

# The Pedagogical Courses in the ELT Program in Turkish Higher Education: How Efficient are They?

By

*Levent Uzun*

Uludag University, Faculty of Education, ELT Department, Bursa, Turkey.

## Abstract

*The present study investigated the efficiency of the educational courses that have been included in the latest English Language Teacher Training Program (ELTTP) at universities in Turkey and run since the 2006 and 2007 educational year. The participants were 90 teacher trainees who were attending their last year in the Faculty of Education at Uludag University. Sources of data included a questionnaire by which teacher trainees were asked to rate each educational course that they have received, and interviews through which participants were asked to rate themselves about their sufficiency and competencies as prospective language teachers with relation to ELTTP and their personal qualities and characteristics. Results revealed that students benefited more from the English educational courses compared to the Turkish educational courses, and that the source of their competencies was their own personal qualities rather than the quality of the educational program. The present study speculated that the courses determined for the new foreign language teacher training programs needed more careful revision and restructuring if the intention is to graduate internationally eligible language teachers whose linguistic and pedagogical capabilities will meet the requirements of the rapidly changing world. The study ended with suggestions related to teacher training programs and the philosophies and approaches to ELT education.*

**Keywords:** *Teacher education, Program evaluation, Educational practices, Educational quality, Turkish higher education.*

## 1. Introduction

Teacher training programs (TTP) in Turkey have undergone an extensive investigation and modification since institutions and faculties of education were established (see Salihoglu, 2012). This interest in teacher education and TTP has emerged from the innovative approaches to and models of teaching, which have been suggested by the trends and findings of the time. Turkish national policies seem to have been heavily affected majorly and mostly by the trends and improvements in Europe and the USA. In an attempt to be recognised and accredited by the world, Turkish universities have been triggered and led to follow the global trends with regard to educational philosophies and policies. Nevertheless, although there has been a tendency to follow the global trends, the Turkish educational system has experienced a conflict between the Ministry of National Education (MEB- MilliEgitimBakanligi), which is an institution responsible for the practical side of education, and the Council of Higher Education (YÖK-Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu) that plans and organises the theoretical part. The controversy between the actual need in practice and the imposed theoretical beliefs has created a gap which has caused some problems unique to Turkey. Yavuz (2007) asserted that the gap is rooted in the lack of communication between those two institutions. Additionally, one might postulate that actually the matter stems from the cultural, political, and philosophical war between the authorities in education. Moreover, another fact is that Turkey is a country where a strong top-down tradition exists, which reinforces the hierarchical settings and circumstances, and reduces tolerant and equitable discussions among the stakeholders.

Although a huge amount of research related to program and curriculum evaluation (e.g. Romeo and Dyer, 2004; Seferoglu, 2006; Erdem, 2009; Lee et. al., 2008; Dunworth, 2008; Angell et. al., 2008; Coskun and Daloglu, 2010; Peacock, 2009; Ögeyik, 2009) as well as research on teacher education (e.g. Lozano et. al., 2002; Erozan, 2005; Oguz, 2009; Lozano et. al., 2004; Fox and Diaz-Greenberg, 2006; Hardin et. al.,

2010) exists in the literature, there is hardly any evidence about the effect of the educational/pedagogic courses within teacher training programs, which also compare the impact of the L1 and L2 medium courses in relation to language teaching abilities and skills. The present research aims at filling this gap by addressing the Turkish educational context. The main motivation of the present study originates from the need to criticise and overcome the top-down system in Turkey, with specific aim to reveal the thoughts, beliefs, and needs of students related to the latest English Language Teacher Training Program (ELTTP) that was launched in the 2006-2007 educational year, in the Faculties of Education throughout the universities in Turkey. The philosophical perspective of the present study is primarily “down” oriented rather than “top” in terms of the ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ discussion. Therefore, teacher trainees were allowed and asked to evaluate some specific courses that have been selected for them to study by the top; instead of asking some authorities to evaluate the process or the success of the imposed courses.

