

**A COMPLEMENTARY STUDY ON EUROPEAN
PORTFOLIO FOR STUDENT TEACHERS OF LANGUAGES
IN RELATION TO THE EUROPEAN PROFILING GRID**

**DİL ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARINA YÖNELİK AVRUPA
PORTFOLYOSU ÜZERİNE AVRUPA PROFİL BELİRLEME
GRİDİ İLE İLİŞKİLİ TAMAMLAYICI BİR ÇALIŞMA**

Ayfer SU BERGİL

Hacettepe Üniversitesi

Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bilim Dalı İçin Öngördüğü

Doktora Tezi

olarak hazırlanmıştır.


2015

To The Graduate School of Educational Sciences,

This work named "A Complementary Study on European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) in Relation to The European Profiling Grid" by Ayfer SU BERGİL has been approved as a **Dissertation for Ph. D. Degree** in the division of **English Language Teaching** by the below mentioned Examining Committee Members.

Head

Prof. Dr. Mehmet DEMİREZEN




Member(Supervisor)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN



Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nalan KIZILTAN




Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tefik CEPHE



Member

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hüseyin ÖZ



APPROVAL

This thesis has been approved as a thesis for Ph. D. Degree in the department of English Language Teaching by the board of directors of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences.

..... / /

Prof. Dr. Berrin AKMAN

Director of Graduate School of Educational Sciences

A COMPLEMENTARY STUDY ON EUROPEAN PORTFOLIO FOR STUDENT TEACHERS OF LANGUAGES IN RELATION TO THE EUROPEAN PROFILING GRID

Ayfer SU BERGİL

ABSTRACT

The current practices in the field of foreign language teacher education have a heavy inclination to make use of traditional means especially throughout the assessment process of prospective teachers at foreign language departments. Observing the world in terms of teacher education makes it urgent to include more reflective and objective tools in Practice Teaching courses. Since the success and the level of affective factors play a huge importance in teacher education as well as cognitive factors while preparing the prospective teachers to their real life experiences, taking into consideration of their reflections and an attempt to increase the level of autonomy, self-efficacy, and self-assessment come on the scene of teacher education. The urgent need of these reflections put the policy makers, professors, educators, practitioners to search for different types of tools to be used for reflections in the process of teacher education.

This dissertation aims at presenting a complementary study on European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages and European Profiling Grid (EPG). By this way, this study intends to define the teaching competency levels of Prospective English language teachers at Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education and develop perceptions of the use of these tools for teacher education courses, especially for School Experience and Practice Teaching courses. In order to achieve this, 38 fourth year prospective English language teachers at Hacettepe University have been chosen randomly for the experiment. The competency levels of prospective teachers is assessed through the scales of European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages filled by the prospective teachers for twice as in the fall and in the spring semester of 2014-2015 academic year, and European Profiling Grid filled by the mentors, class and course supervisors of prospective teachers. EPOSTL in the fall semester is developed to be used as a pre-test and EPOSTL in the spring semester is developed to be used as a post-test while EPG is also used as another kind of post-test in the spring term filled by different

participants defined as mentors, class and course supervisors. Moreover, a two-part questionnaire is adapted to reach the prospective teachers' perceptions of EPOSTL and to determine the correlation levels of didactic courses they are expected to have during their teacher preparation. The reliability and validity of the scales are ensured in order to see to what extent the prospective English language teachers define their teaching competency levels and that the mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors' teaching profile levels of prospective teachers are compatible with each other and EPOSTL. The EPOSTL, EPG and two-part questionnaire have received sequentially .98, .89, .75, and .88 reliability according to Cronbach Alpha. The SPSS 17.00 has been used for the data analysis process. Taking the research question into consideration, the study used both qualitative and quantitative analysis since the competency and profile levels of prospective teachers should be defined and given clearly, then the compatibility and significance of the scales with respect to the participant needs to be explained statistically.

Prior to the instructional process, the prospective teachers are administered the EPOSTL while taking the course of İDÖ 475 School Experience. The data is analyzed by One Sample T-Test and all sections and sub-sections of EPOSTL for each prospective teachers are presented in tables. After that, 8 micro-teaching video-recordings are prepared for them to raise their awareness of EPOSTL. For this purpose and in order to clarify the comparison of competency levels, EPOSTL scale is administered in the spring semester while the participants are taking the course of İDÖ 478 Practice Teaching. The comparison of the competency levels is clarified via One Sample T-Test results and all sections and sub-sections of EPOSTL for each prospective teachers are presented in tables. In order to find out to what extent these recordings have an effect on their teaching competency Paired Sample T-Test is applied and it is found that the mean value of competency levels is 75.57 in the fall semester for School Experience while it is calculated as 85.56 in the spring semester for Practice Teaching. According to this, EPOSTL micro-teaching recordings are accepted to have a meaningful effect on the teaching competency levels of prospective teachers, $t(37) = 6.349, p < .01$.

Apart from the EPOSTL scale which is filled by the prospective teachers own self, the EPG is administered in the spring semester while the prospective teachers are

taking IDÖ 478 Practice Teaching course. This scale aims to support the results of EPOSTL applications and serve for proof from different participations as it is filled by mentors, course registration advisors and course supervisors. At first, One Sample T-Test results of EPG sections and sub-sections, then Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples results for mentors, course registration advisors and course supervisors are presented and all prospective teachers' teaching profiles defined by these professionals are presented in tables. In addition to this, One Way ANOVA results for Repeated Features of Prospective Teachers' EPG Levels in terms of mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors are calculated. Thus, meaningful significance appears mostly between course supervisors and mentors in addition to the course supervisors and course registration advisors; moreover, there is no significant difference between the prospective teachers' profile levels under the supervision of mentors and course registration advisors as the EPG levels of prospective teachers with respect to the different supervisions by mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors, $f(2, 74) = 15.39, p < .01$. EPG levels of prospective teachers by course supervisors ($\bar{X} = 83.84$) are higher than the supervision by the course registration advisors ($\bar{X} = 71.01$) and supervision by the mentors ($\bar{X} = 64.37$). As for the compatibility of EPOSTL with the EPG scale, One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features are given. According to the findings, it is concluded that the EPOSTL results are more compatible with the EPG results filled by the course supervisors of prospective teachers and it is clearly seen that there are significance differences between the EPG levels of prospective teachers with respect to the different supervisions by mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors, and EPOSTL competency levels $f(3, 111) = 57.05, p < .01$. EPOSTL competency levels of prospective teachers places at the most successful part in the table ($\bar{X} = 88.55$) The EPG levels of prospective teachers by course supervisors ($\bar{X} = 83.84$) are higher than the supervision by the course registration advisors ($\bar{X} = 71.01$) and supervision by the mentors ($\bar{X} = 64.37$), which means that there is no significant difference between the prospective teachers' profile levels under the application of EPOSTL competency and EPG levels carried out by course supervisors, which conveys the research to the place that the levels of

these groups are mostly compatible with each other. Finally, the prospective teachers perceptions of EPOSTL are calculated by Chi-Square Test (χ^2) and all descriptive results including the frequencies and percentages of the data are presented in tables clearly.

In conclusion, based on the findings gathered from both quantitative and qualitative processing, it appears that EPOSTL is a useful tool which can be used for English language teacher education in Turkey. Following this argument, it can be said that EPG is also a practical tool that deserves to be handled in teacher education process. These two scales serve as a complementary example which gives chances to different participants in order to assess the quality and needs of teacher education. Moreover, EPOSTL and EPG are kinds of reflective instruments which present not only deep information about the prospective EFL teachers but also the program and the courses they got during their teacher education in English Language Teaching Departments. In this sense, EPOSTL and EPG should be taken into account in English language teacher education programmes and as obligatory or elective. That is, it should be incorporated into English language teacher education curriculum. This study reveals and supports the idea that EPOSTL and EPG provide common basis for the specification and discussion of teaching competency levels in teacher education curricula. Thus, they serve as benchmarking tools suited to compare and observe the contents of teacher education programmes nationwide, which will also bring unity in pre-service teacher education.

Keywords: English language teacher education, reflection, tools for Prospective EFL teachers education, European portfolio for student teachers of languages (EPOSTL), European profiling grid (EPG)

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN, Hacettepe University, Department of Foreign Language Education, Division of English Language Teaching

DİL ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARINA YÖNELİK AVRUPA PORTFOLYOSU ÜZERİNE AVRUPA PROFİL BELİRLEME GRİDİ İLE İLİŞKİLİ TAMAMLAYICI BİR ÇALIŞMA

Ayfer SU BERGİL

ÖZ

Yabancı dil öğretmen eğitimi alanındaki mevcut uygulamalar, özellikle yabancı dil bölümlerindeki öğretmen adaylarının değerlendirme sürecince ağırlıklı olarak geleneksel yolların kullanılması eğilimindedir. Öğretmen eğitimi bakımından dünya gözlemlendiğinde, öğretmenlik uygulamaları derslerinde daha yansıtıcı ve nesnel araçlara acil olarak ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Çünkü öğretmen adaylarını gerçek hayat tecrübelerine hazırlarken, yansımaları ve özerklik, öz-yeterlik ile öz değerlendirmelerini artırma teşebbüslerini dikkate alırken, bilişsel faktörler kadar duyuşsal faktörlerin başarı ve düzeyi de öğretmen eğitiminde büyük bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu yansımalara olan ivedi ihtiyaç karar alıcıları, profesörleri, eğitimcileri ve uygulayıcıları öğretmen eğitiminde kullanılmak üzere farklı türlerde araçlar bulma arayışına sokmuştur.

Bu tez, Dil Öğretmen Adaylarına Yönelik Avrupa Portfolyosu (DÖAYAP) ile Avrupa Profil Belirleme Gridi (APG) üzerine tamamlayıcı bir çalışma sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu yolla, bu çalışma Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesinde bulunan İngiliz dili eğitimi öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik yeterlik düzeylerini belirlemeyi ve özellikle okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması dersleri gibi öğretmen eğitimi derslerinde bu ölçeklerin kullanımına yönelik algıları geliştirmeyi hedeflemektedir. Buna ulaşmak için, uygulamada Hacettepe Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda dördüncü sınıfta okuyan 38 öğretmen adayı rast gele seçilmiştir. Öğretmen adaylarının yeterlik düzeyleri, adaylar tarafından 2014-2014 akademik yılı güz ve bahar yarıyılında doldurulan Dil Öğretmen Adaylarına Yönelik Avrupa Portfolyosu (DÖAYAP) ile öğretmen adaylarının staj öğretmenleri, ders ve sınıf danışmanları tarafından doldurulan Avrupa Profil Belirleme Gridi (APG) aracılığıyla elde edilmiştir. Bahar yarıyılında APG; staj öğretmenleri, ders ve sınıf danışmanları olarak tanımlanan katılımcılar tarafında doldurularak farklı bir tür son-test olarak kullanılırken, güz yarıyılında

DÖAYAP ön-test, bahar yarıyılında da son- test olarak kullanılmak üzere geliştirilmiştir. Ayrıca, öğretmen adaylarının DÖAYAP'a yönelik algılarını ve fakülte eğitimleri süresince almaları beklenen zorunlu derslerin korelasyon düzeylerini belirlemeye yönelik iki bölümlü bir anket uyarlanmıştır. Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik yeterliklerini ne ölçüde tanımladıklarını; staj öğretmenleri, ders ve sınıf danışmanlarının öğretmenlik profil düzeylerini birbirleriyle ve DÖAYAP ile ne ölçüde uyumlu olduklarını belirlemek amacıyla ölçeklerin güvenirlik ve geçerlik düzeyleri hesaplanmıştır. DÖAYAP, APG ve iki bölümlü anket sırasıyla .98, .89, .75, and .88 Cronbach Alpha güvenirlik düzeylerini elde etmiştir. Veri analizi sürecinde SPSS 17.00 paket programı kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın alt problemleri dikkate alınarak, öğretmen adaylarının yeterlik ve profil düzeylerini tanımlamak ve açıkça verebilmek, ayrıca ölçeklerin uyumluluk ve farkındalıklarını katılımcılara göre istatistiksel olarak açıklamak amacıyla bu çalışmada nitel ve nicel analizlerin ikisi birlikte kullanılmıştır.

Öğretimsel süreç öncesinde, öğretmen adaylarına İDÖ 475 Okul Deneyimi dersini aldıklarında DÖAYAP ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Veriler Tek Örneklem T-Testi kullanılarak elde edilmiş ve öğretmen adayları için DÖAYAP'ın tüm bölüm ve alt bölümleri tablolar halinde sunulmuştur. Sonrasında, adayların DÖAYAP'a yönelik farkındalıklarını geliştirmek amacıyla 8 mikro öğretim kaydı hazırlanmıştır. Bu amaçla, adaylara bahar yarıyılında İDÖ 478 Öğretmenlik Uygulaması dersini aldıklarında, bu derslerin yeterlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırmasını açıklamak için DÖAYAP tekrar uygulanmıştır. Tek Örneklem T-test sonuçları ile DÖAYAP'ın tüm bölüm ve alt bölümleri her bir öğretmen adayı için tablolar halinde sunulmuştur. Bu kayıtları öğretmen adaylarının yeterlik düzeyleri üzerinde ne ölçüde etkili olduğunu bulmak amacıyla ilişkili Örneklem için T-Test uygulanmıştır ve yeterlik düzeylerinin bahar yarıyılında 85.56 iken güz yarıyılında 75.56 olduğu bulunmuştur. Buna göre, mikro öğretim kayıtlarının öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik yeterlik düzeyleri üzerinde anlamlı etkisi olduğu kabul edilmiştir, $t(37) = 6.349, p < .01$.

Öğretmen adaylarını kendileri tarafından doldurulan DÖAYAP haricinde, öğretmen adayları bahar yarıyılında İDÖ 478 Öğretmenlik Uygulaması dersini alırken Avrupa Profil Belirleme Gridi de uygulanmıştır. Bu ölçek DÖAYAP uygulamalarını desteklemeyi; staj öğretmenleri, ders ve sınıf danışmanları gibi farklı katılımcılar

tarafından doldurularak kanıt olarak sunulmayı amaçlamaktadır. APG'nin bölümleri ve alt bölümleri için Tek Örneklem T-Test sonuçları, sonrasında staj öğretmenleri, ders ve sınıf danışmanlarına yönelik Kruskal-Wallis Sıralamalı Tek-Yönlü Varyans Analizi ve öğretmen adaylarının bu profesyonel kişilerce tanımlanan öğretmenlik profilleri tablolar halinde verilmiştir. Buna ek olarak, staj öğretmenleri, sınıf ve ders danışmanları açısından öğretmen adaylarının APG düzeyleri Tekrarlı Ölçümler için Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi (ANOVA) kullanılarak hesaplanmıştır. Buna göre, en anlamlı farklılaşma ders danışmanları ile stajyer öğretmenler arasında ve sonrasında ders ve sınıf danışmanları arasında bulunmaktadır. Ayrıca öğretmen adaylarının profil düzeyleri staj öğretmenleri ve sınıf danışmanları açısından anlamlı bir farklılaşma göstermemektedir, $f(2, 74) = 15.39, p < .01$. Öğretmen adaylarının APG düzeyleri ders danışmanları tarafından staj ($\bar{X} = 64.37$) ve sınıf danışmanlarına ($\bar{X} = 71.01$) göre daha yüksek olarak hesaplanmıştır ($\bar{X} = 83.84$). DÖAYAP'ın APG ölçeği ile olan uyumluluğuna gelince, Tekrarlı Ölçümler için Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi (ANOVA) sonuçları verilmiştir. Sonuçlara göre, ders danışmanları tarafından doldurulan EPG bulgularının DÖAYAP sonuçlarına daha uyumlu ve açıkça DÖAYAP ile staj öğretmenleri, sınıf ve ders danışmanları tarafından doldurulan APG düzeyleri arasında anlamlı fark olduğuna ulaşılmıştır, $f(3, 111) = 57.05, p < .01$. DÖAYAP ölçeğinde öğretmen adaylarının yeterlik düzeyleri ($\bar{X} = 88.55$) ders danışmaları ($\bar{X} = 83.84$), sınıf danışmanları ($\bar{X} = 71.01$), ve staj öğretmenlerine göre ($\bar{X} = 64.37$) en yüksek olarak elde edilmiştir. Bu durum, öğretmen adaylarının profil düzeylerini belirlerken, DÖAYAP yeterlik uygulaması ile ders danışmanlarınca doldurulan APG düzeyleriyle en uyumlu olduğu anlamına gelmektedir. Son olarak, Ki-Kare Analizi testi kullanılarak öğretmen adaylarının DÖAYAP'a yönelik algıları hesaplanmış; frekans ve yüzdeleri içeren tüm betimsel sonuçlar açıkça tablolar halinde sunulmuştur.

Sonuç olarak, nitel ve nicel uygulamalardan elde edilen bulgulara dayalı olarak, DÖAYAP'ın Türkiye'de İngiliz dili öğretmen eğitiminde kullanılabilecek faydalı bir araç olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunun üzerine, APG'nin de öğretmen eğitimi sürecine katılmayı hak eden kullanışlı bir araç olduğu söylenebilmektedir. Bu iki ölçek, öğretmen eğitiminin kalite ve ihtiyaçlarını değerlendirmek amacıyla farklı katılımcılara fırsat tanıyan tamamlayıcı bir örnek olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır.

Ayrıca, DÖAYAP ile APG İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretmen adaylarına yönelik derin bilgi veren yansıma araçları olmaları yanında aynı zamanda İngiliz Dili Eğitimi bölümlerinin programları ve öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen eğitimi boyunca aldıkları dersler hakkında da bilgi vermektedir. Bu anlamda, DÖAYAP ve APG isteğe bağlı ya da zorunlu olarak İngiliz dili öğretmen eğitimi programına yerleştirilmeli ve İngiliz dili öğretmen eğitimi programında dikkate alınmalıdır. Bu çalışma, öğretmen eğitimi programlarının öğretmenlik yeterlik düzeylerini tartışması ve belirlemesi bakımından DÖAYAP ve APG'nin ortak bir temel oluşturduğu fikrini ortaya çıkarmakta ve desteklemektedir. Böylece, bu ölçekler hizmet öncesi öğretmen eğitimine de aynı zamanda bütünlük getirecek olan ülke çapında öğretmen eğitimi programlarının içeriklerini gözlem ve kıyaslamaya elverişli karşılaştırma araçları olarak hizmet etmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: İngiliz dili öğretmen eğitimi, yansıma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretmen adaylarının eğitimi, dil öğretmen adaylarına yönelik Avrupa portfolyosu, Avrupa profil belirleme gridi

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

ETHICS

In this dissertation, prepared in accordance with the spelling rules of Graduate School of Educational Sciences of Hacettepe University;

I declare that

- all the information and documents have been obtained in the base of the academic rules
- all audio-visual and written information and results have been presented according to the rules of scientific standards
- in case of using other works, related studies have been cited in accordance with the scientific standards
- all cited studies have been fully referenced
- I did not do any distortion in the data set
- and any part of this thesis has not been presented as any other thesis study at this or any other university.

İmza
Ayfer SU BERGİL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest and greatest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN. Without his supervision, encouragement, and continuous feedback, I would have never produced this work. His endless support heartened and refreshed me to go on my academic life even at times when it was very hard for me. I should also acknowledge him for all his contributions to my academic and personal development.

My special thanks go to Prof. Dr. Mehmet DEMİREZEN for his sincere attitude, valuable comments, helpful criticism and belief in me. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nalan KIZILTAN for her intensive interests, support and generosity throughout the study and I am very grateful to her for her directions and horizons, which make this study more and more comprehensive. I am also grateful to the following names for their support, comments, advice and suggestions throughout the study; Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ, Assist. Prof. Dr. Hüseyin ÖZ, Assist. Prof. Dr. İsmail Fırat ALTAY, Assist. Prof. Dr. Olcay SERT, and Lecturer Özlem KHAN.

I should extend my appreciation and thankfulness to Research Assistants Nilüfer CAN DAŞKIN, Emrah DOLGUNZÖZ, Ufuk BALAMAN, Derya DURAN, Sümeyra BAĞATUR, and Arzu KANAT for their continuous support and help during the application of the scales and procedural issues about the department and students.

I would like to thank the prospective English language teachers at Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education for their endless support, sincerity and patience since without their data and perceptions this study would be impossible. The tiring and difficult things during data collection were overcome more easily with their presence.

I also desire to present my sincere appreciations to all teachers Aydan ERTAN, Ruhan EREN, Asuman ÖNDER, İnci KEÇİK, Erol ŞEREF at Ankara Türk Telekom Mehmet Kaplan Sosyal Bilimler Lisesi; Nesuha GÜRSOY and Muazzez ÖLMEZ at Ankara Ayrancı Aysel Yücetürk Anadolu Lisesi; H. Nuran YİĞİT, Hanife MUIK, Filiz AKMETE at Ankara Gazi Anadolu Lisesi; Ayşen TAVŞANLI and Sibel SERİM at Ankara Beytepe Ortaokulu who are the mentors of the English language

prospective teachers included into this study and didn't hesitate to share their reflections gradually, sincerely and seriously.

I wish to express my love, deepest gratitude and wholehearted thanks to my daughter's aunt and colleague Assist. Prof. Dr. Canan ORAL, who is like my sister and with whose moral support and academic advice this study would have been completed. Her love and encouragement made me feel strong wherever I am forever. I really owe my great thanks to her to be a part of my family and dreams.

Most importantly, I wish to thank my beloved family for their endless love, support and patience during this study. I am grateful to my mother Fatma SU and father İsmail SU for their encouragement and support despite the distance between us. They were there whenever I needed help. My special thanks to my precious sisters and brothers Aynur SU, Ceren SU, Cengiz SU and Dr. Cem SU for their understanding and belief in me.

My deepest feelings of gratitude go to my five-year old daughter Yarensu BERGİL and my husband Lecturer Erhan BERGİL for their endless love and patience. They had to live alone while I was in Ankara and struggle with all the difficulties and hard times without me but they never ceased to support me. I also owe special thanks to my husband for his help in the statistics and the computer work of the study. I feel privileged to have such an awesome, self-sacrificing family. They are the biggest opportunities I have ever had and remind me who I really am, make me more and more modest about myself and show the realities behind things. I hope this growth does not end...

