kelime [ The most frequently used 1000 words in English ].» *Kariyer Penceresi* 4.19 (2014): 23-25.
- Chang, Junyue. «Globalization and English in Chinese higher education.» *World Englishes* 2006: 513-525.
- Copur, Deniz Salli. *Teacher effectiveness in initial years of service: A case study on the graduates of METU language education program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Middle East Technical University . Ankara, Turkey, 2008.
- Cosgun Ogeyik, Muhlise. "Evaluation of English language teaching education curriculum by student teachers." *Journal of Science, Education and Thought* 9.1 (2009).
- Coskun, Abdullah and Aysegul Daloglu. "Evaluating an English language teacher education program through Peacock's model." *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 2010: 23-42.
- Coskun, Abdullah. «The changing face of English.» (2008).
- Council of Europe . *Common European framework of reference for languages*. Cambridge UP: Cambridge, 2001.
- Crandall, Jodi. "Aligning teacher education with teaching." TESOL Matters 1999: 1-21.
- Cullen, Richard. «Incorporating a language improvement component in teacher training programmes .» *ELT Journal* 1994: 162-172.
- Darling- Hammond, Linda ve Peter Youngs. «Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tells us?» *Education Researcher* 2002: 13-25.
- Day, Richard. "Models and the knowledge base of second language teacher education." University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL 1991: 1-13.
- Day, Richard ve John Conklin. *The knowledge base in ESL/EFL teacher education*. Paper presented at the 1992 TESOL Conference . Vancouver, Canada , 1992.
- Demircan, Omer. Dünden Bugüne Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil [ Foreign Language in Turkey from Yesterday to Today ]. Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore , 1988.

- Demirel, Ozcan. Eğitimde Program Geliştirme Kuramdan Uygulamaya [Programme Development in Education from Theory to Practice ]. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing , 2011.
- Demirel, Ozcan. Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirmede karşılaşılan güçlükler [ The difficulties met while educating foreign language teachers in Turkey ].» *Hacettepe University Journal of Education* 6 (1991): 25-39.
- Demirel, Ozcan. *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi [ Foreign Language Teaching ]*. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing , 2012.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, Seran and Zeynep Kiziltepe. "English in Turkey." *World Englishes* 2005: 253-265.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, Seran. «The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile.» *Journal of Multilinguial and Multicultural Development* 1998: 24-39.
- Erozan, Fatos. Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergrauate ELT curriculum at Eastern Mediterrian University: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara, Turkey: Middle East Technical University, 2005.
- Fernsten, Linda ve Jeffrey Fernsten. «Portfolio assessment and reflection: enhancing learning through effective practice.» *Reflective practice: Conference Proceedings "Reflections as a Catalyst of Change* 2005: 303-310.
- Feroz, Ahmad. The Making of Modern Turkey. New York : Routledge , 1993.
- Firth, Alan. «The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'Lingua Franca' English and conversation analysis.» *Journal of Pragmatics* 1996: 237-259.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Runaway World: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Goldhaber, Dan D ve Dominic J Brewer. «Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement.» *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 2000: 129-145.
- Graves, Kathleen. «The curriculum of second language teacher education.» *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* 2009: 115-124.
- Gunes, Bilal. 1945-1980 arası Türkiye'de İngilizce eğitimi [ English education in Turkey between the years 1945-1980 ] . Unpublished master's dissertation . Isparta, Turkey: Suleyman Demirel University , 2009.
- Hammond, Linda Darling. «Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence.» *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 1 January 2000.
- Higher Education Council . «Outline of the Turkish higher education system.» Retrieved December 20, 2015, from http://www.yok.gov.tr/webeng/outline.html. 2001b.