Throughout the current paper, the words ‘pedagogical’ and ‘educational’ will be used interchangeably to imply the meaning relating to teaching methods or to the practice of teaching or education.

### ***Educational reforms and their implementation***

Hargreaves (1994) pointed out that the purpose of schooling is to provide a nation with a qualified workforce and also to ensure that culture, language, and national identity are transmitted to the next generations, which in turn makes educational reforms ideologically and politically very important. Garm and Karlsen (2004) remarked that although educational reforms might be seen as actions with a national mission and agenda, they emerge from the global processes. And, according to Giddens (1998), globalisation might be regarded as a new era which leads to a postmodern society. Undoubtedly, postmodern approaches would require authorities to take steps in accordance with the dynamics of the present and the future rather than desperately keeping on old practices and memorised routines. Therefore, global trends in teacher education, as in all other areas, seem inevitable (Garm, 2002). That is why different perspectives and new approaches to reforms in teacher education and teaching practices are most probably to be adopted by governmental authorities, if not today, certainly in the future. While informing about the educational reforms carried out in Norway and Europe, Garm and Karlsen (2004) stated that experience has taught that instability is the real stability. In other words, the only thing that never changes is change itself. So, there is no place to be scared or to avoid new and different practices for any reason. Yet, Deci (2009) noted that a successful reform requires that all stakeholders accept and internalise all components, and also the related issues of the reform. Many researchers have suggested that feelings of ownership and commitment occur when a reform is designed in such a way that it satisfies the various needs of all stakeholders (e.g. Ryan, 1995; Ryan and Deci, 2000b).

Unfortunately, it would be very hard to propose that reforms in Turkey are laid out with a similar perspective and philosophy to those explained in the previous paragraph. What is more, it seems that reforms do not undergo similar procedures with respect to the involved stakeholders, but are mostly imposed directly by the authorities, and usually the opinions of the bottom (i.e. students, parents, teachers, and even academicians, etc.) are neglected by the top (i.e. the policy makers). The current ELTTP, for instance, seems to be far from displaying the characteristics of a collaboratively prepared and organised curriculum; not only because it does not offer the most interesting and efficient content to the students but also because it does not allow them the flexibility to choose from among a rich variety of elective courses or to organise their individual programs.

### ***The ELTTP in Turkey***

The latest ELTTP in Turkey was determined, restructured, and launched in the 2006-2007 educational year by YÖK. Although there might be some slight differences among the names, content, and procedure of performing the courses in different universities, the package program is implemented uniformly in English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments throughout Turkey. The courses within this package program might be grouped under four main titles, namely *technical courses*, *foreign language (L2-L3)*

*courses, historical and general knowledge courses, and pedagogical courses.* The courses of those four groups are presented in Table 1.

The foreign language courses focus directly on linguistic knowledge and competencies (e.g. Contextual Grammar, Advanced Reading and Writing, Listening and Pronunciation, Vocabulary Acquisition, etc.), while the technical courses are assumed to contribute to the knowledge of the specific field which is foreign language (FL) education in general and English language (EL) education in particular in the current conditions. Therefore, the technical courses focus on further matters related to FL and/or EL (e.g. Linguistics, Pragmatics, Syntax, Discourse Analysis, etc.) as well as the supportive fields that may help in the educational process and implementation of FL and/or EL education (e.g. Computers, English Literature, Scientific Research Methods, Measurement and Evaluation, etc.). Besides these, there are courses that aim at improving L1 competencies and historical knowledge and citizenship awareness (e.g. Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolutions, Turkish Writing and Speaking, History of Turkish Education, etc.). On the other hand, as a unique feature of Faculties of Education, pedagogical courses are anticipated to develop, or to contribute to pedagogical awareness and abilities, that is, to the very basic components of the "teaching" profession, regardless of the action field or teaching area (e.g. Introduction to Educational Sciences, Psychology of Education, Special Teaching Methods, Teaching English to Young Learners, etc.). The total number of educational courses within the whole program is 19 (13 delivered in English and 6 delivered in Turkish). In short, it would be possible to divide the pedagogical courses into two groups, as TMEC (Turkish-medium educational courses), and EMEC (English-medium educational courses).