*To my beloved daughter Yarensu and husband Erhan
who make me the strongest mother and wife
on earth...*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	xiii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xvi
LIST OF TABLES	xviii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xxiii
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xxiv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Statement of the Problem	4
1.2. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.3. Purpose of the Study.....	7
1.3.1. Research Questions.....	7
1.4. Limitations of the Study	8
1.5. Definition of Terms	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
2.1. Teacher Education	11
2.1.1. Teacher Development.....	13
2.1.2. Teacher Training.....	14
2.2. Teacher Education in Turkey.....	15
2.2.1. EFL Teacher Education in Turkey.....	19
2.3. Reflection	24
2.3.1. Teacher Autonomy.....	27
2.3.2. Teacher Self-Efficacy.....	31
2.3.3. Self-Assessment Coming With ELP	34
2.4. The Professionalism of English Language Teaching.....	36
2.4.1. Teachers' Roles.....	39
2.4.2. Teachers' Identity.....	40
2.5. Tools for Prospective EFL teachers	42
2.5.1. EPOSTL.....	43
2.5.2. EPG.....	49
3. METHODOLOGY	52
3.1. The Research Design	52
3.2. The Participants of the Study	53
3.3. Data Collection Instruments	57
3.4. Data Analysis	60
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	62
4.1. Findings and Discussion for What the Competency Levels of the Prospective Teachers are While Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses	62

4.2. Findings and Discussion for What Section/Subsections of 'Self-assessment' the Prospective Teachers Need to Develop.....	66
4.3. Findings and Discussion for to What Extent the Micro-teaching Sessions of Sections/Subsections of 'Self-assessment' are Effective and Useful	101
4.4. Findings and Discussion for What the Prospective Teachers' Perceptions of EPOSTL are.....	111
4.5. Findings and Discussion for What the Correlation Levels of the Compulsory Didactic Courses and the Competency Levels of the Prospective Teachers are.....	114
4.6. Findings and Discussion for What the Prospective Teachers' Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid are.....	120
4.7. Findings and Discussion for Whether Prospective Teachers' EPOSTL Practices are Compatible with European Profiling Grid Filled by Mentors/Supervisors/ Advisors.....	163
4.8. Findings and Discussion for What the Ways of Enhancing the Practices and Implementation of EPOSTL in Hacettepe University English Language Teaching Program are and Making it Common for Teacher Education in ELT.....	165
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	167
5.1. Conclusion	167
5.2. Recommendations	180
REFERENCES.....	183
APPENDICES	195
<u>APPENDIX-1: Approval of Ethical Board.....</u>	<u>196</u>
<u>APPENDIX-2: European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages</u>	<u>197</u>
<u>APPENDIX-3: Questionnaire I The Use of EPOSTL</u>	<u>211</u>
<u>APPENDIX-4: European Profiling Grid Scale.....</u>	<u>214</u>
<u>APPENDIX-5: Originality Report</u>	<u>223</u>
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	224

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1.: Gender and Age Distribution of Participants.....	53
Table 3.2.: Experience, Department and Education Distribution of Participants ...	55
Table 3.3.: Institutional Distribution of Participants	56
Table 3.4.: Likert-Type Item Value Distribution.....	59
Table 3.5.: Reliability Coefficiencies of Data Collection Instruments.....	60
Table 4.1.: Competency Levels of Prospective Teachers while Taking the "School Experience" Course	63
Table 4.2.: Competency Levels of Prospective EFL Teachers while Taking the "Practice Teaching" Course.....	65
Table 4.3.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Context Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses	67
Table 4.4.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Methodology Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses.....	68
Table 4.5.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Resources Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses.....	69
Table 4.6.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Lesson Planning Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses.....	70
Table 4.7.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Conducting a Lesson Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses.....	71
Table 4.8.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Independent Learning Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses.....	72
Table 4.9.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Assessment of Learning Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses.....	73
Table 4.10.: One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL 1	74
Table 4.11.: One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL 2	75
Table 4.12.: Sub-Section Results of "Context" Section for "School Experience".....	77
Table 4.13.: Sub-Section Results of "Context" Section for "Practice Teaching" ...	78
Table 4.14.: Sub-Section Results of "Methodology" Section for "School Experience".....	80

Table 4.15.: Sub-Section Results of “Methodology” Section for "Practice Teaching".....	81
Table 4.16.: Sub-Section Results of “Resources” Section for "School Experience".....	83
Table 4.17.: Sub-Section Results of “Resources” Section for "Practice Teaching".....	84
Table 4.18.: Sub-Section Results of “Lesson Planning” Section for "School Experience".....	86
Table 4.19.: Sub-Section Results of “Lesson Planning” Section for “Practice Teaching”.....	87
Table 4.20.: Sub-Section Results of “Conducting a Lesson” Section for “School Experience”.....	89
Table 4.21.: Sub-Section Results of “Conducting a Lesson” Section for “Practice Teaching”.....	90
Table 4.22.: Sub-Section Results of “Independent Learning” Section for “School Experience”.....	92
Table 4.23.: Sub-Section Results of “Independent Learning” Section for “Practice Teaching”.....	93
Table 4.24.: Sub-Section Results of “Assessment of Learning” Section for “School Experience”.....	95
Table 4.25.: Sub-Section Results of “Assessment of Learning” Section for “Practice Teaching”.....	96
Table 4.26.: One-Sample T-Test Results for Sub-Sections of EPOSTL 1.....	98
Table 4.27.: One-Sample T-Test Results for Sub-Sections of EPOSTL 2.....	100
Table 4.28.: Paired Sample T-Test Result of Each Prospective Teacher’s EPOSTL Competency Levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching’.....	102
Table 4.29.: Paired Sample T-Test Result of EPOSTL Sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”.....	102
Table 4.30.: Paired Sample T-Test Result of EPOSTL Sub-Sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”.....	104
Table 4.31.: Prospective Teachers’ Perceptions of EPOSTL at the End of the “Practice Teaching” Course.....	111
Table 4.32.: The Prospective Teachers’ Estimation of the Correlation Levels Between the Outcome of the Compulsory Didactic Courses and the Teacher Competency Levels.....	115
Table 4.33.: The Prospective Teachers’ Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid with Respect to the Supervisors of IDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” Course.....	122
Table 4.34.: EPG Results of “Training and Qualification” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course.....	124

Table 4.35.: EPG Results of “Key Teaching Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course	126
Table 4.36.: EPG Results of “Enabling Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course	128
Table 4.37.: EPG Results of “Professionalism” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course.....	130
Table 4.38.: One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the Supervisors of ÍDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” Course	131
Table 4.39.: Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the “Practice Teaching” Course Supervisors.....	133
Table 4.40.: The Prospective Teachers’ Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid with Respect to the School Mentors of ÍDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” Course.....	135
Table 4.41.: EPG Results of “Training and Qualification” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors	137
Table 4.42.: EPG Results of “Key Teaching Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors.....	139
Table 4.43.: EPG Results of “Enabling Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors.....	141
Table 4.44.: EPG Results of “Professionalism” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors.....	143
Table 4.45.: One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the School Mentors of ÍDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” Course.....	144
Table 4.46.: Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the “Practice Teaching” Course Mentors.....	146
Table 4.47.: The Prospective Teachers’ Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors.....	148
Table 4.48.: EPG Results of “Training and Qualification” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors	150
Table 4.49.: EPG Results of “Key Teaching Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors.....	152
Table 4.50.: EPG Results of “Enabling Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors	154
Table 4.51.: EPG Results of “Professionalism” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors	156
Table 4.52.: One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors of Prospective Teachers.....	157

Table 4.53.: Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the Course Registration Advisors.....	159
Table 4.54.: Descriptive Statistics of ANOVA Results of Prospective Teachers' EPG Levels in Terms of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors	161
Table 4.55.: One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features of Prospective Teachers' EPG Levels in Terms of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors.....	162
Table 4.56.: Descriptive Statistics of ANOVA Results of How Compatible the EPOSTL Results Are with EPG Scale.....	163
Table 4.57.: One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features of How Compatible the EPOSTL Results Are with EPG Scale	164
Table 4.58.: Descriptive Results of How Prospective Teachers Would Prefer to Use the Sections of EPOSTL in Their Practice Teaching	165

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1.: Self-assessment Section/Sub-sections of EPOSTL.....	10
Figure 2.1.: Reflective Model Proposed by Wallace	26
Figure 2.2.: Differences Between Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Teacher Efficacy	32
Figure 2.3.: TESOL P-12 Teacher Education Program Standards	37
Figure 2.4.: Model of Standards for ESL/EFL Teachers of Adults	38
Figure 4.1.: The Comparison of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” Competency Levels for Each 7 Section of EPOSTL	104
Figure 4.2.:The Comparison of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” Competency Levels for Each Sub-Section of EPOSTL	110
Figure 4.3.: The Frequency Distribution of Each Questionnaire Item	114
Figure 4.4.: The Frequency Distribution of the Prospective Teachers’ Estimation of the Correlation Levels.....	120
Figure 4.5.: The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to Course Supervisors	133
Figure 4.6.: The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to School Mentors.....	146
Figure 4.7.: The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to Course Registration Advisors	159
Figure 4.8.: The Distribution of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors’ Preferences while Filling in the EPG Scale.....	160

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CAEP: Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation

CEFR: The Common European Framework for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment

CHE: Council of Higher Education

CoE: Council of Europe

EAQUALS: The European Association for Quality Language Services

ECML: The European Centre for Modern Languages

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELP: English Language Portfolio

ELT: English Language Teaching

EPG: The European-Profiling Grid

EPOSTL: The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages

EU: The European Union

INSET: In-service Training

MONE: Ministry of National Education

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

TESOL: Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

1. INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century world, learning a language or even languages is almost unavoidable although many people find it hard and laborious. In the everyday lives, people are constantly in touch with each other. They share experiences and beliefs that take them beyond their own languages either directly or indirectly through many different ways. Thanks to mobility and immigration, which brings cultural enrichment to the world and also our countries, other languages and cultures are all around us, which means people live in a multilingual and multicultural world. Especially in the age of globalization, our study, work and experiences are more likely to bring us into contact with the speakers of other languages than ever which provides many opportunities to communicate beyond the safety of our own mother tongue. Thus, from young people to adults, competence and performance in one or more foreign languages is essential and rewarding for all people. Europe has been a good example as a language-learning continent for long years-millennia. Although English has taken the place of Latin which was widely used as a lingua franca, there is nothing new for people in Europe to be able to operate in one or more than one language. The history of foreign language learning and teaching dates back to the Ancient times of Greece and Rome, as well as to the medieval and the 16th century Europe of Shakespeare times. Naturally, bilingual or plurilingual terms are not attained to people of well-educated middle classes. On the contrary, all over the world, especially in Africa and South Asia, people who had little access to education and socialization have the same right as to communicate with ethnic groups for the purpose of earning their livelihood. Since these samples emphasize the need of placing the foreign language or languages in the natural part of people's lives, the importance of language teaching and learning come back to the arena of pedagogy again (Rossner, 2009).

The work of language teacher is, therefore, challenging. They must be well trained as language teachers and good users of the language they teach, understand the language learning needs of their students, relate their needs with the age and proficiency factors, communicate effectively to their students at whatever age they are and demonstrate the usefulness of learning a language for themselves, develop the students' understanding and respect of the people of other cultures

who use the language and bring them in contact with each other; plan and design activities which are effective in the classroom, are seen interesting for students, enabling the students to practice using the language in a realistic and authentic way, help the students understand the importance of both the competence and performance of language together by showing them the grammar and pronunciation examples through the communicative activities, assess and observe individual students' progress, give them formative, constructive and process-based feedback as they see their own progress and gain insight to develop their self-assessment.

At that point, the hope for increasing the effectiveness of language courses and the importance of language teaching and learning motivate the teachers, teacher trainers in familiarizing themselves with new trends in the language learning and teaching and exploring new pedagogical functions of this exciting long way process. The Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) (2004), produced by the Council of Europe, is a comprehensive work and provides guidelines for those responsible for designing language programs and training language teachers. This comprehensive work of references refers to four guiding principles: a focus on the practical needs of language learners, and not only learning grammar and vocabulary 'for the sake of it' ; an approach that is 'action-orientated', i.e. an approach that encourages students to use language actively and communicatively in carrying out tasks, not just in doing exercises; transparency, i.e. making it clear to learners at all times what they are learning and why they are learning it; and 'self-assessment', encouraging learners to be able to assess their own progress in the language, instead of just relying on teachers or tests to tell them this. These guidelines and the approach to teaching and learning that comes from them can greatly assist learners to develop a positive attitude to language learning, to get fully involved in it, and understand the value of foreign languages in their lives.

Accordingly, the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) of the Council of Europe focuses its work on promoting innovative and effective approaches in language education since 1995, and plays a significant role in exploring for good practices and assisting their implementations in member states (Council of Europe, 2007). The ECML carries out research and develop projects within the

framework of their reference. These projects are supported by international teams of experts and concentrate mainly on training experts, promoting professional development and providing networks among the experts. For this purpose, the overall title of the ECML's second term program between 2004 and 2007 was "Languages for social cohesion- Language education in a multilingual and multicultural Europe". This notion also should enable us to deal with one of the major challenges our society have to face at the 21st century is highlighting the role of language education with mutual understanding and respect among the citizens of the whole world.

Set up in Graz, Austria, the ECML is an "Enlarged Partial Agreement" of the Council of Europe to which thirty-three countries (Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", United Kingdom) have currently subscribed. Inspired by the values and principles of the Council of Europe (2007), the ECML promotes linguistic and cultural diversity and fosters plurilingualism and pluriculturalism among the citizens living in Europe. Therefore, its activities are complementary to those of Language Policy Division, and the Council of Europe is a unit responsible for the development of policy and planning tools in the field of language education.

Supported by Council of Europe, the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) is a comprehensive document for students undergoing their initial teacher education experiences. It totally helps the student teachers of language encourage themselves to reflect their didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, help them to assess their own didactic competences and enable them to monitor their own progress while recording their experiences of teaching during the courses of their teacher education (Newby, Allan, Fenner, Jones, Komorowska and Soghikyan, 2007, p.5). On the other hand the Profiling Grid for Language Teachers, developed by EAQUALS (European Association for Quality Language Services) (North & Mateva, 2006) and inspired by the impact of the Common European Framework for Languages: Learning,

Teaching and Assessment (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001) on the field of language learning, seeks to summarize the key features of qualifications and competences at different stages of language teachers' development.

Taking all the aforementioned points above, the current research aims to investigate the effectiveness of these kinds of tools used in language teacher education throughout Europe. The study will also encourage the utilization of EPOSTL in relation with the European Profiling Grid for prospective teachers of English Language Teacher Education Departments in Turkey. Since Turkey gives huge amount of importance to the lifelong educational practices, this study bears a great importance during the process of being a full member of EU for a long time.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

In recent years, tremendous changes in almost all the areas of life have been experienced throughout the world. People are under the influence of different kinds of influences such as technological, cultural, economical in both national and cross-continental sides, social, and educational aspects. For instance, technology offers more and more innovations, which brings both easiness and difficulties together. As the days pass, it becomes difficult for people to reach its speed. But in terms of easiness and advantageous sides of the technology, people have to keep up with its improvements. Keeping in mind that all these kinds of improvements bring lots of transitions together, especially in this era of changes and the influence of these changes, education has experienced lots of transitions which are inevitable and also compulsory for its nature.

As for globalization, the boundaries of countries have become invisible and the transitions are felt more frequently and effectively than before. The period of being a native of a country or one country has passed and understanding not only the self but each other on the whole world has gained much importance. As a result of the globalization, the cross-cultural studies, the need for feeling sympathy and sharing the common features of humanity come to the arena with a huge effect on the world. All of these influences push the importance of language education and seek for better environments of language learning and teaching processes.

It is observed that EU tends to emphasize the basis of lifelong learning strategies and supply the examples of its practices under the frame of needed key

competencies in the process of teaching and learning. Since lifelong competencies that globalization brought upon us shouldn't be seen as a random act, it is better to regard it as a concern that rapid social and economic changes, rapid movements towards knowledge-oriented society and Europe's ageing population require a new approach in education. Thus, that's why the EU gives priority to the educational practices in the 21st century. Among them, teacher education is seen as one of the most important fields that may create amazing learning and teaching environment. Therefore, countries have to improve their educational system by regarding the importance of teacher education, in fact pre-service teacher education as teachers are always seen and play role as moderators of the changing society.

Bearing all the above mentioned points in mind and emphasizing the vital importance of the language skills of the 21st individuals, the problem of this research stems from the need to define the competencies of prospective teachers of English language and specify their competency level not only in national aspect but also in accordance with the competencies stated in Europe. As said earlier, the role of language teachers in learning and teaching English cannot be ignored, it is requisite for us to define the competency levels of prospective teachers and standardize the qualifications of them not after but before their graduation with the vital applications of courses labeled as School Experience and Practice Teachings in Turkey blending the practices continuing throughout the world especially in Europe.

1.2. Significance of the Study

Accepting the era we live now as an "information age" and the society as "knowledge society" bring us to the reality of the importance of being educated and informed constantly. Thus, such concepts such as knowledge, independent learning, knowledge literacy skills such as lifelong learning, maintaining learning and organizing the autonomous learning process gained more significance.

The vital importance of knowledge gives rise to the educational practices especially in Europe. For this purpose in recent years, Europe has experienced many practices giving priority to teacher education. Through a focus on teacher education, because the high popularity of language learning and teaching, language learning and teaching have become a central concern in recent history

(Barfield & Brown, 2007; Benson, 2007; Lamb & Reinders, 2007; Burkert & Schwienhorst, 2008). The idea and desire for better language learning has become widely accepted in mainstream language teaching (Benson, 2001). For that reason, there seems to be a consensus that language teachers have important roles in learning and teaching process. Therefore, language teachers are expected to develop the flexibility to use the most appropriate teaching approaches for their own contexts. This indicates that teacher education may have crucial role to play in preparing prospective teachers to implement pedagogical strategies in their future classroom environments.

In the Turkish educational context, there have been a lot of attempts to integrate practice into language learning curriculum through the implementation of European Council related to language teaching. Among them, one of the most influential publications is CEFR, serving as the main conceptual framework for the teaching of foreign languages in Turkey. In this regard, ELT in Turkey has witnessed drastic changes during the preparation of the new curricula, textbooks, and in-service training. But after a while, it was seen that pre-service teacher education should also be introduced to the new guidelines of CEFR to the prospective teachers. Only by this way, individual universities' different practices can be prevented and the pre-service teacher education for language teachers can be standardized. At this point, it should be realized that moving beyond the CEFR practices and keeping up to date with CEFR principles can succeed with its foundations of EPOSTL which will give direction to the language teachers to do their well in their real classrooms when they are prospective teachers of English language and guide them during the whole professional life of teaching.

Bearing all aforementioned points in mind, this study has a vital importance in giving a chance to English Language Teaching in Turkey surge for whether it is on the European practices level or it needs to shape and improve its competencies in terms of prospective teachers of English language. Meanwhile, this study aims to specify the competency levels of prospective teachers of English language and show the perceptions of prospective teachers about EPOSTL and its usefulness in teacher education practices. Accordingly, it tries to find out whether there are meaningful relations with the courses taken during the whole 4 year education and the competency levels of prospective teachers. Moreover, with the aim of

supporting and relating the results of findings, this study hopes to present evidence for the effectiveness of European Profiling Grid (EPG) by serving it to the mentors or supervisors of prospective teachers of English language during the Practice Teachings in order to specify the profiles of prospective teachers. What's more, this study will open the doors to move the prospective teachers of English language to the international level and will serve as a pilot study not only for prospective teachers of English language but also for prospective teachers of other subject fields.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The urgent need for this study arises from the observation that in teacher education especially during the educational practices of prospective teachers of English language, they receive two important courses named as "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching". Since the observation, experience, practice and reflection of these courses may mean high-profit values for prospective teachers of English language, converting them into consistent and life-long internalizations comes up with more importance gains .

In Turkey, there are a great deal of universities which include English Language Teaching Departments as well. By observations and the self-experience of the researcher of this study, the courses of "School Experience" and "Practice Teachings" undergo according to the mentor's or supervisors' own observations, beliefs and practices. Moreover, these courses partially lack the self-assessment of the prospective teachers of English language and it is strongly believed and aimed that more importance given to self-assessment with European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages and relating its contributions with European Profiling Grid applications will provide such a great deal of contributions to the field of teacher education in English Language Teaching. Under these conditions, this research poses the following research questions.

1.3.1. Research Questions

- 1) What are the competency levels of the prospective teachers while taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching courses"?
- 2) What sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' do the prospective teachers need to develop?

3) To what extent are the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' effective and useful?

4) What are the prospective teachers' perceptions of EPOSTL?

5) What are the correlation levels of the compulsory didactic courses and the competency levels of the prospective teachers?

6) What are the prospective teachers' profiles in relation to the European Profiling Grid?

7) Are the prospective teachers' EPOSTL practices compatible with European Profiling Grid filled by mentors/supervisors/advisors?

8) What are the ways of enhancing the practices and implementation of EPOSTL in Hacettepe University English Language Teaching Program and making it common for teacher education in ELT?

1.4. Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study can be listed as follows:

1- The study is limited to 38 prospective teachers studying in the ELT Department of Hacettepe University Faculty of Education.

2- The data are collected during two semesters (28 weeks).

3- The courses labeled as "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" in 4th year of ELT Department of Hacettepe University Faculty of Education are under the scope of the study.

4- Only the self-assessment part containing 195 descriptors of EPOSTL is included in the study.

5- For the purpose of getting quantitative results supporting the qualitative ones, the descriptors are scaled in 5 point likert-type format due to the fact that a human behavior cannot be measured merely by quantitative tools (Tailor, 2005).

6- Even though the reliability of the research tools are accepted as at desired level since the scales in the study are currently used in European countries, the reliability of them are re-evaluated.


7- The terms "competency" and "competence" are used interchangeably in this study since the Council of Europe (CoE) uses these terms interchangeably as well.

1.5. Definition of Terms

EPOSTL: The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) is a document for students undergoing initial teacher education. It will encourage student teachers to reflect on their didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, helps them to assess their own didactic competences and enables them to monitor their progress and to record their experiences of teaching during the course of their teacher education.

Self-Assessment: Self-Assessment is a judgment made by the learner on his or her own performance, knowledge, strategies etc. It is also widely accepted that self-assessment is a key learning strategy for autonomous language learning which enables students to monitor their progress and help them relate learning to their individual needs.

Self-Assessment Descriptors: At the heart of the EPOSTL are the 195 descriptors of competences related to language teaching which comprise the self-assessment section. These descriptors may be regarded as a set of core competences which language teachers should strive to attain. The descriptors are grouped into seven general categories. These represent areas in which teachers require knowledge and a variety of competences and need to make decisions related to teaching. Each heading has been sub-divided as follows:



(Council of Europe, 2007, p. 6)

Figure 1.1.: Self-assessment Section/Sub-sections of EPOSTL

EPG: The European Profiling Grid (EPG) is an innovative instrument, the main purpose of which is to provide language teachers, teacher-trainers and managers with a reliable means of outlining current competences and enhancing professionalism in language education. The ultimate aim is to increase the quality and efficiency of the training and professional development of language teachers (Mateva, Vitanova & Tashevskva, 2013).

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter as a result of the review of literature, key issues highlighting and giving the way to put forward to this research will be explained. For this purpose the issues of teacher education, teacher development, reflection, self-assessment, teacher autonomy, teacher self-efficacy, teachers' identity, teachers' role and tools for prospective teachers in terms of foreign language teachers' perspective will be explained for the theoretical background of the study.

2.1. Teacher Education

Seen as an important basis for both social and economic development to participate actively in the global economy and have access to the information and knowledge, English language skills of a good proportion are seen as a vital importance for countries in the present time. That's why English language teaching and English language learners are placed in the central part of this enterprise. So, the concept of language teacher education and the key features shaping the way of language teacher education gain more interest and it would be better to conceptualize and realize these notions again today.