- Higher Education Council. *Teacher education and education faculties*. HEC Publications. Ankara, 2007.
- Higher Education Council. Türkiye yükseköğretim yeterlilikler çerçevesi (TTYÇ), Temel alan yeterlilikleri, öğretmen yetiştirme ve eğitim bilimleri [ Turkey higher education qualifications framework, basic qualifications, teacher training and education sciences ]. HEC Publications. Ankara, 2011.
- Higher Education Council. Eğitim fakültelerinde uygulanacak yeni programlar hakkında açıklama [ The account of new teacher education programmes implemented in education faculties ]. Retrieved November 26, 2015, from https://www.yok.gov.tr/documents/10279/49665/aciklama\_programlar/aa7bd091 -9328-4df7-aafa-2b99edb6872f. Ankara: HEC Publications, 2006.
- Higher Education Council. Eğitim-öğretim, öğretmen yetiştirme [ Report on regulation of faculties of education ] . Retrieved September 13, 2015, from http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/ogretmen/yeni\_programlar\_ve\_icerik.htm. Ankara : HEC Publications, 2008.
- Hismanoglu, Murat. «Does English language teacher education curriculum promote CEFR awareness of prospective EFL teachers?» *3rd World Conference on Learning, Teaching and Educational Leadership (WCLTA-2012)*. 2012. 938-945.
- Hismanoglu, Sibel. "Prospective EFL teachers' views on English Language Teacher Training Program." Journal of Research in Education and Teaching May-June-July 2012: 330-341.
- Johnson, Robert. Language Teacher Education . London , 1998.
- Kachru, Braj and Cecil Nelson. "World Englishes." *Analysing English in a global context: A reader*. Ed. Anne Burns and Caroline Coffin. London: Routledge, 2001. 9-25.
- Karaata, Cemal. «Assumptions and pedagogical knowledge: Teaching and learning according to teachers of English.» *Hacettepe University Journal of Education* 2011: 244-254.
- Karakas, Ali. "Evaluation of the English Language Teacher Education Program in Turkey." *ELT Weekly* 4.15 (2012).
- Kavak, Yuksel, Ayhan Aydin ve Sadegul Akbaba Altun. Öğretmen yetiştirme ve eğitim fakülteleri (1982-2007) [ Teacher training and education faculties (1982-2007) ] . Ankara: HEC Publications , 2007.
- Kavcar, Cahit. «Cumhuriyet döneminde dal öğretmeni yetiştirme [ Training branch teacher in the Republic period ].» Ankara University Journal of Education 2002: 1-14.

- Kir, Elif. OBM (Ortak Başvuru Metni) bağlamında dil öğretmeni eğitimi ve Türkiye'deki uygulamaları [Language teacher education and its implementations in Tukey in terms of a joint submission]. Unpublished doctorate dissertation. Ankara University. Ankara, 2011.
- Kirkgoz, Yasemin. "English language teaching in Turkey: Challanges for the 21st century."
   *Teaching English to The World: History, Curriculum and Practice*. Ed. George Braine.
   Mahwah: Lawrance Erlbaum Associates, 2005. 159-175.
- Kirkgoz, Yasemin. "Globalization and English language policy in Turkey." *Educational Policy* 2008: 1-22.
- Kiziltan, Nalan. «Pre-service EFL teachers' attitudes towards 'Language Acquisition Course'.» Journal of Language and Lingustic Studies April 2011: 72-86.
- Kocaoluk, Fatma ve M.Ş. Kocaoluk. *Primary Education Curriculum 1999-2000*. Istanbul: Kocaoluk Publishers, 2001.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. Language Teacher Education for a Global Society. A Modular Model for Kowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing and Seeing . New York : Routledge : ESL & Applied Linguistics Professional Series , 2012 .
- Laczko Kerr, Ildiko ve David C Berliner. «The effectiveness of "Teach for America" and other under-certified teachers on student academic achievement: A case of harmful public policy.» *Education Policy Analysis Achieves* 2002.
- Lange, Dale. "Implications of recent reports on teacher education reform for departments of foreign languages and literature." *ADFL Bulletin* 1991: 28-34.
- Little, David. «Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy.» *System* 1995: 175-182.
- Murdoch, George. «Language development.» ELT Journal 1994: 253-265.
- Nation, Paul. Teaching and Learning Vocabulary. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 1990.
- Nergis, Aysegul. «Foreign language teacher education in Turkey: A historical overview.» *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2011: 181-185.
- Nunan, David. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- OECD. Education at a glance : OECD indicators. Paris: OECD Publications, 2005.
- Official Gazette . «11.04.2012 Number : 28261.» 2012.
- Peacock, Mary. "The evaluation of Foreign-Language-Teacher Education Programmes." Language Teaching Research 2009: 259-78.
- Piaget, Jean. Biology and Knowledge. Paris: Gallimard, 1967.

- Rea-Dickens, Pauline ve Kevin Germaine. *Evaluation*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Richards, Jack C. ve Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Rivkin, Steven G, Eric A Hanushek ve John F Kain. «Teachers, schools, and academic achievement.» *Econometrica* 2005: 417–458.
- Robins, Kevin. "Questions of cultural identity." *Interrupting Identities: Turkey/Europe*. Ed. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay. London: Sage Publications, 1996. 30-52.
- Saglam, Gulderen. *Perceived roles, responsibilities and challanges of CT's in the procedure of teaching practice in practicum*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Middle East Technical University . Ankara, 2007.
- Sakar, Nurhan. «Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Lisans Programı [ Anadolu University Distance Education Faculty English Language Teaching Undergraduate Programme ] .» Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences 3.1 (2001): 179-188.
- Sali, Pinar. Novice EFL teachers' perceived challenges and support needs in their journey to become effective teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Eskisehir : Anadolu University, 2008.
- Salihoglu, Umut M. «Pre-service English language teacher education: "The Turkish case".» Contemporary Online Language Education Journal 2012: 151-168.
- Salihoglu, Umut M. «Pre-service teachers' and their instructors beliefs on the effectiveness of an English Language Teacher Education Program.» *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2012: 3440-3444.
- Samarin, William J. «Lingua Franca.» Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society 1. 1987. 371-374.
- Saricoban, Gulay ve Arif Saricoban. «Atatürk and the history of foreign language education.» *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* April 2012: 24-49.
- Schrier, Leslie. "Developing language teachers for a changing world." Prospects for Professionalization of Foreign Language Teaching. Ed. Gail Guntermann. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1993. 105-23.
- Seferoglu, Golge. «Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English Teacher Education Programme in Turkey.» *Journal of Education for Teaching* 2006: 369-378.
- Shulman, Lee S. "Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform ." *Harward Educational Review* February 1987.