In an earlier study, Coskun and Daloglu (2010) proposed a classification of the pedagogic competence courses in the Turkish ELTTP, which has been improved in the present study by classifying the courses under four main titles, and thus, changing the place of some of the courses as a more detailed and appropriate approach to classification.

**Table 1. The courses of the ELT package program in Turkey.**

Technical courses	Foreign Language (L2-3) courses	Historical and general knowledge courses	Pedagogical courses
Computer I-II	Contextual Grammar I-II	Atatürk's Principles and History of Revolutions I-II-III	Introduction to Educational Sciences
English Literature I-II	Advanced Reading and Writing I-II	History of Turkish Revolution (Nutuk)	Psychology of Education
Linguistics I-II	Listening and Pronunciation I-II	Turkish I: Writing Expression	<i>Approaches to ELT I-II</i>
Language Acquisition	Oral Communication Skills I-II	Turkish II: Speaking Expression	Instruction Principles and Methods
Scientific Research Methods	Effective Communication Skills	History of Turkish Education	<i>Special Teaching Methods I-II</i>
Short Story Analysis and Teaching	Vocabulary Acquisition	Community Service Applications	<i>Teaching Technologies and Planning Materials</i>

The Pedagogical Courses in the ELT Program in Turkish Higher Education: How Efficient are They?

Poetry Analysis	Translation (English-Turkish)	Turkish Educational System and School Management	<i>Teaching English to Young Learners I-II</i>
Novel Analysis and Teaching	Oral Expression and Public Speaking		<i>Teaching Language Skills I-II</i>
Measurement and Evaluation	Second Foreign Language I-II-III		Classroom Management
Elective I (Pragmatics)	Translation (Turkish-English)		<i>Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development</i>
English Language Testing and Evaluation			<b><i>School Experience</i></b>
Elective III (Discourse Analysis)			Guidance
Syntax			Special Education
			<i>Elective II (CALL)</i>
			<b><i>Teaching Practice</i></b>
<b>44 credits</b> <b>ECTS</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>49 credits</b> <b>58</b> <b>ECTS</b>	<b>12 credits</b> <b>19 ECTS</b> <b>56 credits</b> <b>95</b> <b>ECTS</b>

\* Italic courses are EMEC. Bold and italic courses are practicing courses that are carried out at primary and high schools.

Regarding the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), the total credit number of the program is 240, within which the ECTS credits of the technical, FL, historical and general knowledge, and pedagogical courses is 68, 58, 19, and 95 respectively. Table 2 presents the ECTS credits of the TMEC and the EMEC with regard to the years and semesters when they were included in the ELTTP.

**Table 2. The credits and ECTS credits of the TMEC and EMEC.**

Year	Semester	TMEC		EMEC	
		Credits	ECTS	Credits	ECTS
<b>I</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>	3	4	-	-
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3	4	-	-
<b>II</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>	3	4	3	4
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	-	-	9	14
<b>III</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2	3	9	17
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	-	-	6	12
<b>IV</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>	5	9	6	11
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	-	-	7	13
<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>71</b>

The two practical courses (School Experience and Teaching Practice), which have been considered within the EMEC in the present study, actually might be regarded as categorically different than other courses since these courses necessitate direct implementation of practical skills in real environments rather than concentrating on theoretical knowledge in classroom settings. Therefore, if these two courses were excluded from the total evaluations, the picture would appear to be as follows: TMEC (n=6; ECTS=24)