Teacher education refers to all planned interventions intended to help teachers even directly or indirectly to become better at or at least better informed about their profession. This field has been shaped by two developmental issues. One might have been resulted in internally initiated change, that is, the teaching profession gradually evolves from understanding of its essential knowledge base and associated instructional practices through the efforts of applied linguists and specialists in the field of language teaching and teacher education. Much of the debate and discussion in the professional literature in recent years is a kind of entire internal debate instead of those outside the walls of academic institutions. At the same time the development of teacher education has been impacted by external pressures, such as by globalization and the need for English as a language of international trade and communication, which has brought the national educational authorities to search for new language teaching policies, standards and other forms of accountability. In addition to the Common European Framework, the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages and

European Profiling Grid are among the responses to this kind of pressures to attempt professionalism in teacher education process.

For many years, most of what was done in language teaching and in language teacher education was based on conventions that define disciplinary knowledge as linguistics, psychology, and various other fields as the foundation for what language teachers should know and therefore what they should do in their classrooms. These traditions stemmed more from the need to articulate a professional identity for language teachers than any solid, inquiry-derived understanding of what people need to know in order to teach languages or how they learn to do what they do as language teachers.

It was during the 1960s that English Language teaching began a major period of expansion worldwide and that methodologies such as Audiolingualism and Situational Language Teaching emerged as the first wave of new methodologies to regenerate the field of English as a second or foreign language. The specific approaches and teacher training courses were designed to enrich prospective teachers with the practical classroom skills needed to teach the new methods. The discipline of applied linguistics dates from the same period with which specialized academic knowledge and theory that provided the foundation of new discipline came into existence. This knowledge was represented in the curricula of MA programs, which began to be offered from this time that typically contained courses in the language analysis, learning theory, methodology, and sometimes a teaching practicum. Van Lier (1992, p. 1996) proposed a way to resolve the theory practice issue in a paper as:

Instead of the usual linguistic sub-topics such as phonetics, syntax, discourse analysis and so on, I propose that we identify language-related themes from the teachers' own sphere of activity... Within each theme, it is inevitable that straightforward linguistic phenomena of phonology, syntax, discourse, etc. will need to be explored at some point. This exploration will necessitate a certain amount of linguistic study in the traditional sense, but it is very important that such study is now motivated by a real-life question that requires an answer. Interestingly in this scheme of Language Awareness development, we treat "the teaching of linguistics" in a similar way to the way in which we treat "the teaching of grammar" in a task-based communicative approach. We do not teach linguistics "because it is there", but because it helps us to solve language problems in real-life tasks.

Nowadays, the point part that reached more generally is the belief that like any form of education, teacher education is based on the notion that some type of input is introduced or created, which then creates an impact on the learner or

learners. Moreover, input can be examined for the sake of what it is, its content and how it is introduced or created, its process, and the impacts or outcomes it generates. The tripartite organization of what is taught, how is taught and to what extent it is taught can serve as a basic frame for explaining the importance of input. Although some research on classroom teaching has raised complications with casting content and process-or subject-matter and teaching method- as independent of one another, the students' perspective points out that the content or the lesson and how it is presented are often largely inseparable. Nevertheless, this tripartite structure of content, process and outcome continues to be a useful way of thinking about input in teacher education as a source of theory underpinning teacher education and the conception of what the process of education and educating the language teachers, is all about.

The relationship between all these notions parallel to the practical teaching skills and academic knowledge and their representation in language education has generated such a debate ever since that what it follows is now distinguishing "teacher training" from "teacher development" which are vital parts of English teacher education.

2.1.1. Teacher Development

Starting from the early years of their profession, the common belief is that teachers may get better or worse depending on their schools in which they teach or themselves. But the urgent need of continuous attempt to be more qualified in their job or profession does not end. Their desire for improvement and reform in their profession brings the notion of teacher development to the arena.

At this point it would be beneficial to remember Stallings' (1989) attention to the teachers that are more likely to change their behavior and continue to use new ideas under the following conditions:

- they become aware of a need for improvement through their analysis of their own observation profile;
- they make a written commitment to try new ideas in their classroom the next day;
- they modify the workshop ideas to work in their classroom and school;
- they try the ideas and evaluate the effect;

- they observe in each other's classrooms and analyze their own data;
- they report their success or failure to their group;
- they discuss problems and solutions regarding individual students or teaching subject-matter;
- they need a wide variety of approaches; modeling, simulations, observations, critiquing video tapes, presenting at professional meetings;
- they learn in their own way to set new goals for professional growth. (pp.3-4)

The cornerstones of professional development of the model, according to Stallings (1989), are:

- Learn by doing – try, evaluate, modify, try again.
- Link prior knowledge to new information.
- Learn by reflecting and solving problems.
- Learn in a supportive environment – share problems and successes. (p. 4)

All of above mentioned things show that teacher development is a term that used to describe a life-long, continual intellectual and experimental growth of teachers, in other words 'the process of trying to become the best kind of teacher as much as I personally can be' (Underhill, 1986, p.1). So while teachers are thinking about ways of developing, they always ask themselves:

- How can I become a better teacher?
- How can I enjoy my teaching more?
- How can I feel that I am helping learning?

These questioning help them to acknowledge that it is possible to change the way they teach and perhaps the conceptions that they have about teaching and learning also to divide the blurring side of teacher training.

2.1.2. Teacher Training

Conversely to the teacher development, teacher training can be identified with entry level teaching skills linked to a specific teaching context during a short term. Training involves the development of a repertoire of teaching skills, acquired through observing experienced teachers and practice teaching in a controlled setting, e.g. through micro-teaching or peer-teaching. As Widdowson (1984, p. 88)

referred to "training was the process of helping future teachers to master certain classroom techniques".

It must be remembered that the field of ELT was at the height of the age of methods, each method having a set of practical techniques that were thought easy to equip teachers with. As Freeman and Johnson (1998, p. 398) point out, most classroom research on language teaching at that time aimed at describing effective teaching behaviors, positive student outcomes, and teacher-student interactions that were believed to lead to successful foreign language learning. The contributions of the teacher as an individual were not part of the equation. However, with the "post-method condition", a phrase coined by Kumaravallivedu (1994), emerging in the 1990s, it began to be realized that teachers should be empowered with the knowledge, skill and autonomy to decide for themselves what practices work in their own particular situations.

Ur (1997) concurs with the distinction of training and development, saying that training is an externally imposed process that does not directly involve the participant or his/her previous experience at any stage, from syllabus design to evaluation; that assumes learning is the blind acceptance of knowledge; and that acts to disempower the teacher. Development, on the other hand, is a self-initiated process involving the participants, who determine the syllabus, provide the input and take part in their own evaluation; views learning as a collaborative process; and ultimately empowers the teacher. Thus, teacher empowerment is the teacher's being seen as "an autonomous professional, responsible for, and an authority on, professional learning and practice, rather than subordinate to external authority and expertise" (Ur, 1997).

2.2. Teacher Education in Turkey

On the 12th September 1980, Turkey faced with the military takeover and important decisions were taken on higher education and consequently on teacher education (Bilir, 2011). First of all, universities were held responsible for the higher education with law no 41 Decree Law in 1982. Therefore, teachers have been educated in higher education institutions since 1973 when teaching was defined as a specialized profession, namely being a teacher would require a formal preparation and specialization besides certain skills (Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003;

Şişman, 2001; YÖK, 2007). In 1989, the length of teacher education for all teacher education institutions, including two-year education institutes training elementary level teachers, increased to at least four years with the decision of Council of Higher Education. Since these years, Council of Higher Education has taken several steps for the rejuvenation of teacher education. These restructuring efforts are the subjects of following parts.

Today, there are totally many education faculties under the Council of Higher Education (CHE) in Turkey. While some of these faculties are under state universities, some of them are under the control of private universities. Pre-school and elementary school teacher education lasts four years in faculties of education.

The concurrent model of teacher education is used in which candidates have both subject matter and teaching courses together. The courses include subject matter knowledge and skills in the proportion of 50-60%, knowledge and skills on teaching profession in the proportion of 25-30% and general culture lessons with the proportion of 15-20%. Students commonly take teaching-related pedagogy courses, which are Methods of Teaching 1-2, Introduction to Educational Science, Educational Psychology, Curriculum Planning and Teaching, Measurement and Evaluation, Turkish Education System and School Management, Classroom Management, Guidance, Instructional Technologies and Materials Design, School Experience, and Practice Teaching. Students mostly have Practice Teachings in the fourth year while it is given in the third year in a few of the teaching areas. These practices are carried out at cooperating schools under the supervision of cooperating teachers and instructors at faculties. However, the time of the Practice Teaching has always been changed over the years. Different from the elementary teacher education, most of the secondary school teaching (Secondary Science and Mathematics, and Social Areas Teaching) lasts five years. Teacher candidates get their subject courses from the relevant faculties in their universities and teaching courses from the faculties of education. The students graduate with a non-thesis Master's degree after this period (Bilir, 2011; YÖK, 2007).

In addition, students are admitted to these teacher education programs based on their scores from the nation-wide university entrance exam. Only music, arts, and physical education and sports teacher education programs apply additional ability tests while selecting their students. However, it should also be noted here that the

students who graduated from Teacher High Schools would get additional scores when they choose a teaching department. Anatolian Teacher High Schools were one of the high schools in Turkey and they select their students through a nationwide high school exam after the elementary school (now it is 12-year compulsory education). There were more than 200 Anatolian Teacher High Schools all around Turkey and the main admission criterion to these high schools was the students' scores on High School Entrance Exam (SBS). In the curricula of these schools, following pedagogy courses were covered: Introduction to Teaching Profession, Teaching Methods and Techniques, History of Turkish Education, Educational Sociology, and Educational Psychology (MEB, 2009). The studies showed that quality education was offered to students in Anatolian High Schools and students were expected to develop positive attitudes towards teaching to select teaching departments in the university exam (Tican & Başaran, 2004; Tican-Başaran & Aksu, 2007). However, another study showed that the students did not choose the teaching profession as their initial choices when they made their free choices (Çubukçu, 1997). It is also pointed out through studies that the students generally came to these schools because of the extra points added in the university exam but not because of their desire to be a teacher (Kütük, 1992). For that reason, the effectiveness of these high schools is also a contentious issue in Turkey. Since the 05/06/1014 dated and 83203306/10.03/2288835 numbered decision of Ministry of National Education, the Anatolian Teacher Training High Schools' 165 year history has ended up.

On the other hand, there are also other options for the ones who want to be a teacher but did not graduate from faculties of education. In this case, another model used for preparation of teachers in Turkey is to obtain a teaching certificate through non-thesis Master's degree after the completion of Bachelor's degree in Science and Literature Faculties. Graduates/students apply to teaching certificate programs provided by most of the state or private universities against a certain charge. The program lasts one and a half year and applicants have the following courses including practice teaching (at least 25 credits) during this one-year time: Introduction to Educational Science, Developmental Psychology, Teaching and Learning Theories and Approaches, Instructional Planning and Teaching, Measurement and Evaluation, Classroom Management, Guidance, Methods of

Teaching 1-2, Instructional Technologies and Materials Design, and Practice Teaching. After an intensive study, they get their teaching certificate. These programs were announced on April 9th, 2012 to be abolished by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK, 2012a). However, this announcement created confusion; and the students and deans of Science and Literature Faculties protested this abolishment (“Pedagogic Formation was Abolished”, 2012; “A Formation Protest”, 2012). On June 5th, 2012, it was re-announced that the pedagogic formation would be continued till a new model was offered by the Teacher Education Study Group under the Council of Higher Education (YÖK, 2012b).

Another option is the second-shift education provided in the evening in some of the Faculties of Education. The main difference between these programs and other 4 or 5 year programs is the candidates’ lower score in the state university entrance exam. Anatolian University also offered an ELT and Pre-School Teacher Training Programs in the Faculty of Open Education. In that system, teacher candidates had two year formal education in the Open Education Faculties; then they completed their education through Distance Education. Since the meeting held by the CHE on the 9th of February 2012, the Open Education Teacher Training Programs were closed by suspending.

No matter from which program they graduate, all teacher candidates are required to get a certain score from the state exam called KPSS (Exam for the Selection of Civil Servants) to be recruited as a teacher. For that reason, these ways of entering teaching profession, pedagogic formation programs, second-shift evening programs, and Open Education are highly debatable alternatives for the preparation of teachers in Turkey. Especially, pedagogic formation programs are criticized in the educational arena due to the compressed length of education, and, dependent on this, the low quality of education (Altan, 1998; Bilir, 2011; Kızılcıoğlu, 2006). Moreover, the courses taken in the non-thesis graduate degree for teaching certificate were also claimed inefficient and not suitable to prepare the applicants for the needed teaching skills. Being similar to the undergraduate courses, they are not found sufficient by educators for obtaining the degree of Master of Science (Azar, 2011). These problems stemming from these alternatives should be considered covering the current and crucial changes in the area of teacher education.

2.2.1. EFL Teacher Education in Turkey

The foreign language teacher education can be taken into consideration by dividing the process into pre-service and in-service teacher education. Starting with the pre-service English language teacher education, foreign language teaching has emerged as a part of religious education and has gained much importance over time in Turkish national education history. Unfortunately, the fact that the use of foreign languages in politics and economics has always effected the future of the languages taught in the schools. Until the establishment of the Turkish Republic, for the purpose of religious relations and political interactions, the most commonly foreign languages instructed at schools were Arabic; for the scientific and artistic purposes of the Western languages German and French were also used. Nowadays, English is the most commonly spoken and written international language throughout the world. Therefore, Turkish national foreign language policy as the whole world needs to focus on and give importance to the instruction of English as a foreign language. Because of the conservative political attitudes of the Ottoman Empire to the foreign relations until the 18th century, the instruction of Western languages were ignored. The only foreign language taken much attention was Arabic because of the religious dominance within the Empire (Bektaş-Altiok, 2006). The things started to change when the Empire needed some attempts to reconstruct the educational system by taking into consideration the Western advancements. By this way, the Western languages started to appear into the Turkish educational programs (Altundiş, 2006). After that, the foreign language teacher education appeared as an important issue for the governments. Such as the Ministry of National Education (MONE) selected talented young people to send them to France so that they had the chance to have education in French and after returning back to Turkey they would teach the French language to the young people. Although that was a big desire, since the progress of these students' training was not controlled, all these attempts were failed (Tok, 2006). As Tok (2006) declares in his doctoral dissertation another important step for the improvement of teacher education in Turkey was the Declaration of Reforms which assisted the foreign language courses to have places in the educational programs and by this way promote more foreign language teachers to have chance to incorporate them into educational scene. Because that attempt of sending

students abroad to have foreign language education had failed, the government aimed to open a new school in order to train more language teachers. In 1867, the Turkish government reached the French government and requested help in this matter. In 1868, the Enderun Schools of the Ottoman Period which was at first settled to prepare government officers were modernized and restored under the name of Galatasaray Sultanisi whose opening was a critical occasion for foreign language teacher training. This school began to give chance of preparing in French and in a brief time made itself acknowledged in Europe for its high touchstone in training. The understudies in this school knew a decent level of French as it was the most widely used language of that period and got courses to learn different dialects like Bulgarian, Armenian, Greek, English, Italian, and German (Tok, 2006). Foreign language teacher training in Turkey formally began with Darülmüallimin (Teachers' School) that was opened in Istanbul on 16th March, 1948 (Aydın, 2007). Around then, requests for foreign language instructors nationwide were supplied by Gazi Teacher School which was established in 1926 in Konya and was moved to Ankara in 1927. In 1946, the first teacher education instruction foundation was built up under the title of Gazi Institute of Education. Despite the fact that it just incorporated an educational departments at the beginning, some different divisions for science and literature were likewise settled (Demirel, 1991). So as to prepare teachers to teach foreign languages in the Gazi Institute, a division of French dialect was set up in 1941, English language department was set up in 1944 and German language department was built up in 1947 (Demirel, 1991). In the 1967-1968 academic year, these projects were resolved to give a 3-year preparing for teacher education. In the 1978-1979 scholastic year, the preparation period was resolved as 4 years and the name of the foundation was changed into Gazi High Teacher School. The establishment of this organization prompted the foundation of Gazi University and the Faculty of Education in June, 1982 (Akyüz, 2007, p. 387). According to general teacher education in Turkey, Demircan (2001) states that while in the 1950s the quantity of the students taking English courses was 48.000, in the 1980s there were more than 1,5 million students who learn English. Additionally, the quantity of the students who were being instructed in English was around 2500 in the 1950s and around 100.000 students were included in English immersion programs in secondary and high school education (Demircan, 2001). These numbers

demonstrate the quickly expanding requirement for English teaching instructors. Beginning from 1938, the requirement for the establishment of foreign language teacher education programs had developed. Two educational sciences institutes (Gazi Institute in Ankara and Çapa Institute in Istanbul) were established for the first time of the Turkish education history under the title of foreign language teaching departments (Güneş, 2009). In 1950s the arrangement of foreign language teacher education showed preparation relied on upon having more students in these divisions. Strictly since 1965, more English language teaching divisions were built up and following 1970, 4-year foreign language programs were opened in the universities. After 1975, to supply more instructors, the quantity of students in educational divisions was raised. Then again, it was seen that this impromptu activity did not bring about an excellent English language teacher candidate (Demircan, 2001). For sure, the Ministry of Education Commission Report in 1960 demonstrated that foundations of instruction were not qualified in preparing foreign language teachers. It proposed that the foreign language teachers from teacher colleges were not sufficiently qualified to complete their calling, henceforth they must be supplanted by Turkish instructors. Somewhere around 1960 and 1970, the quantity of English language teachers was around 1300 (Demircan, 2001). As it can be seen, the amount, as opposed to the nature of the training for foreign language teachers was underscored in this period. To put it plainly, the foreign language teacher education policy between the 1940s and the 1980s in Turkey was not appropriately arranged. At the point when there was more requirement for new foreign language teachers, the arrangement found for this issue was to acknowledge more student from educational faculties, building up new departments, opening certificate programs for foreign language teaching and enrolling educators who did not have raised up with language teaching and learning pedagogy (Altundiş, 2006). As indicated by Işık (2008), even today the number of instructors who haven't had /taken any methodology courses in their departmental studies is still high.

This is a major issue for the nature of the foreign language education given to Turkish students as these supplementary programs don't convey very qualified preparation in the programs of teacher training.. At last in the 1940s, educational institutions were built up everywhere throughout the nation. While the quantity of

these establishments was around 10 at the outset of the 1970s, in the 1977-1978 scholarly year, they came to up to 18 foundations (Dursunoğlu, 2003). After the 1978-1979 academic year, they were named as Higher Teacher Schools and offered 4-year programs (Aydın, 2007). Until 1982, their number was under 10 and they were giving instruction in 16 divisions, including foreign language teaching (Dursunoğlu, 2003). The Council of Higher Education (CHE) law went in 1982 brought on some huge changes in teacher education. With this new law, teacher education institutions were moved into universities as educational faculties. With this decision, foreign language teacher education in Turkey was at long last institutionalized and regulated level (Demirel, 1991; Öztürk, 2005) form. This could be seen as a foreign language teacher education strategy in Turkey, in light of the fact that the regulations identified with foreign language teacher education were at long last controlled by only institution, CHE. There was an endeavor to trade off the inconsistencies identified with strategies encompassing teacher education. CHE enactment in 1982 recommended that all instructive resources would have under Educational Sciences Departments. These departments were relied upon to fulfill academic teacher training programs for different departments. In the following years, so as to supply more teachers for the service, even resources of workmanship and science opened Educational Sciences Departments inside of their establishments. Öztürk (2005) states that after this date, a few alterations in pre-service teacher education programs were advertised. As a matter of first importance, an endeavor was made to institutionalize pre-service training for instructors all in all. Second, the hours that pre-service teachers spend at practice schools were brought 200% for the students up in every single educational departments. This was a positive choice for the nature of teacher education process in Turkey. In addition, to manufacture a dependable relationship between the two vital organizations in teacher education, MONE and CHE marked an order on 28th July, 2008. On the other hand, Öztürk (2005) states that until 2002 no positive results of these progressions had been observed. In 1973, new enactment was declared that teacher education programs would not be under 2 years. In 1989, this was raised to 4 years for all branches. In 1992, all teacher education programs were accumulated under resources of faculties of education (Aydın, 2007). In 1997, the burden of programs was changed to include more practice time and professional knowledge (Sağlam & Kürüm, 2005). These were valuable

endeavors to enhance the nature of instruction in these programs. Foreign language teacher education in Turkey today is basically centered around the teaching of English. The educators to be enrolled into the national educational framework are obliged to complete a 4-year undergraduate programs identified with English (Seferoğlu, 2004). After the 1997-1998 academic year, it was reported by the MONE that getting certificates given by instructive focuses in universities was additionally acknowledged to have the capacity to fill in as English language teachers in state funded schools. Those certificate programs contain a preparation of 31 study hours a week and 34 universities all over Turkey offer these sorts of programs (Bektaş-Altıok, 2006). Proceeding with the historical backdrop of in-service English language teacher education in Turkey, it is realized that in-service teacher training is administrated nationwide by the Chair of In-Service Training (INSET) Department and district wide by INSET Offices (Şahin, 2006). In 1993, the MONE chose to distribute in-service teacher training programs to provincial INSET workplaces with the goal that instructors did not need to leave their urban communities to go to the preparation system focuses. Consistently the Chair of Inset Education Department chooses 5-6 urban communities to be included in these projects. Cooperation in these projects is intentional (Karaata, 2010). As indicated by Karaata (2010), the English educators who were alumni of English language teaching (ELT) approach were 59% of the entire English language teachers' population in 2007. Around the same time, 25% of the English teachers did not get any sign of preparation, while 14% of the entire population got no English or sign of preparation by any stretch of the imagination. In the most recent 5 years, the 82 INSET courses identified with English language issues got just 4389 teachers. This is only 11.49% of all English teachers (Karaata, 2010). As indicated by Işık (2008), the issue of INSET for foreign language teachers is a tricky one in light of the fact that in spite of the fact that it is under the control of the administration, it is for the most part educated by non-open associations as opposed to scholarly establishments. Another issue for INSET results from the miscommunication between the practices included in teacher training and education in Turkey (Seferoğlu, 2004). In addition, as Turkish legislative issues much influenced by current political occasions and new governments, the individuals from high positions in both the MONE and CHE are changed or moved from their positions regularly and this resulted in numerous new choices and

adjustments next to the insecurity in foreign language teacher education policies (Işık, 2008). Another kind of INSET projects that the Turkish government made utilization of in the historical backdrop of English language teacher education was abroad projects. These INSET projects go back to 1857. The instructors to be sent to another country were chosen by the MONE by an exam or by the nature of their administration. At first, in 1952, 25 educators were sent to the USA. These instructors profited from bursaries supplied by the MONE, NATO or the Council of Europe. Somewhere around 1951 and 1981, the Fulbright training commission additionally gave bursaries to 139 teachers (Demircan, 2001). As it can be seen from these cases, the INSET for foreign language teachers is a disregarded instructive theme in Turkey. INSET projects are masterminded 3-4 times each year. On the other hand, just a little number of foreign language teachers can profit by those projects and the ones extraordinarily produced for ELT teachers are exceptionally constrained (Karaata, 2010).