- Shulman, Lee S. «Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching.» *Educational Researcher* 1986: 4-14.
- The Ministry of National Education . «2001 Yılı Başında Milli Eğitim [ Ministry of National Education in 2001 ].» Retrieved September 12, 2015, from http://www.meb.gov.tr/stats/ist2001/Bolum6s1.htm. 2001.
- The Ministry of National Education. «İlköğretim okulu 4. ve 5. Sınıf yabancı dil (İngilizce ) öğretim programı [ Primary Education Grades 4 and 5 foreign language (English ) curriculum Number : 2481.» MONE Official Journal. 1997b.
- The Ministry of National Education. *İlköğretim ve eğitim kanunu [ The primary education and education act ] Resmi Gazete [ Official Gazette ]. Number : 23084*. Ankara: General Directorate of the Turkish Ministry, 1997a.
- The Ministry of National Education. Öğretmen yeterlikleri: Öğretmenlik mesleği genel ve özel alan yeterlikleri [ Teacher competencies: General and specific field in teaching profession ]. State Books Directorate. Ankara, 2008.
- Tok, Hidayet. *The comparison of foreign language curriculums applied in both European Union countries and Turkey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Malatya: Inonu University, 2006.
- Tomlinson, John. *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press , 1999.
- Tosun, Ismail. «Feasibility study on the establishment of an academic assessment mechanism and structure for higher education in Turkey.» 2001.
- Trinity College London. «CertTESOL, LTCL DipTESOL.» Retrieved October 10, 2015, from http://www.trinitycollege.com/site/?id=293.
- Tsui, Amy Bik May ve James Tollefson. «Language policy, culture and identity in Asian contexts.» *Language Policy and The Construction of National Cultural Identity*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007. 1-21.
- Turkmen, Lale. "The history of development of Turkish elementary teacher education and the place of science courses in the curriculum." *Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* 2007: 327-341.
- Ultanır, Gürcan. Eğitimde Planlama ve Değerlendirmede Kuram ve Teknikler [ Theories and Techniques in Planning and Evaluation in Education ]. Ankara: Nobel Publishing , 2003.
- Ustunoglu, Evrim. "What can Turkey learn from other countries regarding English language. A brief account of language teacher training and teaching from other countries." Journal of the Ministry of National Education 37.179 (2008): 322-332.
- Washburn, George. *Fifty Years in Constantinople and Recollections of Robert College*. New York : Houghton Mifflin Company , 1909.

Weir, Cyril ve Jon Roberts. Evaluation in ELT. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

- Yavuz, Aysun and Ece Zehir Topkaya. "Teacher educators' evaluation of the English Language Teaching Program : A Turkish case." *Novitas Royal Research on Youth and Language* 2013: 64-83.
- Yavuz, Aysun. «Understanding student teachers' effectiveness through journals at an English language teaching department: A Turkish university case.» *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies* 2007: 19-43.

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

Şaziye KARATAŞ completed her undergraduate degree at İstanbul University Hasan Ali Yücel Education Faculty English Language Teaching department in 2012 ranking as the first student with a high honour's degree. As soon as she graduated, she started to work as an English teacher at state MONE schools. After having worked at a vocational high school in Esenvurt for 3 years, she started to work at an Anatolian high school in Esenler in June, 2015 and she is still working there. She began her post-graduate study in 2013 and she expects to finish her MA this year, 2016 and later she hopes to study her PhD on English Language Teaching department. Besides, she travelled to Czech Republic within the scope of Erasmus+ project in July, 2016 to get a training on digital material development for teaching English effectively on real classroom settings. Nowadays, she is attending a 22-week refresher course in the name of "Language Academy" offered for English teachers under responsibility of İstanbul Directorate of Ministry of National Education to contribute the continuous professional development and be more beneficial to her students and the community by learning creative ideas in teaching along with valuable insights from recent researches in the field, building a stronger network among the colleagues and reflecting on her own teaching.