and EMEC (n=11; ECTS=58). In this respect, it might be noted that the program seems to be in line with its aim, which is equipping EL teachers with pedagogical sufficiency in the target language for global purposes. YÖK has launched the current program with a claim that it would solve the existing problems in FL teacher training in Turkey, and would graduate efficient and capable teachers who would serve not only Turkish society but also the ‘world’. The weight of the EMEC embedded in the program is more than twice that of the TMEC (the situation is almost the same in all foreign language teacher training programs in Turkey). Nevertheless, not only the content and quality of the program but also its shape might be the subject of much debate, because FL teaching approaches and methods as well as techniques and learner needs, attitudes, beliefs, and opinions differ significantly, yet the package program together with all its components is not flexible enough to deal with these divergences, nor does it provide room for personalised initiative and individual progress. Moreover, due to the authority-guided educational tradition in Turkey, both the attitudes and manners of the educators and also the habits of the learners seem to need serious treatment in order to improve the general line of vision and understanding of human education. Additionally, according to the personal observation of the researcher, in some circumstances the present situation in the ELTTP is considered (by FL practitioners and teacher trainees) as an invasion of Turkish educationalists in the field of FL teaching, which falls far behind the goals and perspectives of FL education. That is why the ongoing informal criticisms and discussions related to the weight and efficacy of the TMEC in the ELTTP need to be attended to closely and in a more careful manner.

Focusing on the educational courses, the present study aimed at eliciting the opinions of teacher trainees to reveal to what degree the claim of YÖK has been realised, and to find out to what degree the pedagogical courses have helped students become effective ‘international teachers’. The present study aimed at finding answers to the following questions:

1. Which educational courses (Turkish or English) are more effective or beneficial for the teacher trainees in improving their pedagogical awareness or basic skills and abilities that are necessary for the teaching profession?
2. What are the students’ opinions related to the contribution of the courses to their teaching skills and abilities with regard to the content, procedures, and lecturers of the courses?
3. What are the students’ perceptions related to their education and self-efficacy as prospective teachers of English language with regard to the ELTTP and their personal qualities and characteristics?

## 2. Methodology

During the data collection, the present study adopted both the quantitative approach that was realised by the help of a 5-point Likert scale, and the qualitative approach that was implemented by the help of face-to-face interviews, which were carried out with the purpose of ensuring a crosscheck. Having noted this, however, rather than arguing about the quantitative and qualitative paradigms, it might be more beneficial to stress and discuss the *top-down* versus *bottom-up* approaches in the implementation of data collecting procedures. The current study is claimed to be essentially bottom-up in nature since it asks the trainees to express their feelings and opinions rather than consulting the educators or curriculum developers with regard to the efficacy of the ELTTP. This approach could be postulated to be the healthiest and most appropriate in the present setting and conditions, because, after all is said and done, it turns out to be as the audience perceives and digests, regardless of what the management claims. Therefore, besides emphasising the type of the data, perhaps the source of the data, and the procedure by which they were collected should be principally and strongly stressed as a much more significant factor to consider, especially in the social sciences where the problems are deeply rooted within the nature of human beings.

### *Participants*

The participants were 90 (30% of the total fourth grade/ last year) teacher trainees who were all enrolled in the ELT Department in the Faculty of Education at Uludag University, and had just completed their education by successfully accomplishing all the tasks and examinations throughout the 8 semesters of the

ELTTP, and were ready to receive their graduation diplomas. Their age ranged between 22 and 24. The participants (60 female and 30 male) were randomly selected from among the volunteers in the 2010-2011 educational year.

### ***Instruments***

Data collection tools (a Likert scale questionnaire and interview questionnaire) were designed, prepared and validated (through piloting with a separate group) by the researcher. The Likert-scale questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was designed to assess the effect of Turkish and English educational courses; and the interview questionnaire (see Appendix 2) aimed at eliciting student opinions related to the contribution of the educational courses regarding the content, lecturer, and procedure of the courses. Teacher trainees' self-perceptions about their sufficiency as prospective language teachers were also collected in the interview questionnaire with relation to the ELTTP, and to their own personal qualities and characteristics. Both of the questionnaires were prepared and presented in Turkish to ensure that any possible language barriers would be eliminated.

### ***Procedure***

Data collection procedures were carried out in three sessions. First, the Likert-scale questionnaire (LSQ) was applied during the last week (out of the usual course hours) of the second semester in the 2010-2011 educational year, and took no longer than 10 minutes for each individual. There were totally 19 educational courses (13 EMEC and 6 TMEC) to be evaluated. The participants were asked to rate each course by giving a point between 1 and 5 (1 less – 5 more) to indicate how effective was each course in contributing to their teaching skills and competencies. The total points for each course were calculated and the mean scores were estimated.