2.3. Reflection

In everyday language, reflection is considered to be a kind of thinking (Gilpin, 1999, p. 109). In addition, the definition of reflection is likely to vary from one person to another (Dewey, 1933; Schön, 1983, 1987, 1991; Wallace, 1991). However, there are certain insights about what constitutes “reflection”. Dewey (1933, p. 12), who himself preferred to use the term “reflective thinking, defined this term as “...a state of doubt or hesitation in which thinking originates in the practice situation, and an act of inquiry to find material that will resolve the doubt and dispose of the perplexity”. For Dewey, open-mindedness, a sense of responsibility and wholeheartedness or dedication were central to the potential development of a reflective practitioner (Harford & MacRuairc, 2008, p. 2). Gilpin (1999, p. 110), on the other hand, described reflection as “thinking about the strategies to be used to change a situation, innovate etc. using the results to inform the on-going process”. Some others describe reflection as involving actions such as problem solving, comparing and contrasting competing perspectives, and deriving reasoned instructional decisions. Related to the necessity of reflection, Dewey (1933) believes that:

Reflection is an important human activity in which people recapture their experience, think about it, mull it over and evaluate it. It is this working with experience that is important in learning. The capacity to reflect is developed into different stages in different people and it

may be this ability which characterizes those who learn effectively from experience (Dewey, 1933, p. 36).

When it comes to teacher education, reflective teaching has been a concept that is “entrenched in the literature and discourses of teacher education and teachers’ professional development” (Ottesen, 2007, p. 31). Generally, teacher educators describe and explain reflection or reflective practice as a tool for engaging prospective teachers in examining their prior experiences and beliefs, resolving conflicts, and drawing connections between theory and practice in light of new learning (Bainer & Cantrell, 1992; Galvez-Martin, Bowman, & Morrison, 1996; Galvez-Martin, Bowman, & Morrison, 1997). Wallace (1991) mentioned three kinds of teacher education models: 1) Applied Science 2) Craft Model 3) Reflective Teaching. Applied Science is the traditional and the most common model which is used mostly in training and education programmes and viewed as teaching the solving of pedagogical problems through active inquiry and experimentation. As for Craft Model, the professional practitioner is the craft and the trainee teacher learns teaching by watching, imitating and following the instructions of the expert. As opposed to these two teacher education models, reflective teaching teacher education models is more effective in that it offers “observing, examining, evaluating skills as the process of teacher's thinking critically about what happens in the classroom” (Brookfield, 1995; Harford & MacRuairc, 2008; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004; Ur, 1996; Wallace, 1991). Reflective abilities are critical to the development of pre-service teachers. Schön (1987) was one of the first pioneers in reflective teaching along with his contributions to the field. Reflective practice “involves thoughtfully considering one’s own experiences in applying knowledge to practice while being coached by professionals in discipline” (Ferraro, 2000). Schön (1983, 1987, 1991, 1995) introduced the concepts of “reflection-in-action” and “reflection-on- action”. To clarify, reflection-in-action is concerned with thinking about what we are doing in the classroom while we are doing it; and this thinking is supposed to reshape what we are doing. Reflection-on-action, on the other hand, can be thought of “as the process of making sense of an action after it has occurred, and possibly learning something from the experience that extends one’s knowledge-base” (Schön, 1983, 1987, 1991). Schön (1991) offered the concept “reflection-in-practice”. What he meant by this is

that a teacher's performance is internalized on the basis of the practice he undergoes. It is more like the issue of automatisisation in a way that the practitioner gets used to various kinds of teaching situations. Knowing-in-practice "tends to become increasingly tacit, spontaneous and automatic and is likely to develop through expertise in time" (Schön, 1991, p. 60). However, one possible negative drawback is that this cycle can inhibit teachers to consider more about the teaching process and gain valuable insights on teaching. Wallace (1991) offered a conceptual framework of reflective practice by getting inspired by the previous works of Dewey, Schön and many others. He proposed that there are two kinds of knowledge concerning the way teachers get the input of teaching. Experiential knowledge can be defined in the following way. "The trainee will have developed knowledge-in-action by practice of the profession, and will have had, moreover, the opportunity to reflect on that knowledge-in-action" (Wallace, 1991, p. 15). As is easily seen, experiential knowledge is what trainee teachers go through during their Practice Teachings and how they reflect on those experiences. On the contrary, received knowledge refers to "the knowledge of field knowledge such as theories of language, learning and teaching as well as knowing in the target language at a professional level of competency" (Wallace, 1991, p. 15). That is, this sort of knowledge can be best summarized as any kind of information which might pave the way for real practice. Wallace offered the reflective model that combines experiential and received knowledge, practice, and reflection which leads teacher trainees to construct their own professional competence. Here is his proposed reflective model for foreign language teachers.




Figure 2.1.: Reflective Model Proposed by Wallace (1991)

In conclusion, focusing only two dimensions only, Wallace (1991, p.17) offered a very sound explanation of the implications for the training of foreign language

teachers. In line with this model, it is pointed out that the teacher should seek ideas for new instructional strategies, insights into current practices, questions for further inquiry, and suggestions for improving research processes. Even though Wallace's model has come up with two important criticisms one of which is it does not concentrate on received knowledge as much as it should have, which brings the issue of professional competence more than teacher trainee understands (Ur, 1996, p. 5-6) and another of which is it should not be to reject or underestimate the theory, instead it should foster the practice the theory in a more practical manner (Akbari, 2007), which still needs to receive more importance for English language teacher education.

To sum up, Pollard (2005, p. 14) identifies seven key characteristics of reflective practice in relation to reflective approach in teacher education:

1. Reflective teaching implies an active concern with aims and consequences, as well as means and technical efficiency.

2. Reflective teaching is applied in a cyclical or spiraling process in which teachers monitor, evaluate and revise their own practice continuously.

3. Reflective teaching requires competence in methods of evidence based classroom enquiry, to support the progressive development of higher standards of teaching.

4. Reflective teaching requires attitudes of open-mindedness, responsibility and whole heartedness.

5. Reflective teaching is based on teacher judgment, informed by evidence-based enquiry and insights from other research.

6. Reflective teaching, professional learning and personal fulfillment are enhanced through collaboration and dialogue with colleagues.

7. Reflective teaching enables teachers to creatively mediate externally developed frameworks for teaching and learning.

2.3.1. Teacher Autonomy

There are several theoretical foundations that have tried to explain the concept of autonomy in different ways. Among them, the constructivist theories of learning in education play the most key role in helping the concept of autonomy. Starting with Dewey, who supported the modes of thinking in different phases of education, he

believed that the primary purpose of education should be to prepare learners to take an active part in both social and political life by having them gain the skills and attitudes they need for democratic social participation (Dewey, 1916). Seen from his remarks, individuals should be prepared for life in order to survive in the environment they have to live. Thus, learners are responsible for their own social and political lives. Because constructivism, which emphasize the belief that knowledge cannot be taught but must be constructed by learners (Candy, 1991, p. 252), has common characteristics with autonomy and autonomous learning process. In this sense, Piaget, Kelly, Bruner and Vygotsky have nearly shared same thoughts with each other. Piaget (1965) also maintained that the ultimate aim of education is for the individual to develop the autonomy of thought to create new, original ideas rather than just recycle old ones. Kelly (1955), who developed “personal-construct theory”, viewed the learning process as a constant attempt to make sense of an individual's world. Learning is more like “involving learners making their own sense of information or events” (Williams & Burden, 1997, p. 27). Vygotsky, on the other hand, believes that social interaction is influential in language development. Emphasizing the importance of language in interacting with people, Vygotsky (1978), in his theory of the zone of proximal development, stated that the idea of collaboration is a key factor in the development of autonomy. According to Vygotsky, the learner should be at the center of learning process, which allows him to move from interdependence to independence in time (Benson, 2001, p. 14). Bruner (1966) incorporated knowledge in a personal framework, stating that knowing and thinking develop with experiences, placing emphasis on the individual as a self-realizing being, and stressing the importance of self-concept and affective factors in learning. This insight triggers the development of autonomy in educational context. As easily recognized in the applications of constructivism, the greatest impact of this learning theory on the idea of autonomy would be that autonomy has borrowed the idea “effective learning is active learning” (Benson, 2001, p. 40) from constructivism.

Just like the concept of learner autonomy, teacher autonomy too is a complex construct on which educators have yet to reach a consensus. It is both a multifaceted and confusing concept. There are a number of accounts of teacher education practices on teacher autonomy in the literature. There is “no easy

definition to operationalize teacher autonomy” (Lamb, 2008, p. 280). Unfortunately, in the field of language learning/teaching, teacher autonomy, surprisingly enough, is not given as much weight as it should be by teacher educators. Autonomy researchers; however, have produced only a few studies on teacher autonomy (Smith, 2003; Smith & Erdoğan, 2008).

Since researchers take the concept of teacher autonomy from a multidimensional perspective, it is difficult to define “teacher autonomy” properly. In other words, there is no definite understanding of what teacher autonomy refers to. That’s why one can encounter varying definitions from one person to another, one insight to yet another. In the autonomy literature, for more than 15 years, the concept of teacher autonomy has been frequently connected with language learner autonomy, yet not many attempts to define the concept clearly have managed to make the term clear enough. Here it would be useful to present the varying definitions of teacher autonomy in the historical order. It was Street and Licata (1989) who first described teacher autonomy as “teacher’s feelings of independence from the institution in making instructional decisions with the classroom”. This definition shows that teacher autonomy is viewed as a kind of independence from the institution when instructional decisions such as choosing the textbook to follow, teaching strategies to employ and classroom rules to obey are concerned. Pearson and Hall (1993, p. 172) viewed teacher autonomy as “the right of teachers to manage themselves and their job environment”. Shaw’s definition of teacher autonomy is “the capacity to take control of one’s own teaching” (2002, p. 2). Unlike the first two definitions proposed above, Shaw seemed to exclude the school factor and put the very emphasis on the teacher. Before moving on the definitions more specifically in the context of ELT, it would be wise to refer to Little (1995) who stated that “genuinely successful teachers have always been autonomous in the sense of having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their teaching” (p, 179). That is, autonomous teachers and successful teachers are very similar to one another greatly. McGrath (2000), defines teacher autonomy in a more comprehensive way. He mentioned two discrete dimensions of teacher autonomy: a) “teacher autonomy as a self-directed professional development” b) “teacher autonomy as freedom of control by others” (McGrath, 2000, p. 101-102). What is important here is that the first dimension is

more concerned with the psychological perspective, while the second one offers a more political one. Following McGrath, Aoki (2002, p. 111) defined teacher autonomy, in her remarks by analogy, as “the capacity, freedom, and/or responsibility to make choices concerning one's own teaching”. Smith (2003, 2006) and later Smith and Erdoğan (2008) prefer to use teacher-learner autonomy. According to Smith and Erdoğan (2008, p. 83), teacher/learner autonomy is “the ability to develop appropriate skills, knowledge and attitudes for oneself as a teacher, in cooperation with others” (Smith & Erdoğan, 2008, p. 83). Drawing on Benson’s argument for the sound definition of learner autonomy, Huang (2005, p. 206) focused on three terms willingness, capacity, and freedom to formulate his own working definition of teacher autonomy “teachers’ willingness, capacity and freedom to take control of their own teaching and learning”. Jimenez-Raya, Lamb and Vieira (2007, p. 1) provided a definition “the competence to develop as a self-determined, socially responsible and critically aware participant in (and beyond) educational environments, within a vision of education as (inter) personal empowerment and social transformation”. After a rigorous examination of the definitions in the literature, Ling (2007, p. 96) offered his own understanding of teacher autonomy as “an insight, a positive attitude, a capacity for reflection in teaching, and a readiness to promote the learner to be more independent and to take control over his/her own teaching”. During the course of a significant amount of time, educators have proposed different definitions by especially focusing on what they believe the most important component in teacher autonomy. It is a common belief that the term “teacher autonomy” may be used in a variety of ways, with different dimensions or components emphasized.

Apart from abovementioned things, there is a common belief that learner autonomy is a prerequisite for effective language learning (Benson, 2001, 2007; Dam, 1995; Little, 1991; Little, Ridley, & Ushioda, 2003; Thavenius, 1999). As far as the development of learner autonomy is concerned in class, there seems to be a general consensus that “it is the teacher’s responsibility to develop learner autonomy” (Dam, 1995, p. 79). There are possible links between teacher and learner autonomy in language learning/teaching. As Little stated (1995), the development of learner autonomy depends on the development of teacher autonomy in two senses. First, it is unreasonable to expect teachers to foster the

growth of autonomy in their learners if they themselves do not know what it is to be an autonomous learner. Second, in determining the initiatives they take in the classroom, teachers must be able to exploit their professional skills autonomously, applying to their teaching those same reflective and self-managing processes that they apply to their learning. Furthermore, language teachers are expected to develop the flexibility to use teaching approaches, which are the most appropriate for their existing contexts. Smith (2001, 2003) and later (Smith & Erdoğan, 2008) took a further step towards teacher autonomy and believed “of the privileged conditions for the promotion of pedagogy for autonomy with language learners” and “an important goal in its own right”, which constitute the very basic of autonomy in foreign language teacher education contexts. Barfield et al. (2001) suggest that the possible characteristics of autonomous teachers may involve:

- Negotiation skills;
- Institutional knowledge in order to start to address effectively constraints on teaching and learning;
- Willingness to confront institutional barriers in socially appropriate ways to turn constraints into opportunities for change;
- Readiness to engage in lifelong learning to the best of an individual’s capacity;
- Reflection on the teaching process and environment;
- Commitment to promoting learner autonomy.

In the light of these characteristics, one can easily assume that autonomous teachers and learners are two sides of a coin and will best stimulate their learning by negotiating between themselves in order to resolve the constraints on teaching and learning process via depending deeply to the principles of CEFR especially for learner autonomy and EPOSTL for teacher autonomy.

2.3.2. Teacher Self-Efficacy

The major part of research reviewed in this part of the study pays attention to the issue of teacher self-efficacy in terms of its definition and theoretical construct. As a general term, teacher self-efficacy refers to the teacher’s beliefs about his/her talents and those beliefs effect not only the learning environment, but also the student success. Teacher self-efficacy can be described as the teacher’s belief of

his or her talent on how to cause a positive change on the learning, achievement and engagement of students (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). By taking its roots from social cognitive theory, teacher self-efficacy might also be identified as a teacher's beliefs in his/her capability to plan, arrange, and perform tasks which are necessary in order to achieve the educational goals (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010).

With these arguments in mind, Dellinger et al. (2008) clearly differentiate between teacher efficacy and teacher self-efficacy beliefs. The authors are of the opinion that teacher efficacy merely refers to the beliefs of the teacher in his/her capability; nonetheless, teacher self-efficacy beliefs are more specific than the previous one. That is to say, the latter beliefs contextualize the specific teaching tasks, specific school, students and classroom (see Figure 2. 2).




Figure 2.2.: Differences between teacher self-efficacy beliefs and teacher efficacy (Dellinger et al., 2008, p. 753).

Bandura (1997) demystifies the significance of teacher self-efficacy in education, so he notes that the teachers' skills and self-efficacy shapes the learning environments which are suitable for developing cognitive competencies. In simple terms, teachers' beliefs in their efficacy regarding teaching may affect the academic activities in their classrooms. As noted in a later section, teachers' sense of efficacy determines their way of practices in the classroom. In other words, instead of practicing authoritarian control in class; some persuasive ways

are performed by the teachers who have increased sense of instructional efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

With regard to the construct of teacher self-efficacy, factors such as achievement, attitudes, and beliefs so and so forth may be uttered. Notably, Yüksel (2010) argues that educational innovations will not be successful as long as developing specific skills are emphasized without considering the teachers' beliefs, attitudes and so on. In support of this view, Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) explain the issue in broader terms. Namely, they argue that teacher self-efficacy has a strong relationship with teachers' behaviors in the classroom, their acceptance of fresh ideas and their attitudes toward teaching. Along a similar vein, teacher self-efficacy most probably affects the student in terms of achievement, attitude and actual growth. Besides, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) argue the elements that are linked to the teacher's sense of efficacy, some of which are named as performance of the learner, the level of goal achievement, teacher change and so on.

Based on the literature above, it is important to keep in the forefront of one's mind that teacher self-efficacy is not only context but also subject matter specific. To this end, "a teacher may feel very competent in one area of study or when working with one kind of student and feel less able in other subjects or with different students" (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 215). In support of this claim, Chan (2008) emphasizes the importance of studying domain-specific teacher self-efficacy rather than general self-efficacy because teachers work in the diverse classrooms that include students with different abilities and needs.

To sum up, as it is believed that European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages gives the prospective teachers the chance of expressing their beliefs on their competency levels of how they perform or will perform in their classrooms, the concept of self-efficacy will also improve and take place its necessary role through the act of teaching English. Parallel with this belief, European Profiling Grid will also serve as a proof or prevalence in showing the strong interests of EPOSTL with teachers' self-efficacy during the process of teaching English.

2.3.3. Self-Assessment Coming With ELP

Most of us probably associate the word “portfolio” with the world of art and design: it evokes the samples of work, sometimes presented in a large folder, that artists and designers use to introduce their skills to potential patrons and clients. Part of the European Language Portfolio (ELP) is similar to this, but it has two other components that do not usually form part of an artist’s portfolio.

The *Principles and Guidelines* approved by the Council of Europe (DGIV/EDU/LANG (2000) 3) define the three components of the ELP as follows:

- *The Language Passport* section provides an overview of the individual’s proficiency in different languages at a given point in time; the overview is defined in terms of skills and the common reference levels in the Common European Framework; it records formal qualifications and describes language competencies and significant language and intercultural learning experiences; it includes information on partial and specific competence; it allows for self-assessment, teacher assessment and assessment by educational institutions and examinations boards; it requires that information entered in the Passport states on what basis, when and by whom the assessment was carried out. To facilitate European recognition and mobility, a standard presentation of a Passport Summary is promoted by the Council of Europe for ELPs for adults.
- *The Language Biography* facilitates the learner’s involvement in planning, reflecting upon and assessing his or her learning process and progress; it encourages the learner to state what he/she can do in each language and to include information on linguistic and cultural experiences gained in and outside formal educational contexts; it is organized to promote plurilingualism, i.e. the development of competencies in a number of languages.
- *The Dossier* offers the learner the opportunity to select materials to document and illustrate achievements or experiences recorded in the Language Biography or Passport.

Over the past years, ELP developed for use with learners of different ages who are learning languages in many different contexts for different variety of purposes. Not surprisingly, then, many versions of ELP were designed for use with different

learners. Pedagogically, as the ELP is also intended to be used as a means of making the language learning process more transparent to both learners and teachers, it helps them to develop their capacity for reflection and self-assessment by enabling them gradually to assume more and more responsibility for their own learning and teaching.

The act of self-assessment in foreign language learning and teaching play such a huge importance that it is the natural effect of the reflections and self-efficacy levels of teachers referring also the learners level and situations as well. In this part, at first it would be very useful to mention about the three different possible focuses of the act of self-assessment. The first of them is related with the learning process itself. Overall learners need to be able to assess how well they are progressing or have progressed, how well they are learning at a particular level or stage, and how successful they are in performing the language tasks and the perceived learning goals. With this focus, self-assessment plays an integral part of reflective approaches to learning and teaching. In the very early stages of learning, it may be useful for learners as they can record a rather general judgment about their own learning. On account of this, it should be one of teachers' central pedagogical purposes to bring the learners to the point where they can record this kind of self-assessment during the process of target language learning. But here it should be noted that this kind of self-assessment is inescapably subjective, since it is based on the view of learners themselves and it should be kept in mind that there is no way for objective alternative to self-assessment when it is focused mainly on the learning process supported by the learners' perceptions and feelings.

The second focus of the concept of self-assessment deals with the learners' communicative proficiency which is labeled by the Council of Europe's scales and descriptors. These proficiency levels are central to the classroom activities. Of the three focuses, this one may be the easiest to deal with because individuals usually know what they can do and cannot do. Nevertheless, the risk part of this focus is that the learners may claim they have some proficiency in parts of language they learn. If they insist on possessing the skills, this should be followed by requiring them to demonstrate what they claim to.

The third focus for self-assessment is the learner's linguistic proficiency which includes the words he knows, the structures he can deploy and the sounds he can articulate. As Oskarsson (1992, p. 32.) declares learners are likely to find this focus more difficult than assessing their own communicative proficiency. Thus, if the learners feel incapable for this kind of self-assessment which also needs to monitor, correct and refine their linguistic output, one way of helping learners is to assess their own linguistic proficiency is to give them tasks that they can perform and correct for themselves.

In this study, the self-assessment abilities of teachers under the scope of prospective teachers of English language have been studied and the belief of performing these three focuses in the process of learning by the learners' demands firstly providing the teachers with the valuable support in self-assessing their performance and professional growth. Prospective teachers participating to the self-assessment process may build and develop such a powerful profession that the number of learners who have the capacity of self-assessment in their own learning supported by both ELP and CEFR may increase.

2.4. The Professionalism of English Language Teaching

Contemporary educational reforms has resulted in a period of significant change for teachers especially when the involvement of wider range of stakeholders are realized including both marketisation and centralization. So, it is needed to reflect the appropriateness of existing notions of teacher professionalism to the context of teacher education more than ever in recent times. As Millerson (1964) defined the typical list which terms an occupation as a profession should include such items as:

- the use of skills based on theoretical knowledge
- education and training in those skills certified by examination
- a code of professional conduct oriented towards the 'public good'
- a powerful professional organization

It is clear that English language teaching is a kind of profession, which needs to underline and acquire the aspects of professionalism to the teachers. For this purpose and as part of its mission to advance professional expertise in English language teaching and learning for speakers of other languages worldwide,

TESOL International Association has developed standards for various aspects of English language teaching. Starting with the TESOL ESL Standards for PreK–12 Students (2006) through the TESOL P–12 Professional Teaching Standards (2010), TESOL has developed, published, and revised standards for students, teachers, and programs in various sectors including elementary and secondary education in the United States, teacher preparation, and adult education. In these guidelines for developing EFL standards, TESOL utilizes its resources both human and material, accumulated knowledge, and experience in the field to create a new document, the sharing of which, and not exportation, is perceived as a positive result of globalization rather than of linguistic, cultural, academic, or educational imperialism. Thus, the following figure presents the Teacher Education Program Standards defined by TESOL:




Figure 2.3.: TESOL P–12 Teacher Education Program Standards (TESOL, 2010, p. 19).

This figure summarizes the equivalent idea that the teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011, p. 1). Moreover, based on current research, TESOL (2010) identified five domains that are needed to prepare English teachers. These five domains are:

- Language (foundation domain)
- Culture (foundation domain)
- Instruction (application domain)
- Assessment (application domain)
- Professionalism (at the intersection of all the domains)

Figure 2.4 needs attention as it illustrates that student learning is the central concern for all teachers, and therefore occupies the center of these teaching standards. Surrounding student learning in two concentric circles are the eight standards for ESL/EFL teachers of adults. Collectively, these eight standards represent the core of what professional teachers of ESL and EFL learners should know and be able to do.