The second stage, which was the application of the interview questionnaire (IQ), was carried out face to face and individually. In the first part of the second step, the participants were asked whether the educational courses contributed to their teaching skills and competencies, and if the response was positive, whether this was because of the content, lecturer/instructor, or the procedures by which the courses were carried out. In the second part, the teacher trainees were asked to rate themselves concerning their sufficiency as prospective language teachers with relation to the ELTTP and to their personal qualities and characteristics. In other words, the trainees were asked whether they considered themselves sufficient and well-equipped as prospective FL teachers; and whether they felt so thanks to the ELTTP or to their individual qualities and personalities. The interview session took no longer than 5 minutes for each trainee. For the second part of the IQ the total points for each item were calculated and the mean scores were estimated.

The third part was carried out with regard to the two sets of EMEC (Special Teaching Methods I and II and Teaching Language Skills I and II) that were rated below the average by the participants. The researcher shared the results and informed participants that the two sets of courses were rated below the average of EMEC, and asked the teacher trainees to respond individually and anonymously to the forwarded open-ended question (related to the probable reason of the obtained result) in a written form, which were all short paragraphs of one or two sentences. The collected papers were subjected to content analysis, and common concerns were recorded.

## **3. Results and Discussion**

The criteria of evaluation of the results were determined on a scale of 1 to 5 similarly to the Likert scale as follows:

1- Inefficient, 2- Poor, 3- Moderate, 4- Efficient, 5- Very efficient

Therefore, prior to analysing the results, it was determined that any record below 4 would be evaluated as an indicator of insufficient efficiency, while 4 and over would count as adequate and efficient. Table 3 presents the total points and mean scores that were given by the trainees for each educational course with regard to what degree these courses contributed to their teaching skills and abilities.

**Table 3. The total and mean scores of the educational courses in the ELTT program.**

Course Name	Total Point	Mean Score	Total Mean
Introduction to Educational Sciences	242	2,69	3,17
Psychology of Education	302	3,35	
Instruction Principles and Methods	310	3,44	
Classroom Management	314	3,49	
Guidance	278	3,09	
Special Education	264	2,93	
<i>Teaching Technologies and Planning Materials</i>	402	4,47	4,02
<i>Approaches to ELT I</i>	372	4,13	
<i>Approaches to ELT II</i>	378	4,2	
<i>Special Teaching Methods I</i>	312	3,47*	
<i>Special Teaching Methods II</i>	290	3,22*	
<i>Teaching English to Young Learners I</i>	422	4,69	
<i>Teaching English to Young Learners II</i>	404	4,49	
<i>Teaching Language Skills I</i>	306	3,4*	
<i>Teaching Language Skills II</i>	284	3,16*	
<i>Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development</i>	360	4,00	
<i>Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL)</i>	361	4,01	
<i>School Experience</i>	398	4,42	
<i>Teaching Practice</i>	410	4,56	

According to the findings, the lowest mean score of TMEC was  $M=2.69$  and the highest was  $M=3.49$ ; while the lowest mean score of EMEC was  $M=3.16$  and the highest was  $M=4.69$ . It might be noticed that except for two sets of EMEC (Special Teaching Methods I-II,  $M=3.47$  and  $M=3.22$  respectively; and Teaching Language Skills I-II,  $M=3.4$  and  $M=3.16$  respectively) the scores of all other courses were  $M=4$  and above. However, the scores of all Turkish educational courses were below  $M=3.50$ . This indicator showed that students perceived EMEC as more beneficial, and rated them to have contributed more to their teaching skills and abilities, while TMEC were apparently seen as less beneficial, and thus, received lower scores. This could be observed in the total mean scores ( $M=3.17$  for TMEC;  $M=4.02$  for EMEC) as well.

Having recorded these findings, I investigated why the two sets of EMEC received low scores from the students. The conclusion that I reached after the interview sessions was that somehow the lecturers of the courses were responsible for this result. The participants who rated the Special Teaching Methods I and II with scores lower than the total mean expressed that the lecturer of the course did not attend the classes regularly, and that the lecturer was somehow not very interested in the procedure of the course delivery,

or that the lecturer left everything on the shoulders of the students without providing them with sufficient knowledge and support. Likewise, for the Teaching Language Skills I and II courses, trainees indicated that the lecturer had a huge teaching load of more than 36 hours per week, and thus, did not allocate equal time and energy for each individual or group. The participants also added that the lecturer criticised them a lot, and that no matter how well they did, it would be not good enough for the lecturer. They also complained that the lecturer went too much into details, and that preparation for the classes tired them a great deal.

To sum up, the rating of the EMEC surpassed the rating of the TMEC by an average of approximately 1 point. The total average score of the six TMEC was  $M=3.17$ , while the total average score of the thirteen EMEC was  $M=4.02$ . The two sets of EMEC that received relatively low ratings from the students were determined to be delivered by the same two lecturers, whose teaching styles were assessed negatively by the trainees. When those two sets of courses were excluded, the estimated total average was  $M=4.33$ . Therefore, it became clear that the perception and evaluation of the teacher trainees was in favour of the EMEC with regard to the contribution of the pedagogical courses to their teaching skills and abilities.

In addition to these quantitative data that were obtained by the help of the LSQ, considerable qualitative data were collected by the help of the IQ. The findings acquired through the interview sessions are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Teacher trainees’ opinions related to the contribution of the courses to their teaching skills and abilities, and their opinions about their education and self-efficacy as prospective teachers of English language.**

	YES	NO		n	
<i>Question 1</i> The educational courses contributed to my teaching skills and abilities	68	22	thanks to...	the content of the courses	21
				the lecturers of the courses	44
				the course procedure	3
<i>Question 2</i> I believe that I have been trained well and have become a good teacher candidate	81	9	thanks to...	the ELTTP	11
				my own personality and characteristics	70

As a result of the interview sessions carried out with the participants, it was observed that a dominating number of trainees believed that they had been trained well and become good and sufficient teachers ( $n=81$ ) as well as that the stated courses had contributed to their pedagogical skills ( $n=68$ ). Most of the participants ( $n=44$ ), from among the ones who responded positively to Question 1, indicated that the evaluated courses contributed to their teaching skills and sufficiency thanks to the lecturers of the courses, while some of the participants ( $n=21$ ) indicated that the mentioned courses contributed to their teaching abilities owing to the content; and the rest of the participants ( $n=3$ ) stated that the procedure of the course delivery initially affected their improvement of pedagogical capabilities. It was also recorded that the majority of the trainees ( $n=70$ ) believed that they had become good teacher candidates thanks to their own qualities and characteristics, while the remaining participants ( $n=11$ ) believed that primarily the ELTTP program had helped them in becoming good teacher candidates.

To review, the ratings and opinions of the participants showed that except for the two sets of courses, students benefited more from the EMEC compared to the TMEC. The problematic EMEC were revealed to be so due to lecturer related issues. Furthermore, the majority of the students expressed that the pedagogical courses contributed to their teaching skills and abilities, which was indicated to be mostly thanks to the positive contribution of the lecturers. Again, the trainees reported that they had become good teacher candidates, which was claimed to have been realised thanks to their own characteristics rather than to the provided TTP package. In this sense, although it would not be possible to generalise, the local indices clearly showed that teacher training in Turkey is mostly instructor/lecturer-based rather than program-based. Therefore, prior to making modifications in the ELTTP, it might be a more stable solution (although not so philosophically) to modify the educational perspectives and approaches of the educators, as the educational processes seems to depend heavily on them rather than being bound to the program, and thus, to the system. Moreover, it would be possible to speculate that if there are symptoms of failure, these would stem mostly from teacher related issues rather than from program or student related ones. In addition, it might be useful to provoke discussions with regard to the higher education programs that according to the trainees do not provide them with the necessary conditions and knowledge to practice. That is why it might be a good idea to shift from fixed and strict package programs to more flexible and customisable ones. It seems that students of the current age need permissiveness and room for individual initiative more than ever before, so that each of them can construct and follow their own paths and achieve self-realisation in their unique styles or ways. Unfortunately, the present research revealed that neither the educational tradition nor the formal educational settings succeed in doing this.