Figure 2.4.: Model of Standards for ESL/EFL Teachers of Adults (TESOL, 2008, p. viii).

Although the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (Council of Europe, 2001) does not include

standards per se, they organize the framework of reference essentially by domains. These include:

1. Structure (how a teacher preparation program is organized)
2. Knowledge and Understanding (similar to TESOL's Language and Culture domains, and CAEP's Content Knowledge)
3. Strategies and Skills (similar to TESOL's Instruction domain and CAEP's Pedagogical Knowledge)
4. Values (included in TESOL's Professionalism domain)

As Darling-Hammond (1997) suggests unless we move toward keeping more consistent goals rather than always making exceptions to the goals, our educational reforms "will surely evaporate in a very short time, long before good schooling spreads to the communities where it is currently most notable by its absence" (p. 211). Darling-Hammond advocates that standards are a way to provide the stability and consistency. She also states a direct connection between standards for student learning and professional standards for teaching, stressing that both are necessary for genuine learning to occur.

2.4.1. Teachers' Roles

There are many different and complex factors influence the roles that teachers adopt in the classroom. An appreciation of these factors is essential if we are to understand teaching and learning activities. Although often the social and psychological factors inherent in the roles are hidden, the process of learning a language in the classroom is underpinned by the teacher/learner relationship. Nowadays, the influences the role relations of teachers can be defined easier than before. As there are interpersonal factors including status and position, attitudes and beliefs, personality, and motivation factors; and task related factors such as goals, tasks and topics that have huge influence on the role of teachers. Apart from these influences, a teacher's style is the collection of the many attitudes and behaviors he employs to create the best possible conditions under which learning can take place. Thus, the primary role when setting up learning activities is managerial. From this point of view essentially, it can be said that teachers have two major roles in the classroom. The first one is to create the conditions under the which learning can take place that compromise the social side of teaching; the

second one is to impart, by a variety of means, knowledge to their learners consisting of the task-oriented side of teaching. While the first term makes reference to the “enabling” or “management” function, the second one refers to the “instructional” function. They complement each other; the latter would be more or less impossible without the former. In practice, it is very difficult to separate the two and often one act in the classroom can perform both functions simultaneously. Moreover, the teachers should be designed and assisted for these two parties to develop and enhance the effectiveness of these roles. In order to achieve this from the teacher’s point of view, a third major role is presented for teachers’ consideration: investigator.

This role is based on the following assumptions:

1- In order to develop as both a professional and an individual, a teacher can consider reflecting upon and evaluating his own experience. This can be done alone or with the assistance and support of colleagues and friends.

2- Teachers can become better teachers _more sensitive to the demands of their learners and better equipped to manage the learning process.

3- Learners can become better learners –more efficient at their task and also better able to participate in learning activities.

4- The total classroom process involving both teachers and learners can become better suited to the promotion of learning. The extract from the Widdowson (1978, p. 162-3) serves as a very influential work on language teaching:

Our lack of certainty about how language is put to communicative use might incline us to the view that we should wait for more definitive findings to emerge from research before we adopt a communicative orientation to the teaching of language. I think this would be an unfortunate view to take. It would imply that language teachers are simply consumers of other people’s products, that they are incapable of initiative and must only make advances in methodology across ground already prepared by proclaimed theorists. But the language teacher need not, and usually does not, assume such a passive role. He can, and does, conduct operational research and he is in the position of being able to explore the possibilities of communicative approach to teaching for himself.

2.4.2. Teachers’ Identity

Identity has been studied thoroughly and there are multiple characterizations which depend on the way one is looking it. Identity is a wide term and over time, it

has acquired sub-branches. It is possible to distinguish for example personal identity, social identity, professional identity, national identity and cultural identity.

It is worth mentioning though, that there are several identities that construct the identity of an individual. Neither can it be thought that, for instance, professional identity would work on its own. Each branch of identity affects others. Only in specific situations are some identities more visible than others but they all influence constantly at the background.

When dealing with identity, one cannot overlook the impacts of one's history and past. History is inevitably somehow present in the formulation of identity. Block (2006, p. 28-39) has studied identities of individuals living in London and summarizes that

...they construct identities which are neither the sum of the new and the old, nor half of what they were and half of what they are; rather their stories seem more result of the negotiation of difference cited above, as their past and present interact and transform each other.

In his study, he also draws the conclusion that by using various items, identity constructs an individual's general sense of self. The importance of time is highlighted; identities are about negotiating new subject positions at the crossroads of the past, present and future. Individuals are shaped by their sociohistories but they also shape their sociohistories as life goes on (Block, 2007, p. 27).

What seems to be common to many researchers is that identity formation is a continuous and socialized process (Brown et al., 2007). Among others, Wenger (1998, p. 14563), views identity as showing social, cultural and historical aspects of a person. She stresses the role of social settings; through our attendance in social situations, we construct our identities and learn to understand ourselves, our actions and our mind. Identities are therefore temporary, constructed/developed in social settings, constantly in process, containing historical, present and future experiences of a person. This is exactly what Brown et al. (2007) also suggest. He states that identity is never completed, it develops continuously during time, although unconsciously.

Other major issues constructing identity are the self-image one has and the culture one is living in. One's own perceptions of oneself in different situations as well as

one's own beliefs mould the identities one has. In many ways, one's identities are products of the culture that one is born into or one's identities can be considered to exemplify cultural aspects (Wenger, 1998, p. 14563). Since culture is often considered to define, for instance the way one is a human being as well as values, moral, ideals, the right and wrong conception and so on, it no doubt affects strongly also the way the identity is being built (Valsiner, 2000; Hofstede 2001).

As Demirezen (2007) mentions identity types of non-native teachers of English in teacher education, it is reflected that due to be under the effects of different influences English teacher may develop and have ethnic identity, national identity, cultural identity, bilingual identity, professional and collective identity as well. Among these types of identity, as the English teaching is suited in such an important place as a profession and because the possibility of learning and teaching a foreign or a second language conveys the development of acquiring a second identity, for English language teacher it has vital importance to develop a professional identity. This type of identity may hinder the risk of identity crisis the teachers are under the possibility of their profession during their teaching life.

2.5. Tools for Prospective EFL Teachers

When the experiences of English language prospective teachers are examined, it is seen that all the regularities and requirements are designed by the Council of Higher Education in Turkey. Here, we should be pay attention that among these regularities and requirements there are no specific qualifications that only mention about that kind of subject-teacher. All of these statements and the tasks which the Council of Higher Education offers include all types of teachers ignoring the subject-field they have for their profession. At this point, it is urgently needed to put forward a new teacher education process, especially during the classes of faculties which prepare the prospective teachers of English language to their real life experiences and teaching situations. For this purpose, it would be useful to propose EPOSTL and EPG in English language teacher education process, mainly focusing on the courses of School Experience and Practice Teaching. The following parts will clarify what roles these applications have in teacher education of English language and how they can be used for this purpose.


2.5.1. EPOSTL

The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL), the main aims of which are to encourage student teachers to reflect on the competences a teacher strives to attain and on the underlying knowledge which feeds these competences; help prepare them for their future profession in a variety of teaching contexts; promote discussion between student teachers and their peers and between student teachers and their teacher educators and mentors; facilitate self-assessment of their developing competences; provide an instrument which helps chart progress, is a document for students undergoing initial teacher education. It will encourage the prospective teachers to reflect on their didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, helps them to assess their own didactic competences and enables them to monitor their own progress and to record their experiences of teaching during the course of teacher education.

Generally, the EPOSTL contains the personal statement section to help the prospective teachers, at the beginning of their teacher education, to reflect on general questions related to teaching; a self-assessment section, consisting of 'can-do' descriptors, to facilitate reflection and self-assessment; a dossier, in which student teachers can make the outcome of their self-assessment transparent, to provide evidence of progress and to record examples of work relevant to teaching a glossary of the most important terms relating to language learning and teaching used in the EPOSTL; an index of terms used in the descriptors; and a users' guide which explains the detailed information about the EPOSTL.

At the heart of the EPOSTL, there are 195 descriptors of competences related to language teaching which comprise the self-assessment section. These descriptors may be regarded as a set of core competences that language teachers should strive to attain. Each descriptor is accompanied by a bar, which helps students to visualize and chart their competences according to their own assessment. Moreover, self-assessments may take place at different stages of their teacher education. Such as:

'I can create a supportive atmosphere that invites learners to take part in speaking activities.'



In the above example a prospective teacher has made self-assessments at three stages of her teacher education and added the date on which these assessments were made so that her growing competence may be charted. The arrow indicates that competence development is a life-long process that continues throughout one's teaching profession.

The descriptors are grouped into seven general categories. These represent areas in which teachers require knowledge and a variety of competences and need to make decisions related to teaching. Each heading has been sub-divided as follows:

1- Context

- a. Curriculum,
- b. Aim and Needs,
- c. The Role of Language Teacher,
- d. Instructional Resources and Constraints

2- Methodology

- a. Speaking/Spoken Interaction,
- b. Writing/Written Interaction,
- c. Listening,
- d. Reading,
- e. Grammar,
- f. Vocabulary,
- g. Culture

3- Resources

4- Lesson Planning

- a. Identification of Learning Objectives,
- b. Lesson Content,
- c. Organization

5- Conducting a Lesson

- a. Using Lesson Plans,
- b. Content,
- c. Interaction with Learners,
- d. Classroom Management,

e. Classroom Language

6- Independent Learning

- a. Learner Autonomy,
- b. Homework,
- c. Projects,
- d. Portfolios,
- e. Virtual Learning Environments,
- f. Extra-Curricular Activities

7- Assessment of Learning

- a. Designing Assessment Tools,
- b. Evaluation,
- c. Self and Peer-Assessment,
- d. Language Performance,
- e. Culture,
- f. Error Analysis

The EPOSTL was developed for the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe by a team of teacher educators from five different countries (Armenia, Austria, Norway, Poland, UK). It arose from a project initiated by the ECML, 'A Framework for Teacher Education', which had the overall aim of addressing the broad question of harmonizing teacher education across Europe. The EPOSTL builds on existing documents already developed by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe – *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* and the *European Language Portfolio (ELP)* – as well as the European Commission-financed project European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference (European Profile). Draft versions of the EPOSTL were presented at two ECML workshops, attended by student teachers and teacher educators from more than 30 countries. The EPOSTL is used at a large number of institutions across Europe and also in Asia and North and South America. Due to the result of a four-year project 'Piloting and Implementing the *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*' (EPOSTL2), which ran from 2008 to 2011, it was co-ordinated by David Newby (Austria), Anne-Brit Fenner (Norway), Barry Jones (UK) and Sylvia Velikova (Bulgaria) that following the publication of the *European Portfolio for Student*

Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) in 2007, many teacher educators expressed the need for support materials concerning the use of the EPOSTL and clear guidance on how to use it. Thus, some parts of projects were published in order to exemplify and guide the following research on EPOSTL.

In "Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages" edited by Newby, Fenner & Jones (2011) sample project works have been presented to guide the people who desire to use it. The EPOSTL in brief European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) –A Reflection Tool for Language Teacher Education by Newby (Austria), Allan (UK), Fenner (Norway), Jones (UK), Komorowska (Poland), Soghikyan (Armenia) comes at the first line (2007). In this part the authors provide a general framework of EPOSTL by explaining about it briefly. In the part of issues in using the EPOSTL, Newby (2011) comprises a publication deals with eight European countries which experience and implement their own context and research they have carried out among the users of EPOSTL. It also provides many useful insights and a variety of perspectives and gives a snapshot from specific teacher education programmes. Orlova (2010; 2011) (in Newby et al., 2011) under the heading of "Challenges of Integrating the EPOSTL into Pre-service Teacher Training" shares her insights regarding the use of the EPOSTL; to be more precise, its self-assessment part which is an integral part of pre-service teacher programmes in the Czech Republic. In the research, The EPOSTL has been consistently used during the three modules of EFL didactics courses which are provided within the framework of an MA programme. The course format includes lectures, seminars and two periods of practicum. The feedback from student teachers bears evidence that they regard the EPOSTL as a useful tool in their learning process. Mehlmauer-Larcher (2011) (in Newby et al., 2011) with the title of "Implementing the EPOSTL in the Early Phase of Pre-service EFL Teacher Education", shows that the first implementation of the EPOSTL in the pre-service teacher education programme at the Centre for English Language Teaching, members of the team have been enthusiastic about the EPOSTL and have constantly tried to improve the use of this reflection and self-assessment instrument for its student teachers. It is the declared aim of the team to intensify its application, particularly in the student teachers' school practice and field experiences. As a further step towards a more intensive use of the EPOSTL,

tasks have been devised which the student teachers need to carry out during their pre- and post-teaching conferences with their school mentors. From this, it follows that workshops need to be organized for school mentors to introduce them to the EPOSTL and to encourage them to use it in their work with student teachers. Fenner (in Newby et al., 2011) in the study of “The EPOSTL as a Tool for Reflection in Three Contexts of Language Teacher Education” examines the piloting of the EPOSTL in a one-year postgraduate course for student teachers of languages at the University of Bergen, Norway, in the autumn of 2009. In this article, three different contexts related to using the EPOSTL have been discussed: in university lectures, in seminars to develop students’ lesson-planning competence and during school practice. The aims in each context were to enhance the students’ ability to critically reflect on the various stages of their professional development. Part of the discussion has been to consider the EPOSTL also as a tool for mentors to improve their mentoring and to increase collaboration between the university and schools. In the research of “The Use of the Personal Statement”, Makinen (in Newby et al., 2011) provide the reader with a glimpse of how the Personal Statement section was applied in the context of Finnish subject teacher education. The intention was to provide teacher educators with ideas for implementing those particular section of the EPOSTL in their own context. Dealing with the Personal Statement section served as an important source of shared information and knowledge. It encouraged a joint exploration of further theoretical and practical aspects of foreign language teaching. The student participants in the EPOSTL project regarded the tasks in this section as relevant and challenging, encouraging independent as well as group reflection and discussion. A number of issues raised prompted debate and an exchange of ideas, beliefs, attitudes and experiences. During the study, the students felt that the use of the Personal Statement in a language teaching methodology course was an inspiring and thought provoking. It made them think about a foreign language teacher’s work in a flexible manner, helping them as student teachers realize what specific questions of teaching and learning needed to be addressed to enhance their professional development. Nihlen under the title of “What goes into the EPOSTL Dossier and Why?” (in Newby et al., 2011) has described how parts of the EPOSTL were implemented into a subject matter didactics course for student teachers studying English as a foreign language at the University of

Gothenburg in Sweden. One of the aims was to encourage self-assessment and reflection among the student teachers and, after working with the EPOSTL for a year, most students felt that they had developed a more reflective approach. They could relate the Self-Assessment descriptors in Methodology, Lesson Planning and Conducting a Lesson to different kinds of evidence that they had collected for their Dossier during the Practice Teaching periods. At first, the most common pieces of evidence in the Dossier were lesson plans, but when discussing their evidence with peers and receiving more structured instructions, the student teachers collected a variety of activities, for example, lesson observation notes from mentors, learners' tasks, excerpts from diaries and reading logs. By collecting evidence for their Dossier, the student teachers had received more oral and written feedback from their mentors, and the use of the EPOSTL had assisted them in discussions during their Practice Teaching. However, the aim of involving the mentors needs to be developed and must be planned in collaboration with the Board of Teacher Education at the university since it would involve in-service training. In the study of "The EPOSTL in Iceland: Getting the Mentors on Board", Ingvarstottir (in Newby et al., 2011) has reached a long-term goal of creating a learning community between university and schools. More than the EPOSTL, it is needed for such as accepting that the partnership school as a whole has a role in teacher education and not just individual teachers. The EPOSTL has, however, undoubtedly brought the partners closer and has narrowed the gap between university and the partnership schools. After the two years of the pilot, there is a consensus between university lecturers and mentors that the EPOSTL is on its way to becoming an integral part of programme. Following that, Bagaric (2011) in the study of "The Role of the EPOSTL in the Evaluation and Development of Teacher Education Programmes in Croatia" (in Newby et al., 2011), needs to find out how student teachers' didactic competences develop during the two year master-level teacher education programme; comparing the level of attained competences with the expected learning outcomes of specific methodology courses in the study programme and state to what extent these courses contribute to the development of teachers competences; and to develop students' awareness and understanding of their growth through self-evaluation. However, the results of the study suggest that the EPOSTL can be relatively efficiently used for the purposes of evaluation and further development of teacher education

programmes. The students' self-ratings provided a good insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher education programme, and gave a clear guideline for its improvement. In this respect, changes to the contents of compulsory courses and introduced two elective courses: Teaching Grammar, and Learning Styles and Strategies are seen. At the same time, it is considered to propose a course on foreign language teaching to learners with special needs. Furthermore, the use of the EPOSTL at different stages of the teacher education programme enables teacher educators and mentors to monitor students' progress and provides them with feedback on the effectiveness of their teaching. At the same time, the EPOSTL enables students to log their growth and reflect on what has been and should be taught and learned as well as on how the contents of different courses are interrelated, thus contributing to the overall teacher competence. Presented as the last study titled as "The Use of the EPOSTL in a Bilateral Teacher-Education Programme" by Jones (in Newby et al., 2011), includes the bilateral programme in which each group was engaged allowed comparisons to be made, showing sometimes similar and sometimes different uses of the document within a similar time span. Although reactions differed there was a commonality of opinion; from the students' responses, it is clear that the EPOSTL can be used constructively and imaginatively in a variety of contexts, within and outside those experienced ones in this particular programme.

2.5.2. EPG

The European Profiling Grid (EPG) results from a project co-funded by the European Commission, which ran from 2011 to October 2013 and involved partners from nine countries, which are leading national and international authorities on language education. EPG is an innovative instrument, the main purpose of which is to provide language teachers, teacher-trainers and managers with a reliable means of outlining current competences and enhancing professionalism in language education. The ultimate aim is to increase the quality and efficiency of the training and professional development of language teachers.

More specifically, it intends to:

- assist self-assessment and mapping of a range of current language teaching skills and competences;

- outline individual and group profiles of language teachers in an institution; stating the levels of competence attained according to a set of categories and descriptors;
- help to identify development needs and training programmes;
- serve as an additional tool for staff selection and appraisal;
- assist in understanding of and communication between different pedagogical systems and educational traditions in Europe;
- foster transparency of teaching standards, facilitating teacher mobility.

From the perspective of partners in the EPG Project, teacher development is primarily 'bottom up': teachers develop themselves based on the training they participate in, their own personal career experiences, and their interests (Mann, 2005). Depending on the circumstances, teacher development may be triggered by all kinds of events: participating in a training course, attending a workshop organized within the language centre, reading, being observed by or observing a colleague, teaching a new type of course, feedback and discussion with a trainer or manager, exchanging ideas with a colleague on teaching materials, and so on.

It is useful to remind that the EPG is not a kind of a checklist for observations, for job interviews or performance reviews. It can only serve as an additional reference point for aspects of appointing and assessing staff. Its main aim is to provide a snapshot of the current phases of professional development of teachers in various European countries and help them realize their potential for growth.

The EPG is a tool which contains a series of descriptors of the can-do type, outlining the multifaceted activity of language teachers. The descriptors represent a gradual progression of teachers' qualifications and competences from teachers-in-training, through novice teachers, teachers with considerable practice, to experienced modern language professionals. Thus, horizontally, the Grid distinguishes between six phases of development, which, for convenience purposes, are grouped into three main phases, 1.1 and 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 to encompass teachers of different experience and degrees of competence.

The phases are related to four broad categories of language teachers' professional practice: Training and Qualifications, Key Teaching Competences, Enabling Competences and Professionalism. Developing vertically, the EPG

features thirteen categories, grouped in the above-mentioned four categories. For a detailed description, the reader is referred to the Grid itself.

The first main category of Training and Qualifications consists of four sub categories, describing the level of proficiency of teachers in the target language, their education and training, assessed Practice Teaching as well as the scope and length of their teaching experience. It aims to incorporate the wide range of language proficiency and training backgrounds of teachers in Europe, including both native and non-native speaking teachers.

The category of Key Teaching Competences encompasses four sub categories, which aim to incorporate teachers' knowledge and skills in methodology, lesson and course planning, assessment, interaction management and monitoring.

The category of Enabling Competences includes three sub categories: intercultural competence, language awareness and the use of digital media. The final category of Professionalism is dedicated to the two sub categories of professional conduct and administration, including the approach to administrative duties, teamwork and the teacher's commitment to personal professional growth, as well as to the development of the institution.

To sum up, as stated in the user guide of EPG (Mateva et al., 2013), an important and useful part of teacher development is reflection on professional experiences, especially (but not only) day-to-day teaching. Assessing one's own competences in specific areas of language teaching is a reflective task that can be particularly useful in identifying areas for further development. The EPG, with its sets of descriptors covering key aspects of language teaching competence organized over successive 'phases of development', aims to provide a means of making such self-assessment easier and more methodological. It also aims to encourage discussion of development needs between teachers and their managers and/or trainers, who can use the EPG as a guide when making their own assessments of teachers' competences. The use of the common criteria in the form of descriptors that the Grid contains helps to reduce the subjectivity and selectiveness that arises in the assessment and self-assessment processes.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter mainly focuses on the design of the research, the participants of the study, data collection process and data analysis. The reliability of the data is also presented in this section.

3.1. The Research Design

This dissertation is based on a mixed-type research design which includes both quantitative and qualitative research approaches. In terms of the descriptive research design, it is seen that the researcher has used the data in order to reveal and describe the current situation. As indicated, descriptive analysis is a research approach that aims to describe a past or current situations as in their bare facts. In fact, it is seen that the case, individual, or object which are used to the research are tried to be described in their own conditions or as they really are (Karasar, 2005). To sum up, especially at the outset of the study, this research design was preferred to draw the general aspects of the problem and to support the results of quantitative research process.

With regards to the experimental or quantitative research design, which is accepted as a systematic investigation of observable phenomena via statistical or numerical data or computational techniques, this research mainly includes the data which stem from the process of this type. Because quantitative data are any data that are in numerical form such as statistics, percentages; all of the data gathered during the whole research have been supported by this way. For the purpose of drawing statistical conclusions and results of the prospective teachers' competency levels, and searching for the differences or significance of the obtained data, the experimental design was also included into data analysis process of the study.

In conclusion, this research gains importance for using both qualitative and quantitative research models together. The fact that educational process is among the phenomenon that needs not only observable basis but also statistical facts as well, this will prevent the results of this research from biased speculations and generalizations and yield unbiased results that can be generalized to some larger population.