#### 4. Conclusion

In brief, it will be possible to train teachers who possess high quality linguistic and pedagogical capabilities only when appropriate programs, the content of which should be organised and determined by the consensus of all stakeholders, are provided; and also by following the innovation and trends as well as good and effective teaching practices all around the world. Additionally, there might be benefit in adopting a bottom-up approach while setting programs or structuring new methodologies rather than imposing predetermined ideas from the top. Education should be seen as a process which provides opportunities to individuals of various needs and interests, and thus, should primarily and always ask about the opinions of the students, and only then taking lecturers' evaluations into consideration. Perhaps it is only this approach that might cultivate progressive results in education in the current age of globalisation, technology, and so forth.

FL teachers, in local terms, might improve much more (not only their pedagogic skills and abilities but also their linguistic levels) if fewer Turkish educational courses and more foreign language courses occupy the programs. This will contribute both to the knowledge and efficacy of the teacher candidates and allow for further improvement of the foreign language teaching approaches and methodology as well as for creation of new materials and even philosophies. However, it would always be wise to remember that the courses in any given program mean nothing on their own without the presence and perceptions of firstly the trainees and secondly the trainers. It should not be forgotten that in the current age of social media and information, trends are not created by the authorities but by societies, which are formed by individuals that up to now have been situated at the very bottom.

#### References

- Angell, J. et. al., (2008). Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: Selecting Textbooks for College-Level Language Programs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 562-572.
- Ögeyik, M.C. (2009). Evaluation of English Language Teaching Education Curriculum by Student Teachers. *Bilim, EgitimveDüşünceDergisi*, 9(1).

- Coskun, A. and Daloglu, A. (2010).Evaluating an English Language Teacher Education Program through Peacock's Model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 24-42.
- Deci, E.L. (2009). Large-scale school reform as viewed from the self-determination theory perspective. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 244-253.
- Dunworth, K. (2008). Ideas and Realities: Investigating Good Practice in the Management of Transnational English Language Programmes for the Higher Education Sector. *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(2), 95-107.
- Erdem, A. (2009). Comparing the language curriculums of Turkey and Ireland. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 1, 529-535.
- Erozan, F. (2005). Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergraduate ELT curriculum at Eastern Mediterranean University: A case study. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey*.
- Fox, R.K. and Diaz-Greenberg, R. (2006). Culture, multiculturalism, and foreign/world language standards in U.S. teacher preparation programs: toward a discourse of dissonance. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(3), 401-422.
- Garm, N. (2002). *The impact of globalization and national counter forces in Russian education*. Paper presented at NERA's congress in Tallin, March 7-9.
- Garm, N. and Karlsen, G.E. (2004). Teacher education reform in Europe: the case of Norway; trends and tensions in a global perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 731-744.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *Runaway world. How globalization is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Hardin, B.J. et. al., (2010). Teachers, Families, and Communities Supporting English Language Learners in Inclusive Pre-Kindergartens: An Evaluation of a Professional Development Model. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 31, 20-36.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times*. London: Cassell.
- Lee, Y-F.et. al., (2008). Practices and challenges in educational program evaluation in the Asia-Pacific region: Results of a Delphi study. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 31, 368-375.
- Lozano, A.S. et. al., (2002).Evaluation of Professional Development for Language Teachers in California. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(2), 161-170.
- Lozano, A.S. et. al., (2004).A Statewide Professional Development Program for California Foreign Language Teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), 268-277.
- Oguz, A. (2009). An Evaluation Of The Suitability Of Practices In Teacher Training Programs For The Constructivism Depending On The Teacher Trainees' Views. *Ankara University Journal of Educational Sciences*, 42(1), 129-155.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278.
- Romeo, K. and Dyer, M. (2004).Adapting to Changing Needs: A Teacher-led Japanese FLES Program. *Learning Languages*, 10(1), 10-15.
- Ryan, R.M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 397-427.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.

- Salihoglu, U.M. (2012). Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education: The Turkish Case. *Contemporary Online Language Education Journal*, 2(1), 151-168.
- Seferoglu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(4), 369-378.
- Yavuz, A. (2007). Understanding student teachers' effectiveness through journals at an English language teaching department: a Turkish university case. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*, 12(2), 19-43.
- YÖK (The Council of Higher Education) ELT Program and Course Content Descriptions. [http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/ogretmen/yeni\\_programlar\\_ve\\_icerik.htm](http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/ogretmen/yeni_programlar_ve_icerik.htm).

## Appendices

### Appendix 1

Aşağıdakiders “**öğretmenlikbeceriveyeterliliklerimiçinkatkıdabulundu**” önermesiçinlütfen 1 ile 5 arasındabir not veriniz. (1=az →5=çok)

Please rate the following courses between 1 to 5 (1=less →5=more) with regard to the following expression: “**The following course contributed to my teaching skills and competencies.**”

	1	2	3	4	5
<b>YEAR I</b>					
<b>Semester 1</b>					
Introduction to Educational Sciences					
<b>Semester 2</b>					
Psychology of Education					
<b>YEAR II</b>					
<b>Semester 3</b>					
<i>Approaches to ELT I</i>					
Instruction Principles and Methods					
<b>Semester 4</b>					
<i>Approaches to ELT II</i>					
<i>Teaching Technologies and Planning Materials</i>					
<i>Special Teaching Methods I</i>					
<b>YEAR III</b>					
<b>Semester 5</b>					
<i>Special Teaching Methods II</i>					
<i>Teaching English to Young Learners I</i>					
Classroom Management					
<i>Teaching Language Skills I</i>					
<b>Semester 6</b>					
<i>Teaching English to Young Learners II</i>					
<i>Teaching Language Skills II</i>					
<b>YEAR IV</b>					
<b>Semester 7</b>					
<i>Language Teaching Materials Adaptation and Development</i>					
Guidance					
Special Education					
<i>School Experience</i>					
<b>Semester 8</b>					
<i>Elective II (CALL- Computer Assisted Language Learning)</i>					
<i>Teaching Practice</i>					

## Appendix 2

### A. Part 1

Yukarıdabelirtilendersleröğretmenlikbeceriveyeterliliklerimiçinkatkıdabulundu:  
(The courses stated above contributed to my teaching skills and competencies:)

EVET (YES)  HAYIR (NO)

Eğercevabınız EVET ise: (If your answer is YES:)

1. Dersleriniçeriğindendolayımı (Thanks to the content of the courses)
2. Derslerinhocalarındandolayımı (Thanks to the lecturers of the courses)
3. Derslerinişlenişşeklindendolayımı (Thanks to the procedure of the courses)
4. Diğer (lütfenbelirtiniz) ... Other (please specify) ...

### B. Part 2

**İyibiröğretmenadayıolduğumainanıyorum:**  
(I believe that I have become a good teacher candidate:)

EVET (YES)  HAYIR (NO)

Eğercevabınız EVET ise: (If your answer is YES:)

1. İngilizceÖğretmeniYetiştirmeProgramındandolayımı   
(Thanks to the English Language Teacher Training Program)
2. Kendiöznitelikvekişiliğinzendolayımı   
(Thanks to my own qualities and character)
3. Diğer (lütfenbelirtiniz) ... Other (please specify) ...

### C. Part 3

**Aşağıdakiderslersizcenedortalamanınaltındapuanlandırılmışolabilir?**  
(Why do you think the following courses were rated below the average?)

- *Special Teaching Methods I*
- *Special Teaching Methods II*
- *Teaching Language Skills I*
- *Teaching Language Skills II*