3.2. The Participants of the Study

The participants of the study were chosen by using the convenience or opportunity sampling model which is the most common type of sampling model in second language studies where the only criterion according to Dörnyei (2007) is the convenience of the researcher. Thus, the researcher of this dissertation aimed to collect data from the prospective EFL teachers and also from the other participants, who were paired with the prospective teachers during the practice teaching studies, included in the study. Here, it should be kept in mind that although the participants are different in groups the main aim of the data collection process is to gather data about the competency levels of these prospective EFL teachers. At the outset of the data collection, the participants are asked to fill in the demographic information indicated at the beginning of the scale (Appendix 1 and 3) and based on the obtained data, the detailed information about the participants is presented in Table 3.1 below:

Table 3.1.: Gender and Age Distribution of Participants

Participants	Occupation	Gender		Age							
		Male	Female	18-22	23-30	31+	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	
Group A	Student (38)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
		7	31	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mentor (12)	1	11	0	0	0	1	6	3	2	
Group B	Course Supervisor (3)	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	
	Course Registration Advisor(3)	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	
	Total (56)	11	45	38	0	0	2	10	4	2	

As stated before, four different groups of participants are the subjects of this research. Group A consists of prospective English Language Teachers studying their last academic year in their departments. The participants of this group have been chosen randomly among the total number of 100 prospective teachers who have taken İDÖ 475 School Experience course and have been continuing their Practice Teaching studies for İDÖ 478 in the academic year of 2014-2015 (N= 38). In fact, 100 prospective teachers have registered for the Practice Teaching course;

however, 38 of the participants are included in the study because those prospective teachers participated in the first application carried out during İDÖ 475 School Experience course and the researcher aimed to make paired samples for all the gathered data. Thus, the study excludes the other ELT prospective teachers registered to the courses and consists only the voluntary and randomly chosen prospective teachers (N=38). According to Table 3.1 *Gender and Age Distribution of Participants*, 31 of the prospective teachers are females and 7 of them are males. All prospective teachers' age distribution ranges from 18 to 22.

The participants in Group B consists of the mentor teachers (N= 12), course supervisors (N=3), and course registration advisors of prospective teachers. First of all, the participants in Group B consists of the mentor teachers (N= 12), at state schools where the prospective teachers have taken İDÖ 475 School Experience and İDÖ 478 Practice Teaching courses. Due to the requirement of the courses, the prospective teachers have gone to different state primary, secondary and high schools and taught there in the supervision of the mentor teachers especially during the spring term. Therefore, the participants of the second group are also chosen randomly among these mentor teachers working in different schools in Ankara province who are responsible for the prospective teachers' practice teaching studies (N= 12). Paying attention to the gender distribution of this group 1 mentor out of 12 is a male and 11 of them are females. As for the age distribution, the age of 1 mentor ranges from 25 to 34, 6 of them range from 35 to 44, 3 of them range from 45 to 54 and 2 of them range from more than 55 years old.

The third group of participants consists of the course supervisors responsible for the labeled courses of İDÖ 475 School Experience and İDÖ 478 Practice Teaching(N= 3). As for the gender distribution of this group, 2 of the course supervisors are males and 1 of them is a female. Moreover, paying attention to the age distribution of these participants, 1 of them ranges from 25 to 34 while 2 of them range from 35 to 44 years.

The fourth group of participants consists of the course registration supervisors who are expected to know all the prospective teachers during their faculty years (N= 3). According to the gender distribution of this participants, 1 of them is a male and 2 of them are females. As for their age distribution, 2 of them range between 25-34 years and 1 of them ranges between 45-54 years.

Moreover, Table 3.2 shows experience, department and education distribution of participants.

Table 3.2.: Experience, Department and Education Distribution of Participants

Occupation	Experience					Department					Education			
	No	1-3	4-5	6-10	11+	ELT	ELL	ALL	LIN	TRI	OTHER	BA	MA	PhD
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Mentors (12)	0	0	0	0	12	8	3	0	0	0	1	12	0	0
Course Supervisors (3)	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Course Registration Advisors(3)	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
Total (16)	0	1	0	1	16	12	4	0	1	0	1	12	3	3

According to Table 3.2 *Experience, Department and Education Distribution of Participants*, except for the student participants, all mentors numbered as 12 are experienced more than 10 years (11+). When the department distribution is taken into consideration, 8 of mentors out of 10 are from English Language Teaching Department (ELT), 3 of them are from English Language and Literature (ELL) and 1 of them is from other departments not included or related to English Language. The education level of all mentor participants are labeled under the category of Bachelor of Arts (BA).

As for the course supervisors, 3 of the supervisor participants who are responsible for the courses have more than 10 years experiences (11+). 2 of these supervisors, responsible for the courses, have degrees from English Language Teaching Department while 1 of them has degree from Educational and Applied Linguistics. Paid attention to the educational level of these participants, it is clearly seen that 1 of them has BA degree and 2 of them out of 3 have PhD degrees in their subject field.

The experience of the course registration supervisors, who are responsible and guide for the prospective teachers during their faculty life, range from 1 to 3 year(s), 6 to 10 years and 1 of them has more than 11 years of experience.

Among them, 2 supervisors have degrees from English Language Teaching Department and 1 of them has a degree from English Language and Literature Department. In terms of education, although 2 of them are PhD candidates in English Language Teaching Department, they all have MA degrees in their subject fields; moreover, 1 of them has a PhD degree from the department of English Linguistics. To sum up, out of 18, 1 participant has 1-3 year(s) experience, 1 has 6-10 years of experience and 16 participants have more than 10 years of (11+) experience. Out of 18, 12 participants have a degree from English Language Teaching Department, 4 participants have a degree from English Language and Literature Department, 1 has a degree from Educational and Applied Linguistics Department while 1 has a degree from another department which is not labeled in this study. In addition, although 12 participants have BA degrees, 3 participants have MA and 3 participants have PhD degrees in their subject fields. Further, Table 3.3 shares the institutional distribution of participants included in this study.

Table 3.3. Institutional Distribution of Participants

Name of Institution	Mentors	Course Supervisors	Course Registration Advisors
	N	N	N
Hacettepe University	0	3	3
Ankara Türk Telekom Mehmet Kaplan Social Sciences High School	5	0	0
Ankara Ayrancı Anatolian High School	2	0	0
Ankara Gazi Anatolian High School	3	0	0
Beytepe Secondary School	2	0	0
Total (18)	12	3	3

According to the Table 3.3 *Institutional Distribution of Participants*, it is clearly seen that totally 3 supervisors who are responsible for the courses and 3 course registration supervisors who are responsible for the prospective teachers during their faculty life are attending at Hacettepe University. Out of 10, 5 mentor participants are attending at Ankara Türk Telekom Mehmet Kaplan Social Sciences High School, 2 of them are attending at Ankara Ayrancı Anatolian High School, 3 of them are teaching at Ankara Gazi Anatolian High School and 2 of them are enrolled in Beytepe Secondary School at this term.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are different data collection methods which can be classified into different categories such as observation, interview, survey including also questionnaires or scales (Aiken, 1997). In this research, for the purpose of collecting data, three different data collection instruments were used and they were adapted by turning into likert-type format.

Initially at the beginning of the research, European Profiling Grid for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) which is a document intended for prospective teachers undergoing their initial teacher education and encourages them to reflect on the didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, helps them to assess their own didactic competences and enables them to monitor their progress and to record their experiences of teaching during the course of their teacher education.

The EPOSTL was developed for the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe by a team of teacher educators from five different countries (Armenia, Austria, Norway, Poland, UK). It arose from a project initiated by the ECML, 'A Framework for Teacher Education', which had the overall aim of addressing the broad question of harmonizing teacher education across Europe (2007). The EPOSTL builds on existing documents already developed by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe – Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the European Language Portfolio (ELP) – as well as the European Commission-financed project European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference (European Profile). Draft versions of the EPOSTL were presented at two ECML workshops, attended by student teachers and teacher educators from more than 30 countries. Nowadays, the EPOSTL is used at a large number of institutions across Europe and also in Asia and North and South America.

As mentioned before, although EPOSTL includes three sections of a personal statement, a self-assessment and a dossier section, only the self-assessment section which deals with 195 descriptors is under the scope of this study. This section contains list of 'can-do' descriptors relating to didactic competences of student teachers and each descriptor is accompanied by an arrow divided into

three parts in order to give the users the chance of reviewing each descriptor more than once. To prevent the participants from reflecting their experiences in the dossier section and gather numerical data defining the competency level of prospective teachers, these descriptors are transformed into 5 point likert-type scale designed as "not developed", "less developed", "developed", "very developed", "fully developed " and graded as 1,2, 3, 4, 5 respectively. In this way one part of the EPOSTL which is a process based document turned into a 195 item likert-type format scale and serves for quality of the practicality of the scale in the literature.

The second data collection instrument of this study was the European Profiling Grid (EPG) which is developed by European Association for Quality Language Services (EAQUALS) (2011). As stated before, this document is accepted as a grid because it has two axes. One axis is provided by three broad stages of development "Basic," "Independent" and "Proficient", which deliberately echo the three broad levels (A, B and C) of the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001) and of which, as in the CEFR, is each split into two in order to imply 6 bands, labeled in the Grid from T1 to T6. At the Basic stage, teaching knowledge and competence is holistic and in the process of being acquired. The aim of a "Basic" teacher is to make it to T3. By T5, however, development in certain directions may well be noticeable; there are many different ways to be a proficient teacher. "Proficient" teachers may also acquire specialized skills in certain "supplementary" areas.

The second axis is provided by four broad categories intended to reflect the main aspects of a language teacher's profile: (1)"Language" (proficiency/ awareness), (2)"Qualifications" (practice teaching/experience), (3)"Core Competencies" (methodology knowledge and skills/planning/interaction management/assessment) and (4)"Complementary skills" (teacher development/ digital literacy). All of these show that some people may have high-level core competencies yet lack significant formal qualifications.

This grid which specifies the competences of a language teacher in Europe has been applied to the mentors of the prospective teachers. At the beginning the mentors are guided by the whole specifications labeled in the grid and then in order to make it easy to fill this grid for each prospective teacher, the parts of T1

and T2 in “Basic,” T3 and T4 in “Independent” and T5 and T6 in “Proficient” sections were designed as T1=0 "extremely not developed" , T2=1 "not developed", T3=2 "less developed", T4=3 "developed", T5=4 "very developed", T6=5 "fully developed" and no idea part= $\sqrt{}$ like a 5 point likert-type scale. By doing so, this grid was made parallel to the first data collection instrument and increase the reliability and consistency of the research in terms of keeping in mind that both of them are intended to complete each other as the nature of this study aims to be a complementary study as well. In addition, the EPG scale has been filled by the course supervisors and course registration advisors of prospective teachers as well.

The third data collection instrument was a two part questionnaire designed by Bagaric (2011) and adapted to explore the prospective teachers' perceptions of EPOSTL and its practices. The first part includes the general impression of prospective teachers about the EPOSTL and the correlation levels between the learning outcomes of the compulsory courses and the teacher competences defined by the descriptors in the EPOSTL scaled as "not correlated", "less correlated", "correlated", "very correlated", "fully correlated" and graded as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 respectively and the second part includes the statements about the usefulness of EPOSTL prepared as 5 point likert-type scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, to 5=strongly agree.

Table 3.4 given below shows the likert-type item value distribution of each options labeled in all the data collection instruments carried out in this research.

Table 3.4.: Likert-Type Item Value Distribution

Options	Limitation
1	1,00- 1,79
2	1,80–2,59
3	2,60–3,39
4	3,40– 4,19
5	4,20–5,00

Moreover, though all the data collection instruments were applied and included in different researches, their reliabilities were re-evaluated and supported by different

experts from these subject fields for the purpose of increasing their validity condition. Here, Table 3.5 presents the reliability levels of each data collection instrument.

Table 3.5.: Reliability Coefficiencies of Data Collection Instruments

Data Collection Instrument	Cronbach alpha (α)
EPOSTL	,98
EPG	,89
Questionnaire Part I	,75
Questionnaire Part II	,88

The reliability levels of the scales meet the requirement since in social sciences the scales are expected to have at least .70 reliability.

3.4. Data Analysis

In this research, for the analysis of the data SPSS 17.00 packet program is used. The estimated value level of 0.05 is interpreted as meaningful. The reliability of the data is examined by the coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha.

Based on the research questions stated beforehand, different types of scales were applied throughout this research and accordingly different data analysis ways were chosen. For the 1st and 2nd research questions which examine the condition of competency levels of the prospective teachers before beginning to the School Experience and Practice Teaching courses and what sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' the prospective teachers need to develop, the descriptive statistics and one-sample t-test were used. For the 3rd question to find out to what extent the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' are effective and useful, the paired sample t-test was used. In order to search for the answers of 4th question including what the prospective teachers' perceptions of EPOSTL are and the 5th question dealing with what the correlation levels of the compulsory didactic courses and the competence levels of the prospective teachers are, descriptive statistics and chi-square test (χ^2) were calculated. For the 6th question, which asks what the prospective teachers' profiles are in relation to the European Profiling Grid, descriptive, one-sample t-test statistics and Kruskal Wallis H Test

for Independent Samples were calculated. For answering the 7th question whether the prospective teachers' EPOSTL practices are compatible with European Profiling Grid filled by mentors/supervisors/advisors or not, one way ANOVA for repeated features was used and the whole results were used to reflect the ways of enhancing the practices and implementation of EPOSTL in Hacettepe University English Language Teaching Program and making it common for teacher education in ELT consisting the answer of the 8th Research Question of this study.

Throughout the data analysis process of this research, mostly parametric statistics were used since the number of participant of this study is 38 and the range of data is accepted as normal. Furthermore, although the number of the mentors and supervisors seemed limited in number, it will be reasonable to keep in mind that the number of the prospective teacher they are expected to deal with during the practice and observation sessions are at that number (N=38). Here, it would be useful to point out that the qualitative data gathered in scientific social, psychological, educational research may be accepted in defined values; moreover, some qualitative data may be handled as quantitative ones in order to calculate appropriate statistics as Büyüköztürk states (2007, s. 4). Finally, although the prospective teachers numbers meet the requirement of parametric statistics, for the statistics dealing with mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors the study needs to include nonparametric statistics as well since the distribution of prospective teachers cannot be accepted as equal in terms of their mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors .

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section conveys the findings, interpretations and discussions provided by searching through the results of the tests applied for different research questions stated beforehand. In this part of the research, each research question is taken into consideration, which means the findings and discussions are divided into eight different categories.

4.1. Findings and Discussion for What the Competency Levels of the Prospective Teachers are while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Research Question 1: What are the competency levels of the prospective teachers while taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching courses"?

Table 4.1.: Competency Levels of Prospective EFL Teachers while Taking the “School Experience” Course

Participants	N of Items N	Minimum Min.	Maximum	Mean Max.	Frequency f	Percent %	Std. Deviation
Student1	195	790	975	81,02	1	2,6	1,01060
Student2	195	655	975	67,17	1	2,6	,92339
Student3	195	764	975	78,35	1	2,6	,80354
Student4	195	669	975	68,61	1	2,6	,59285
Student5	195	604	975	61,94	1	2,6	,63212
Student6	195	792	975	81,23	1	2,6	,66846
Student7	195	765	975	78,46	3	7,9	,93715
Student8	195	960	975	98,46	1	2,6	,24334
Student9	195	894	975	91,69	1	2,6	,69749
Student10	195	631	975	64,71	1	2,6	,88716
Student11	195	702	975	72,00	1	2,6	,75272
Student12	195	797	975	81,74	1	2,6	,86736
Student13	195	630	975	64,61	1	2,6	,95837
Student14	195	673	975	69,02	1	2,6	,58562
Student15	195	753	975	77,23	1	2,6	,57007
Student16	195	757	975	77,64	1	2,6	,70326
Student17	195	731	975	74,97	1	2,6	,68741
Student18	195	652	975	66,87	1	2,6	,98070
Student19	195	802	975	82,25	1	2,6	,42191
Student20	195	725	975	74,35	1	2,6	1,03693
Student21	195	765	975	78,46	3	7,9	,61452
Student22	195	708	975	72,61	1	2,6	,51063
Student23	195	705	975	72,30	1	2,6	,64676
Student24	195	847	975	86,87	1	2,6	,67683
Student25	195	639	975	65,53	1	2,6	,91358
Student26	195	617	975	63,28	1	2,6	,52442
Student27	195	834	975	85,53	1	2,6	,79411
Student28	195	794	975	81,43	1	2,6	,71623
Student29	195	674	975	69,12	1	2,6	,90984
Student30	195	770	975	78,97	1	2,6	1,04491
Student31	195	745	975	76,41	1	2,6	,66870
Student32	195	769	975	78,87	1	2,6	,55030
Student33	195	752	975	77,12	1	2,6	,59981
Student34	195	765	975	78,46	3	7,9	,71932
Student35	195	808	975	82,87	1	2,6	,69144
Student36	195	789	975	80,92	1	2,6	,80354
Student37	195	715	975	73,33	1	2,6	,49699
Student38	195	525	975	53,84	1	2,6	,76235
Total (38)	195	27967 735,97	975	2868,41 75,48	38	100	8,70208

Table 4.1 above indicates the prospective EFL teachers’ general competency levels while taking the “School Experience” course labeled as ÍDÖ 475. This table shows the data of the number of the items included in the research, minimum and

maximum scores taken from the scale, the mean values of scores for each student, the frequency of each student competency level and its percentage, and finally the standard deviation of the data. Thus, the prospective EFL teachers' competency levels differ from each other widely as paid attention to the frequencies of levels. Among the general scores taken from the EPOSTL scale, only 78.46 is repeated for three times ($f=3$), but the other scores exist only once for each student ($f=1$), which also means that the data are distributed very successfully and meaningfully. Focusing on each student's competency level, it is clearly seen that the competency levels of prospective teachers differ from 53.84 to 98.46. Seen that this research includes 38 prospective teacher participants, the competency levels of prospective teachers differ very much from each other. Although huge differences occur between the prospective teachers, the general mean score of prospective teachers' competency levels is calculated as 75.48, which requires the needs of average level of competency.

Table 4.2.: Competency Levels of Prospective EFL Teachers while Taking the “Practice Teaching” Course

Participants	N of Items N	Minimum Min.	Maximum	Mean Max.	Frequency f	Percent %	Std. Deviation
Student1	195	826	975	84,71	1	2,6	1,01318
Student2	195	756	975	77,53	1	2,6	,69995
Student3	195	914	975	93,74	1	2,6	,56495
Student4	195	918	975	94,15	1	2,6	,81966
Student5	195	612	975	62,76	1	2,6	,58882
Student6	195	795	975	81,53	1	2,6	,77939
Student7	195	802	975	82,25	1	7,9	,42788
Student8	195	966	975	99,07	1	2,6	,21036
Student9	195	934	975	95,79	1	2,6	,45623
Student10	195	815	975	83,58	1	2,6	,62885
Student11	195	788	975	80,82	1	2,6	,59928
Student12	195	898	975	92,10	1	2,6	,55888
Student13	195	669	975	68,61	1	2,6	,57354
Student14	195	763	975	78,25	1	2,6	,30050
Student15	195	776	975	79,58	1	2,6	,20203
Student16	195	876	975	89,84	1	2,6	,56868
Student17	195	721	975	73,94	1	2,6	,46055
Student18	195	891	975	91,38	2	5,3	,51681
Student19	195	812	975	83,28	1	2,6	,37132
Student20	195	799	975	81,94	1	2,6	,89428
Student21	195	896	975	91,89	1	2,6	,69976
Student22	195	831	975	85,23	2	5,3	,64080
Student23	195	814	975	83,48	1	2,6	,68139
Student24	195	913	975	93,64	1	2,6	,55746
Student25	195	849	975	87,07	2	5,3	,62830
Student26	195	891	975	91,38	2	5,3	,71730
Student27	195	768	975	78,76	1	2,6	,72247
Student28	195	809	975	82,97	1	2,6	,64491
Student29	195	877	975	89,94	1	2,6	,55030
Student30	195	831	975	85,23	2	5,3	,82381
Student31	195	690	975	70,76	1	2,6	,51001
Student32	195	895	975	91,79	1	2,6	,56157
Student33	195	885	975	90,76	1	2,6	,55826
Student34	195	900	975	92,30	1	2,6	,55684
Student35	195	839	975	86,05	1	2,6	,69293
Student36	195	953	975	97,74	1	2,6	,34818
Student37	195	849	975	87,07	2	5,3	,69083
Student38	195	881	975	90,35	1	2,6	,92694
Total (38)	195	31702 834,2632	975	3251,49 85,56	38	100	8,07572

Table 4.2 also indicates the prospective EFL teachers' general competency levels while taking the “Practice Teaching” course labeled as İDÖ 478. This table shows the data of the number of the items included in the research, minimum and maximum scores taken from the scale, the mean values of scores for each

student, the frequency of each student competency level and its percentage, and finally the standard deviation of the data. Thus, the prospective EFL teachers' competency levels differ from each other widely as paid attention to the frequencies of levels. Among the general scores taken from the EPOSTL scale, only 85.23, 87.07 and 91.38 are repeated for twice ($f=2$), but the other scores exist only once for each student ($f=1$), which also means that the data are distributed very successfully and meaningfully again. Focusing on each student's competency level, it is clearly seen that the competency levels of prospective teachers range from 62.76 to 99.07. Seen that this research includes 38 prospective teacher participants, the competency levels of prospective teachers differ very much from each other. Although huge differences occur between the prospective teachers, the general mean score of prospective teachers' competency levels is calculated as 85.56 which means positive enhancement in the prospective EFL teachers' competency levels.

4.2. Findings and Discussion for What Sections/Subsections of 'Self-Assessment' the Prospective Teachers Need to Develop

Research Question 2: What sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' do the prospective teachers need to develop?

Related to this research question, the descriptive results of each EPOSTL section for "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses are explained below:

Table 4.3.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Context Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
CONTEXT	4	23	115	99	86,09	99	86,09
	4	23	115	61	53,04	88	76,52
	4	23	115	87	75,65	99	86,09
	4	23	115	110	95,65	110	95,65
	4	23	115	81	70,43	71	61,74
	4	23	115	91	79,13	87	75,65
	4	23	115	88	76,52	94	81,74
	4	23	115	107	93,04	115	100,00
	4	23	115	106	92,17	106	92,17
	4	23	115	68	59,13	93	80,87
	4	23	115	75	65,22	98	85,22
	4	23	115	103	89,57	103	89,57
	4	23	115	100	86,96	82	71,30
	4	23	115	83	72,17	93	80,87
	4	23	115	85	73,91	87	75,65
	4	23	115	88	76,52	95	82,61
	4	23	115	76	66,09	77	66,96
	4	23	115	97	84,35	97	84,35
	4	23	115	93	80,87	94	81,74
	4	23	115	89	77,39	89	77,39
	4	23	115	92	80,00	92	80,00
	4	23	115	82	71,30	82	71,30
	4	23	115	83	72,17	83	72,17
	4	23	115	91	79,13	90	78,26
	4	23	115	92	80,00	92	80,00
	4	23	115	72	62,61	95	82,61
	4	23	115	82	71,30	86	74,78
	4	23	115	78	67,83	98	85,22
	4	23	115	65	56,52	101	87,83
	4	23	115	92	80,00	94	81,74
	4	23	115	79	68,70	76	66,09
	4	23	115	98	85,22	99	86,09
4	23	115	92	80,00	105	91,30	
4	23	115	85	73,91	106	92,17	
4	23	115	97	84,35	104	90,43	
4	23	115	80	69,57	113	98,26	
4	23	115	87	75,65	97	84,35	
4	23	115	102	88,70	102	88,70	

Table 4.4.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Methodology Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
M E T H O D O L O G Y	7	57	285	238	83,51	238	83,51
	7	57	285	211	74,04	242	84,91
	7	57	285	239	83,86	267	93,68
	7	57	285	280	98,25	280	98,25
	7	57	285	191	67,02	198	69,47
	7	57	285	253	88,77	248	87,02
	7	57	285	253	88,77	243	85,26
	7	57	285	283	99,30	283	99,30
	7	57	285	262	91,93	271	95,09
	7	57	285	208	72,98	252	88,42
	7	57	285	210	73,68	240	84,21
	7	57	285	256	89,82	256	89,82
	7	57	285	218	76,49	195	68,42
	7	57	285	201	70,53	224	78,60
	7	57	285	215	75,44	229	80,35
	7	57	285	226	79,30	257	90,18
	7	57	285	195	68,42	213	74,74
	7	57	285	265	92,98	265	92,98
	7	57	285	234	82,11	238	83,51
	7	57	285	243	85,26	243	85,26
	7	57	285	266	93,33	266	93,33
	7	57	285	232	81,40	232	81,40
	7	57	285	258	90,53	258	90,53
	7	57	285	270	94,74	266	93,33
	7	57	285	248	87,02	248	87,02
	7	57	285	169	59,30	268	94,04
	7	57	285	267	93,68	236	82,81
	7	57	285	238	83,51	249	87,37
	7	57	285	160	56,14	263	92,28
	7	57	285	192	67,37	240	84,21
	7	57	285	208	72,98	208	72,98
	7	57	285	233	81,75	272	95,44
7	57	285	224	78,60	262	91,93	
7	57	285	215	75,44	272	95,44	
7	57	285	256	89,82	255	89,47	
7	57	285	257	90,18	279	97,89	
7	57	285	211	74,04	252	88,42	
7	57	285	238	83,51	238	83,51	

Table 4.5.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Resources Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
RESOURCES	None	11	55	39	70,91	39	70,91
	None	11	55	35	63,64	47	85,45
	None	11	55	39	70,91	52	94,55
	None	11	55	41	74,55	41	74,55
	None	11	55	32	58,18	28	50,91
	None	11	55	45	81,82	52	94,55
	None	11	55	41	74,55	47	85,45
	None	11	55	55	100,00	54	98,18
	None	11	55	49	89,09	54	98,18
	None	11	55	38	69,09	41	74,55
	None	11	55	44	80,00	52	94,55
	None	11	55	54	98,18	54	98,18
	None	11	55	33	60,00	36	65,45
	None	11	55	31	56,36	43	78,18
	None	11	55	45	81,82	44	80,00
	None	11	55	44	80,00	49	89,09
	None	11	55	41	74,55	41	74,55
	None	11	55	50	90,91	50	90,91
	None	11	55	44	80,00	45	81,82
	None	11	55	47	85,45	47	85,45
	None	11	55	49	89,09	49	89,09
	None	11	55	51	92,73	51	92,73
	None	11	55	51	92,73	51	92,73
	None	11	55	48	87,27	46	83,64
	None	11	55	51	92,73	51	92,73
	None	11	55	31	56,36	40	72,73
	None	11	55	48	87,27	41	74,55
	None	11	55	52	94,55	47	85,45
	None	11	55	43	78,18	47	85,45
	None	11	55	38	69,09	49	89,09
	None	11	55	40	72,73	37	67,27
	None	11	55	44	80,00	50	90,91
	None	11	55	37	67,27	46	83,64
None	11	55	46	83,64	48	87,27	
None	11	55	47	85,45	47	85,45	
None	11	55	51	92,73	55	100,00	
None	11	55	41	74,55	48	87,27	
None	11	55	54	98,18	54	98,18	

Table 4.6.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Lesson Planning Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
L E S S O N P L A N N I N G	3	22	110	96	87,27	96	87,27
	3	22	110	81	73,64	82	74,55
	3	22	110	76	69,09	105	95,45
	3	22	110	109	99,09	109	99,09
	3	22	110	60	54,55	65	59,09
	3	22	110	88	80,00	87	79,09
	3	22	110	93	84,55	89	80,91
	3	22	110	110	100,00	110	100,00
	3	22	110	98	89,09	107	97,27
	3	22	110	83	75,45	91	82,73
	3	22	110	81	73,64	90	81,82
	3	22	110	100	90,91	100	90,91
	3	22	110	62	56,36	78	70,91
	3	22	110	80	72,73	87	79,09
	3	22	110	82	74,55	88	80,00
	3	22	110	90	81,82	97	88,18
	3	22	110	83	75,45	77	70,00
	3	22	110	104	94,55	104	94,55
	3	22	110	90	81,82	89	80,91
	3	22	110	95	86,36	95	86,36
	3	22	110	105	95,45	105	95,45
	3	22	110	96	87,27	96	87,27
	3	22	110	91	82,73	91	82,73
	3	22	110	100	90,91	106	96,36
	3	22	110	92	83,64	92	83,64
	3	22	110	68	61,82	97	88,18
	3	22	110	91	82,73	92	83,64
	3	22	110	92	83,64	89	80,91
	3	22	110	83	75,45	99	90,00
	3	22	110	96	87,27	93	84,55
	3	22	110	89	80,91	80	72,73
	3	22	110	84	76,36	99	90,00
	3	22	110	85	77,27	94	85,45
3	22	110	87	79,09	106	96,36	
3	22	110	93	84,55	94	85,45	
3	22	110	88	80,00	106	96,36	
3	22	110	81	73,64	100	90,91	
3	22	110	99	90,00	99	90,00	

Table 4.7.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Conducting a Lesson Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
N O S S E S S I O N S I N T R O D U C T I O N	5	27	135	114	84,44	114	84,44
	5	27	135	105	77,78	102	75,56
	5	27	135	109	80,74	132	97,78
	5	27	135	121	89,63	121	89,63
	5	27	135	82	60,74	93	68,89
	5	27	135	103	76,30	108	80,00
	5	27	135	102	75,56	111	82,22
	5	27	135	135	100,00	130	96,30
	5	27	135	117	86,67	132	97,78
	5	27	135	91	67,41	117	86,67
	5	27	135	74	54,81	94	69,63
	5	27	135	126	93,33	126	93,33
	5	27	135	70	51,85	97	71,85
	5	27	135	93	68,89	107	79,26
	5	27	135	109	80,74	108	80,00
	5	27	135	101	74,81	126	93,33
	5	27	135	100	74,07	100	74,07
	5	27	135	125	92,59	125	92,59
	5	27	135	114	84,44	117	86,67
	5	27	135	107	79,26	107	79,26
	5	27	135	133	98,52	133	98,52
	5	27	135	122	90,37	122	90,37
	5	27	135	110	81,48	110	81,48
	5	27	135	122	90,37	134	99,26
	5	27	135	115	85,19	115	85,19
	5	27	135	90	66,67	130	96,30
	5	27	135	109	80,74	109	80,74
	5	27	135	122	90,37	111	82,22
	5	27	135	108	80,00	119	88,15
	5	27	135	121	89,63	127	94,07
	5	27	135	109	80,74	97	71,85
	5	27	135	102	75,56	128	94,81
	5	27	135	108	80,00	121	89,63
	5	27	135	119	88,15	128	94,81
	5	27	135	98	72,59	111	82,22
5	27	135	108	80,00	131	97,04	
5	27	135	99	73,33	114	84,44	
5	27	135	127	94,07	127	94,07	

Table 4.8.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Independent Learning Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
I N D E P E N D E N T L E A R N I N G	6	28	140	115	82,14	115	82,14
	6	28	140	73	52,14	102	72,86
	6	28	140	108	77,14	131	93,57
	6	28	140	130	92,86	130	92,86
	6	28	140	79	56,43	77	55,00
	6	28	140	115	82,14	114	81,43
	6	28	140	89	63,57	110	78,57
	6	28	140	140	100,00	140	100,00
	6	28	140	133	95,00	130	92,86
	6	28	140	74	52,86	109	77,86
	6	28	140	112	80,00	107	76,43
	6	28	140	133	95,00	133	95,00
	6	28	140	73	52,14	87	62,14
	6	28	140	91	65,00	104	74,29
	6	28	140	115	82,14	112	80,00
	6	28	140	110	78,57	129	92,14
	6	28	140	126	90,00	109	77,86
	6	28	140	129	92,14	129	92,14
	6	28	140	118	84,29	116	82,86
	6	28	140	112	80,00	112	80,00
	6	28	140	128	91,43	128	91,43
	6	28	140	125	89,29	125	89,29
	6	28	140	114	81,43	114	81,43
	6	28	140	115	82,14	139	99,29
	6	28	140	126	90,00	126	90,00
	6	28	140	94	67,14	128	91,43
	6	28	140	125	89,29	102	72,86
	6	28	140	119	85,00	107	76,43
	6	28	140	110	78,57	128	91,43
	6	28	140	126	90,00	116	82,86
6	28	140	119	85,00	101	72,14	
6	28	140	106	75,71	131	93,57	
6	28	140	106	75,71	129	92,14	
6	28	140	106	75,71	114	81,43	
6	28	140	105	75,00	117	83,57	
6	28	140	108	77,14	138	98,57	
6	28	140	103	73,57	115	82,14	
6	28	140	133	95,00	133	95,00	

Table 4.9.: Descriptive Results of Prospective EFL Teachers' Competency Levels for Assessment of Learning Section of EPOSTL while Taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" Courses

Section	N of Sub-sections	N of Items	Maximum	Score of EPOSTL1	Means of EPOSTL1	Score of EPOSTL2	Means of EPOSTL2
A S S E S S M E N T O f L E A R N I N G	6	27	135	125	81,48	125	92,59
	6	27	135	91	93,33	93	68,89
	6	27	135	110	57,04	128	94,81
	6	27	135	127	71,85	127	94,07
	6	27	135	82	77,78	80	59,26
	6	27	135	101	74,81	99	73,33
	6	27	135	103	82,96	108	80,00
	6	27	135	135	89,63	134	99,26
	6	27	135	134	83,70	134	99,26
	6	27	135	72	78,52	112	82,96
	6	27	135	110	91,11	107	79,26
	6	27	135	126	91,11	126	93,33
	6	27	135	77	79,26	94	69,63
	6	27	135	97	77,04	105	77,78
	6	27	135	105	92,59	108	80,00
	6	27	135	101	71,85	123	91,11
	6	27	135	112	85,19	104	77,04
	6	27	135	121	71,11	121	89,63
	6	27	135	113	80,00	113	83,70
	6	27	135	106	80,74	106	78,52
	6	27	135	123	77,04	123	91,11
	6	27	135	123	78,52	123	91,11
	6	27	135	107	76,30	107	79,26
	6	27	135	104	82,22	132	97,78
	6	27	135	125	85,93	125	92,59
	6	27	135	97	74,07	133	98,52
	6	27	135	115	71,85	102	75,56
	6	27	135	96	94,81	108	80,00
	6	27	135	108	81,48	120	88,89
	6	27	135	109	93,33	112	82,96
	6	27	135	104	57,04	91	67,41
	6	27	135	106	71,85	116	85,93
6	27	135	103	77,78	128	94,81	
6	27	135	111	74,81	126	93,33	
6	27	135	116	82,96	111	82,22	
6	27	135	100	89,63	131	97,04	
6	27	135	97	83,70	123	91,11	
6	27	135	128	78,52	128	94,81	

Tables 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 include descriptive results of prospective EFL teachers' competency levels for context, methodology, resources, lesson planning, conducting a lesson, independent learning and assessment of learning sections of EPOSTL while taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses. These tables illustrate the sub-sections of each section, number of the items in each section, maximum grades that the prospective teachers may get, the exact achievement grade of each prospective teacher, the mean score of EPOSTL1 and EPOSTL2. In detail, "context" section consists of 4 sub-sections with 23 descriptors named as *curriculum (4)*, *aims and needs (7)*, *the role of the language teacher (10)*, *institutional resources and constraints (2)*. "Methodology" section consists of 7 sub-sections with 57 descriptors named as *speaking/spoken interaction (12)*, *writing/writing interaction (12)*, *listening (8)*, *reading (9)*, *grammar (5)*, *vocabulary (3)*, *culture (8)*. "Resources" section doesn't include any sub-sections but consists of 11 descriptors. "Lesson Planning" section consists of 3 sub-sections with 22 descriptors named as *identification of learning objectives (6)*, *lesson content (12)*, *organization (4)*. "Conducting a Lesson" section consists of 5 sub-sections with 27 descriptors named as *using lesson plans (6)*, *content (4)*, *interaction with learners (6)*, *classroom management (5)*, *classroom language (6)*. "Independent Learning" section consists of 6 sub-sections with 28 descriptors named as *learner autonomy (6)*, *homework (4)*, *projects (6)*, *portfolios (5)*, *virtual learning environments (3)*, *extra-curricular activities (4)*. "Assessment of Learning" section consists of 6 sub-sections with 27 descriptors named as *designing assessment tools (3)*, *evaluation (8)*, *self and peer assessment (3)*, *language performance (6)*, *culture (3)*, *error analysis (4)*.

Table 4.10.: One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL 1

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Context	38	76,33	9,99	37	47,09	,000
Methodology	38	81,46	10,43		48,11	,000
Resources	38	79,85	12,07		40,78	,000
Lesson Planning	38	80,88	10,18		48,95	,000
Conducting a Lesson	38	80,31	10,95		45,19	,000
Independent Learning	38	79,75	12,43		39,52	,000
Assessment of Learning	38	80,07	8,72		56,55	,000

Table 4.10 One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL 1 is presented in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37)= 47.09, 48.11, 40.78, 48.95, 45.19, 39.52, 56.55, p<.01$. The mean value of context, methodology, resources, lesson planning, conducting a lesson, independent learning and assessment of learning are sequentially 76.33, 81.46, 79.85, 80.88, 80.31, 79.75 and 80.07. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers have less competencies especially in the *context* section and the other sections are needed to take into consideration in teacher education process especially considering it reflects one of the Turkey's successful universities' 4th year prospective teacher's competency levels.

Table 4.11.: One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL 2

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Context	38	82,19	8,66	37	58,44	,000
Methodology	38	87,22	7,58		70,84	,000
Resources	38	84,83	10,69		48,89	,000
Lesson Planning	38	85,74	8,93		59,17	,000
Conducting a Lesson	38	86,43	8,84		60,22	,000
Independent Learning	38	84,34	10,12		51,36	,000
Assessment of Learning	38	85,49	10,01		52,63	,000

In Table 4.11 One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL 2 are clarified in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37)= 58.44, 70.84, 48.89, 59.17, 60.22, 51.36, 52.63, p<.01$. The mean value of context, methodology, resources, lesson planning, conducting a lesson, independent learning and assessment of learning are sequentially 82.19, 87.22, 84.83, 85.74, 86.43, 84.34 and 85.49. These results indicate that the mean values of prospective EFL teacher's competency levels have increased in the context section from 76.33 to 82.19. Moreover, although the mean values of all sections has increased in the second EPOSTL application, all the sections specifically should be integrated and handled in detail in the process of English Language Teacher Education programs and curricula as well.

Tables from 4.12 to 4.25 present the each section’s subsection competency levels of prospective teachers for both IDÖ 475 “School Experience” and IDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” courses.

Table 4.12.: Sub-Section Results of “Context” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Context	Curriculum	Aims and Needs	The Role of LgT	Institutional Resources and Constrains
N of Items	23	4	7	10	2
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	86	100	71	80	100
Student 2	53	60	34	60	50
Student 3	76	55	69	76	100
Student 4	96	60	51	60	50
Student 5	70	75	60	68	80
Student 6	79	75	74	74	90
Student 7	77	85	66	70	90
Student 8	93	80	86	92	100
Student 9	92	90	77	92	100
Student 10	59	40	51	64	70
Student 11	65	40	69	70	40
Student 12	90	65	80	82	100
Student 13	87	85	71	90	100
Student 14	72	75	69	70	60
Student 15	74	75	66	74	70
Student 16	77	70	80	72	70
Student 17	66	60	66	66	60
Student 18	84	60	54	62	70
Student 19	81	80	69	82	80
Student 20	77	60	66	66	90
Student 21	80	70	66	78	90
Student 22	71	50	54	60	80
Student 23	72	80	63	78	70
Student 24	79	70	71	78	100
Student 25	80	65	60	68	50
Student 26	63	70	51	64	40
Student 27	71	60	69	70	80
Student 28	68	70	69	62	60
Student 29	57	50	46	62	50
Student 30	80	60	69	84	100
Student 31	69	65	54	74	70
Student 32	85	90	71	84	90
Student 33	80	70	74	82	80
Student 34	74	80	63	66	100
Student 35	84	70	74	90	80
Student 36	70	60	66	70	70
Student 37	76	65	69	74	90
Student 38	89	65	49	56	70
Total (38)	76	68	65	73	77

Table 4.13.: Sub-Section Results of “Context” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Context	Curriculum	Aims and Needs	The Role of LgT	Institutional Resources and Constrains
N of Items	23	4	7	10	2
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	86	75	89	86	100
Student 2	77	75	71	80	80
Student 3	86	95	77	90	80
Student 4	96	85	97	100	90
Student 5	62	60	66	60	60
Student 6	76	65	69	82	90
Student 7	82	80	80	82	90
Student 8	100	100	100	100	100
Student 9	92	100	89	92	90
Student 10	81	75	89	80	70
Student 11	85	80	80	88	100
Student 12	90	100	89	88	80
Student 13	71	60	77	72	70
Student 14	81	80	80	82	80
Student 15	76	65	80	76	80
Student 16	83	85	80	82	90
Student 17	67	75	69	64	60
Student 18	84	75	89	82	100
Student 19	82	85	80	82	80
Student 20	77	65	77	78	100
Student 21	80	90	89	70	80
Student 22	71	70	74	70	70
Student 23	72	75	74	72	60
Student 24	78	70	71	82	100
Student 25	80	85	83	76	80
Student 26	83	90	89	80	60
Student 27	75	55	83	76	80
Student 28	85	85	94	78	90
Student 29	88	100	83	86	90
Student 30	82	65	91	86	60
Student 31	66	60	74	66	50
Student 32	86	65	83	94	100
Student 33	91	100	83	96	80
Student 34	92	85	97	90	100
Student 35	90	85	89	92	100
Student 36	98	100	97	98	100
Student 37	84	75	100	82	60
Student 38	89	90	89	86	100
Total (38)	82	80	83	82	83

Scanning all the tables in detail, it is clearly seen that in Table 4.12 the competency levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 475 “School Experience” for “context” section are shown and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 76%. In terms of the sub-sections, the competency level of prospective teachers for “curriculum” is found as 68%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “aims and needs” sub-section are expressed and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 65%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “the role of the language teacher” is 73% and “institutional resources and constraints” is 77%. Furthermore, Table 4.13 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “context” section and the total competency mean value of this section is calculated as 82%. According to this table, the total competency mean value of “curriculum” sub-section is stated as 80%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “aims and needs” sub-section are expressed and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 83%. Meanwhile, in this table the total competency mean values of “the role of the language teacher” is 82% and “institutional resources and constraints” is 83%. Thus, it is clearly seen that the competency levels of prospective teachers is improved during the "Practice Teaching" course they have been taking in the spring semester.

Table 4.14.: Sub-Section Results of “Methodology” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Methodology	Spk Int.	Wrt Int.	Listening	Reading	Grammar	Vocabulary	Culture
N of Items	57	12	12	8	9	5	3	8
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	95	88	83	93	93	72	80	95
Student 2	68	67	70	75	75	80	80	68
Student 3	80	85	90	85	85	84	87	80
Student 4	75	95	80	78	78	76	80	75
Student 5	63	62	73	60	60	76	67	63
Student 6	80	97	93	75	75	84	93	80
Student 7	80	92	92	90	90	80	80	80
Student 8	95	100	100	100	100	100	100	95
Student 9	85	93	98	90	90	92	100	85
Student 10	73	63	77	43	43	88	93	73
Student 11	75	65	77	70	70	80	73	75
Student 12	70	90	83	85	85	100	87	70
Student 13	43	83	82	88	88	80	60	43
Student 14	58	72	70	73	73	80	80	58
Student 15	70	82	73	70	70	80	73	70
Student 16	73	73	82	83	83	76	73	73
Student 17	65	65	70	68	68	76	73	65
Student 18	38	92	60	60	60	88	87	38
Student 19	80	87	82	80	80	76	80	80
Student 20	88	88	72	80	80	68	73	88
Student 21	90	97	75	75	75	68	80	90
Student 22	60	72	78	80	80	80	80	60
Student 23	58	87	75	73	73	84	93	58
Student 24	88	100	93	95	95	88	100	88
Student 25	65	85	80	75	75	72	87	65
Student 26	53	53	62	65	65	56	80	53
Student 27	93	95	92	95	95	92	100	93
Student 28	80	68	75	93	93	96	100	80
Student 29	70	57	50	50	50	60	60	70
Student 30	68	83	67	60	60	44	40	68
Student 31	65	63	75	80	80	72	67	65
Student 32	75	80	82	85	85	80	80	75
Student 33	80	80	75	78	78	64	93	80
Student 34	73	77	72	88	88	68	87	73
Student 35	98	95	80	90	90	68	100	98
Student 36	85	92	87	93	93	100	100	85
Student 37	73	75	75	73	73	72	73	73
Student 38	53	67	73	65	65	64	73	53
Total (38)	75	81	79	78	78	78	82	73

Table 4.15.: Sub-Section Results of “Methodology” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Methodology	Spk Int.	Wrt Int.	Listening	Reading	Grammar	Vocabulary	Culture
N of Items	57	12	12	8	9	5	3	8
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	84	88	70	88	91	76	80	90
Student 2	85	87	80	88	80	96	87	85
Student 3	94	90	85	95	98	100	100	100
Student 4	98	95	100	100	100	100	100	95
Student 5	69	68	72	73	76	60	60	68
Student 6	87	83	95	70	98	96	93	78
Student 7	85	82	87	85	91	92	87	78
Student 8	99	100	100	95	100	100	100	100
Student 9	95	93	93	95	96	96	100	98
Student 10	88	98	90	83	84	100	100	70
Student 11	84	73	98	80	87	92	80	78
Student 12	90	90	87	88	91	100	73	95
Student 13	68	68	68	68	69	76	73	63
Student 14	79	80	80	80	78	76	80	75
Student 15	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	83
Student 16	90	87	92	88	91	92	80	98
Student 17	75	75	78	75	73	68	73	75
Student 18	93	92	95	93	93	96	100	88
Student 19	84	80	87	88	82	80	80	85
Student 20	85	88	78	80	96	92	93	78
Student 21	93	97	93	95	98	72	100	93
Student 22	81	72	78	73	93	88	93	88
Student 23	91	87	93	90	96	88	100	85
Student 24	93	87	97	95	100	100	100	83
Student 25	87	85	82	83	98	80	93	93
Student 26	94	98	97	98	100	100	100	68
Student 27	83	83	85	88	78	88	87	75
Student 28	87	80	88	100	89	84	80	88
Student 29	92	93	90	90	93	100	87	93
Student 30	84	85	77	85	89	96	87	80
Student 31	73	68	75	78	78	76	67	68
Student 32	95	98	100	95	93	92	87	93
Student 33	92	92	88	95	93	96	93	90
Student 34	95	95	93	100	93	100	100	93
Student 35	89	95	87	85	91	64	100	100
Student 36	98	97	98	98	100	100	100	95
Student 37	88	95	92	85	84	100	73	80
Student 38	84	67	88	83	91	88	73	95
Total (38)	89	86	88	87	90	89	88	85

Table 4.14 explains the detail competency levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 475 “School Experience” for “methodology” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 75%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “speaking/spoken interaction” sub-section are given and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 81%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “writing/written interaction” sub-section is 79%, for “listening” sub-section it is calculated as 77%. The total competency mean values for “reading”, “grammar”, “vocabulary” and “culture” sub-sections are found out as 78%, 78%, 82% and 73%. Furthermore, Table 4.15 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “methodology” section and the total competency mean value of this section is calculated as 89%. According to this table, competency levels of prospective teachers for “speaking/spoken interaction” sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 86%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “writing/written interaction” sub-section is 88%, for “listening” sub-section it is calculated as 87%. The total competency mean values for “reading”, “grammar”, “vocabulary” and “culture” sub-sections are stated as 90%, 89%, 88% and 85%. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers' competency levels in terms of the methodological issues developed in a positive way.

Table 4.16.: Sub-Section Results of “Resources” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Resources
N of Items	11
Participant	%
Student 1	85
Student 2	64
Student 3	71
Student 4	80
Student 5	58
Student 6	82
Student 7	75
Student 8	100
Student 9	89
Student 10	69
Student 11	80
Student 12	82
Student 13	60
Student 14	56
Student 15	82
Student 16	80
Student 17	75
Student 18	62
Student 19	80
Student 20	69
Student 21	87
Student 22	80
Student 23	71
Student 24	87
Student 25	60
Student 26	56
Student 27	87
Student 28	95
Student 29	78
Student 30	69
Student 31	73
Student 32	80
Student 33	67
Student 34	84
Student 35	85
Student 36	93
Student 37	75
Student 38	47
Total (38)	76

Table 4.17.: Sub-Section Results of “Resources” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Resources
N of Items	11
Participant	%
Student 1	71
Student 2	85
Student 3	95
Student 4	75
Student 5	51
Student 6	95
Student 7	85
Student 8	98
Student 9	98
Student 10	75
Student 11	95
Student 12	98
Student 13	65
Student 14	78
Student 15	80
Student 16	89
Student 17	75
Student 18	91
Student 19	82
Student 20	85
Student 21	89
Student 22	93
Student 23	93
Student 24	84
Student 25	93
Student 26	73
Student 27	75
Student 28	85
Student 29	85
Student 30	89
Student 31	67
Student 32	91
Student 33	84
Student 34	87
Student 35	85
Student 36	100
Student 37	87
Student 38	98
Total (38)	85

Table 4.16 displays the detail competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 475 “School Experience” for “resources” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 76%. Furthermore, Table 4.17 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “resources” section and the total competency mean value of this section is calculated as 85%. This section isn’t registered as including any sub-sections. Therefore, it does not have any data about the sub-section of this section. Although the prospective teachers competency levels improved in the resources section, it is observed that the competency levels of prospective teachers differ from each other which underlines the importance of decreasing the individual difference of teachers in action.

Table 4.18.: Sub-Section Results of “Lesson Planning” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Lesson Planning	Identification of Learning Objectives	Lesson Content	Organization
N of Items	22	6	12	4
Participant	%	%	%	%
Student 1	87	63	85	50
Student 2	74	70	80	60
Student 3	69	60	73	70
Student 4	99	60	68	60
Student 5	55	43	58	60
Student 6	80	80	78	85
Student 7	85	93	85	70
Student 8	100	100	100	100
Student 9	89	87	88	95
Student 10	75	87	70	75
Student 11	74	80	70	75
Student 12	91	93	83	75
Student 13	56	53	53	70
Student 14	73	70	75	70
Student 15	75	60	80	80
Student 16	82	73	85	85
Student 17	75	73	75	80
Student 18	95	87	78	85
Student 19	82	80	80	90
Student 20	86	40	80	90
Student 21	95	80	82	80
Student 22	87	77	70	80
Student 23	83	77	73	75
Student 24	91	90	97	75
Student 25	84	60	67	65
Student 26	62	60	63	60
Student 27	83	87	80	85
Student 28	84	77	83	95
Student 29	75	70	75	85
Student 30	87	60	98	95
Student 31	81	83	75	95
Student 32	76	80	73	80
Student 33	77	70	80	80
Student 34	79	80	80	75
Student 35	85	73	85	100
Student 36	80	80	77	90
Student 37	74	73	73	75
Student 38	90	50	50	60
Total (38)	81	73	77	78

Table 4.19.: Sub-Section Results of “Lesson Planning” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Lesson Planning	Identification of Learning Objectives	Lesson Content	Organization
N of Items	22	6	12	4
Participant	%	%	%	%
Student 1	87	87	87	90
Student 2	75	67	77	80
Student 3	95	90	100	90
Student 4	99	97	100	100
Student 5	59	60	60	55
Student 6	79	87	80	65
Student 7	81	80	83	75
Student 8	100	100	100	100
Student 9	97	93	100	95
Student 10	83	80	82	90
Student 11	82	80	83	80
Student 12	91	90	88	100
Student 13	71	73	70	70
Student 14	79	77	80	80
Student 15	80	80	80	80
Student 16	88	87	85	100
Student 17	70	70	70	70
Student 18	95	93	95	95
Student 19	81	80	82	80
Student 20	86	83	87	90
Student 21	95	100	95	90
Student 22	87	87	88	85
Student 23	83	87	83	75
Student 24	96	100	93	100
Student 25	84	83	83	85
Student 26	88	77	93	90
Student 27	84	80	82	95
Student 28	81	67	87	85
Student 29	90	90	90	90
Student 30	85	70	92	85
Student 31	73	80	68	75
Student 32	90	80	93	95
Student 33	85	87	82	95
Student 34	96	100	93	100
Student 35	85	87	83	90
Student 36	96	87	100	100
Student 37	91	87	92	95
Student 38	90	100	90	75
Total (38)	86	84	86	87

Table 4.18 emphasizes the detail competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 475 "School Experience" for "lesson planning" section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 81%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for "identification of learning objectives" sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 73%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of "lesson content" sub-section is 77%, for "organization" sub-section it is calculated as 78%. Furthermore, Table 4.19 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" for "lesson planning" section and the total competency mean value of this section is calculated as 86%. According to this table, competency levels of prospective teachers for "identification of learning objectives" sub-section are explained and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 84%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of "lesson content" sub-section is 86%, for "organization" sub-section it is calculated as 87%. In spite of the general improvement in *conducting a lesson* section, it is stated that the competency levels of *identification of learning objectives* during the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses are lower than the other sub-sections. This finding reminds us that the prospective teachers need to be clear and informed about the identification of learning objectives.

Table 4.20.: Sub-Section Results of “Conducting a Lesson” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Conducting a Lesson	Using Lesson Plans	Content	Interaction with Learners	Classroom Management	Classroom Language
N of Items	27	6	4	6	5	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	84	77	75	87	88	83
Student 2	78	70	80	83	80	77
Student 3	81	73	85	83	84	80
Student 4	90	67	60	60	72	67
Student 5	61	60	70	57	60	60
Student 6	76	77	80	80	60	83
Student 7	76	83	85	80	64	67
Student 8	100	100	100	100	100	100
Student 9	87	83	95	100	68	87
Student 10	67	77	70	70	60	60
Student 11	55	53	70	60	52	43
Student 12	93	80	80	83	84	83
Student 13	52	60	60	47	44	50
Student 14	69	67	70	60	68	80
Student 15	81	90	80	83	72	77
Student 16	75	80	75	67	72	80
Student 17	74	70	70	80	64	83
Student 18	93	37	60	70	72	67
Student 19	84	83	80	87	92	80
Student 20	79	70	90	90	92	73
Student 21	99	87	70	70	76	80
Student 22	90	73	80	80	80	80
Student 23	81	63	80	57	68	73
Student 24	90	97	80	93	96	83
Student 25	85	67	70	63	64	63
Student 26	67	70	60	63	68	70
Student 27	81	70	80	80	84	90
Student 28	90	100	80	80	92	97
Student 29	80	80	80	77	80	83
Student 30	90	100	100	90	68	90
Student 31	81	77	80	80	92	77
Student 32	76	73	75	77	80	73
Student 33	80	93	80	73	76	77
Student 34	88	90	90	93	84	83
Student 35	73	70	80	73	68	73
Student 36	80	97	80	80	76	67
Student 37	73	73	70	73	76	73
Student 38	94	57	55	43	48	53
Total (38)	80	76	77	76	74	75

Table 4.21.: Sub-Section Results of “Conducting a Lesson” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Conducting a Lesson	Using Lesson Plans	Content	Interaction with Learners	Classroom Management	Classroom Language
N of Items	27	6	4	6	5	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	84	90	85	93	72	80
Student 2	76	73	80	70	88	70
Student 3	98	97	100	93	100	100
Student 4	90	100	100	93	56	97
Student 5	69	60	70	80	72	63
Student 6	80	67	95	77	92	77
Student 7	82	80	85	80	88	80
Student 8	96	93	95	93	100	100
Student 9	98	97	100	97	96	100
Student 10	87	97	90	77	88	83
Student 11	70	77	80	60	72	63
Student 12	93	80	100	90	100	100
Student 13	72	67	70	70	76	77
Student 14	79	80	80	80	80	77
Student 15	80	80	80	80	80	80
Student 16	93	90	95	90	96	97
Student 17	74	73	80	67	72	80
Student 18	93	93	90	90	96	93
Student 19	87	80	90	83	88	93
Student 20	79	90	75	63	84	83
Student 21	99	100	100	93	100	100
Student 22	90	93	90	90	88	90
Student 23	81	83	85	67	80	93
Student 24	99	97	100	100	100	100
Student 25	85	83	80	83	88	90
Student 26	96	97	100	100	88	97
Student 27	81	80	70	77	76	97
Student 28	82	90	85	70	76	90
Student 29	88	90	90	83	100	80
Student 30	94	97	100	90	92	93
Student 31	72	80	65	67	72	73
Student 32	95	93	95	93	100	93
Student 33	90	90	90	90	92	87
Student 34	95	97	90	93	96	97
Student 35	82	77	90	83	80	83
Student 36	97	90	100	97	100	100
Student 37	84	87	80	87	96	73
Student 38	94	83	100	100	88	100
Total (38)	86	86	88	84	87	88

Table 4.20 gives the detail competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 475 “School Experience” for “conducting a lesson” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 80%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “using lesson plans” sub-section are shown and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 76%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “content” sub-section is 77%, for “interaction with learners” sub-section it is calculated as 76%. The total competency mean value of “classroom management” sub-section and “classroom language” sub-section are found out as 74% and 75%. Furthermore, Table 4.21 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “conducting a lesson” section and the total competency mean value of this section is calculated as 86%. According to this table, competency levels of prospective teachers for “using lesson plans” sub-section are given and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 86%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “content” sub-section is 88%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “using lesson plans” sub-section are clarified and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 86%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “content” sub-section is 88%, for “interaction with learners” sub-section it is calculated as 84%. The total competency mean value of “classroom management” sub-section and “classroom language” sub-section are stated as 87% and 88%. The competency levels of prospective teachers in *conducting a lesson* section seem improved but the sub-sections of especially *interaction with learners* and *using lesson plan* are among the important issues that prospective EFL teacher need to be informed.

Table 4.22.: Sub-Section Results of “Independent Learning” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Independent Learning	Learner Autonomy	Homework	Projects	Portfolios	Virtual Learning Environments	Extra-curricular Activities
N of Items	28	6	4	6	5	3	4
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	82	93	90	87	88	40	45
Student 2	52	63	55	47	40	40	65
Student 3	77	67	75	83	80	100	65
Student 4	93	100	95	100	100	47	60
Student 5	56	53	70	57	56	60	45
Student 6	82	77	85	83	76	80	95
Student 7	64	63	70	57	76	53	60
Student 8	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Student 9	95	77	100	100	100	100	100
Student 10	53	67	70	43	40	47	50
Student 11	80	70	80	80	80	80	95
Student 12	95	90	100	100	100	100	45
Student 13	52	60	60	53	40	60	40
Student 14	65	70	70	53	60	80	65
Student 15	82	83	80	80	60	100	100
Student 16	79	80	85	77	72	80	80
Student 17	90	97	85	87	100	80	85
Student 18	92	90	95	87	92	100	60
Student 19	84	80	85	87	72	93	95
Student 20	80	83	95	77	64	67	70
Student 21	91	100	100	90	76	100	65
Student 22	89	83	90	90	92	93	80
Student 23	81	73	95	83	72	93	65
Student 24	82	80	100	83	80	87	65
Student 25	90	87	85	87	92	100	65
Student 26	67	63	65	67	72	60	75
Student 27	89	80	95	83	88	100	100
Student 28	85	90	95	80	84	80	80
Student 29	79	80	70	83	76	87	75
Student 30	90	97	85	73	96	93	100
Student 31	85	83	85	90	84	80	85
Student 32	76	80	80	80	84	40	75
Student 33	76	73	65	70	84	80	85
Student 34	76	63	75	83	84	73	75
Student 35	75	70	75	70	80	80	80
Student 36	77	83	70	73	72	100	70
Student 37	74	77	70	77	72	80	65
Student 38	95	100	90	100	100	100	40
Total (38)	80	80	83	79	79	80	73

Table 4.23.: Sub-Section Results of “Independent Learning” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Independent Learning	Learner Autonomy	Home work	Projects	Portfolios	Virtual Learning Environments	Extra-curricular Activities
N of Items	28	6	4	6	5	3	4
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	82	93	90	87	88	40	75
Student 2	73	73	70	80	64	80	70
Student 3	94	100	85	93	84	100	100
Student 4	93	100	95	100	100	47	95
Student 5	55	60	65	40	60	73	40
Student 6	81	77	85	87	76	93	75
Student 7	79	80	95	77	76	60	80
Student 8	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Student 9	93	97	90	80	96	100	100
Student 10	78	80	80	80	80	60	80
Student 11	76	60	80	83	80	80	80
Student 12	95	90	100	100	100	100	80
Student 13	62	73	75	53	60	53	55
Student 14	74	60	75	80	76	80	80
Student 15	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Student 16	92	87	100	83	96	100	95
Student 17	78	80	80	77	80	73	75
Student 18	92	90	95	87	92	100	95
Student 19	83	87	90	80	80	80	80
Student 20	80	83	95	77	64	67	95
Student 21	91	100	100	90	76	100	85
Student 22	89	83	90	90	92	93	90
Student 23	81	73	95	83	72	93	80
Student 24	99	100	95	100	100	100	100
Student 25	90	87	85	87	92	100	95
Student 26	91	100	90	97	100	60	85
Student 27	73	70	75	73	76	73	70
Student 28	76	80	95	67	68	80	75
Student 29	91	93	90	90	92	93	90
Student 30	83	80	90	87	92	60	80
Student 31	72	67	65	70	80	80	75
Student 32	94	87	100	93	88	100	100
Student 33	92	87	95	97	88	93	95
Student 34	81	90	90	83	80	60	75
Student 35	84	80	65	93	96	87	75
Student 36	99	97	100	100	96	100	100
Student 37	82	93	100	73	88	60	70
Student 38	95	100	90	100	100	100	75
Total (38)	84	85	88	84	84	82	83

Table 4.22 implies the detail competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 475 “School Experience” for “independent learning” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 80%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “learner autonomy” sub-section are explained and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 80%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “homework” sub-section is 83%, for “projects” sub-section it is calculated as 79%. The total competency mean value of “portfolios” sub-section and “virtual learning environment” sub-section are given as 79% and 80%. Finally, the last sub-section of “extra-curricular activities” in this section is found as 73%. Furthermore, Table 4.23 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “independent learning” section and the total competency mean value of this section is calculated as 84%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for “learner autonomy” sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 85%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of “homework” sub-section is 88%, for “projects” sub-section it is calculated as 84%. The total competency mean value of “portfolios” sub-section and “virtual learning environment” sub-section are found as 84% and 82%. Finally, the last sub-section of “extra-curricular activities” in this section is found as 83%. However, the results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers should be informed about the extra-curricular activities, projects, portfolios and virtual learning environments in detail.

Table 4.24.: Sub-Section Results of “Assessment of Learning” Section for “School Experience”

Section/Sub-Sections	Assessment of Learning	Designing Assessment Tools	Evaluation	Self- and Peer Assessment	Language Perf.	Culture	Error Anlys.
N of Items	27	3	8	3	6	3	4
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	93	60	85	73	87	100	85
Student 2	67	47	68	60	77	67	75
Student 3	81	80	83	80	80	87	80
Student 4	94	60	60	60	60	60	75
Student 5	61	53	60	67	63	60	60
Student 6	75	80	70	73	70	87	80
Student 7	76	67	83	80	77	73	70
Student 8	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Student 9	99	100	100	100	100	100	95
Student 10	53	60	48	53	57	60	50
Student 11	81	93	85	80	73	80	80
Student 12	93	87	88	67	60	73	85
Student 13	57	60	58	47	53	67	60
Student 14	72	80	70	60	70	73	80
Student 15	78	73	80	73	80	80	75
Student 16	75	73	73	73	77	80	75
Student 17	83	93	85	80	87	73	75
Student 18	90	53	85	93	47	53	65
Student 19	84	87	78	73	87	87	95
Student 20	79	80	73	60	60	60	90
Student 21	91	73	65	80	73	80	80
Student 22	91	60	80	80	60	80	60
Student 23	79	60	70	60	70	67	75
Student 24	77	80	70	73	70	87	95
Student 25	93	47	63	53	63	53	55
Student 26	72	80	68	67	80	80	60
Student 27	85	87	88	80	77	87	95
Student 28	71	80	73	67	67	73	70
Student 29	80	80	80	80	73	93	80
Student 30	81	80	80	73	77	93	85
Student 31	77	93	75	80	73	67	80
Student 32	79	80	78	87	77	80	75
Student 33	76	80	78	73	73	73	80
Student 34	82	87	88	73	83	87	70
Student 35	86	80	90	67	80	100	95
Student 36	74	60	63	73	80	93	85
Student 37	72	80	68	73	73	67	75
Student 38	95	53	43	40	40	47	50
Total (38)	80	74	75	72	72	77	77

Table 4.25.: Sub-Section Results of “Assessment of Learning” Section for “Practice Teaching”

Section/Sub-Sections	Assessment of Learning	Designing Assessment Tools	Evaluation	Self- and Peer Assessment	Language Perf.	Culture	Error Anlys.
N of Items	27	3	8	3	6	3	4
Participant	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	93	87	88	93	93	100	100
Student 2	69	67	70	67	67	73	70
Student 3	95	100	93	100	90	100	95
Student 4	94	100	93	87	97	87	100
Student 5	59	60	60	47	60	60	65
Student 6	73	67	68	67	63	100	90
Student 7	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Student 8	99	100	100	93	100	100	100
Student 9	99	100	100	100	100	100	95
Student 10	83	80	80	93	97	60	80
Student 11	79	80	88	80	73	73	75
Student 12	93	100	83	100	100	93	95
Student 13	70	60	73	73	67	60	80
Student 14	78	80	80	60	80	80	80
Student 15	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Student 16	91	93	93	100	80	100	90
Student 17	77	73	78	80	73	80	80
Student 18	90	100	88	93	87	87	90
Student 19	84	80	83	80	83	93	85
Student 20	79	80	85	67	73	93	70
Student 21	91	93	98	73	83	100	95
Student 22	91	93	90	93	90	93	90
Student 23	79	80	70	80	77	100	85
Student 24	98	100	100	100	100	80	100
Student 25	93	100	90	87	100	100	80
Student 26	99	100	100	100	100	93	95
Student 27	76	67	75	87	73	80	75
Student 28	80	80	85	93	77	60	80
Student 29	89	87	90	93	87	80	95
Student 30	83	73	65	100	100	100	75
Student 31	67	60	68	60	73	60	75
Student 32	86	80	83	80	80	100	100
Student 33	95	93	93	93	100	87	100
Student 34	93	93	93	100	93	87	95
Student 35	82	87	90	60	77	100	75
Student 36	97	100	100	100	93	93	95
Student 37	91	93	93	93	87	93	90
Student 38	95	100	93	93	87	100	100
Total (38)	86	85	85	85	85	87	87

Table 4.24 elaborates the detail competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 475 "School Experience" for "assessment of learning" section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 80%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for "designing assessment tools" sub-section are indicated and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 74%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of "evaluation" sub-section is 75%, for "self-and peer assessment" sub-section it is calculated as 72%. The total competency mean value of "language performance" sub-section and "culture" sub-section are found as 72% and 77%. Finally, the last sub-section of "error analysis" in this section is found as 77%. Furthermore, Table 4.25 shows the competency levels of prospective teachers during IDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" for "assessment of learning" section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total competency mean value of this section is 86%. The competency levels of prospective teachers for "designing assessment tools" sub-section are given and the mean sum of the values show that the total competency mean value of this sub-section is 85%. Moreover, in this table the total competency mean values of "evaluation" sub-section is 85%, for "self-and peer assessment" sub-section it is calculated as 85%. The total competency mean value of "language performance" sub-section and "culture" sub-section are found as 85% and 87%. Finally, the last sub-section of "error analysis" in this section is found as 87%. Even though the general improvement is observed in the *assessment of learning* section, it is clearly seen that prospective EFL Teachers need more help for *designing assessment tools, evaluation, self- and peer assessment, language performance* sub-sections during the teacher education process.

In Table 4.26 and 4.27 one sample t-test parametric statistical procedure is reported for the sub-sections of EPOSTL carried out in the fall semester for "School Experience" and in the spring semester for "Practice Teaching" courses. The aim here, is to evaluate the mean values of distribution observe how significant the distributions of sections/subsections are.

Table 4.26.: One-Sample T-Test Results for Sub-Sections of EPOSTL1

Sections/Subsections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
CONTEXT	38	76,33	9,99	37	47,15	,000
Curriculum	38	68,42	13,05		32,31	,000
AimsNeeds	38	64,92	10,58		37,82	,000
RoleofLgTr	38	72,89	9,71		46,30	,000
InsResConstraints	38	77,37	18,55		25,71	,000
METHODOLOGY	38	81,46	10,43		32,26	,000
SpkSpokenInteraction	38	80,66	13,09		37,99	,000
WrtWrittenInreaction	38	78,24	10,34		46,65	,000
Listening	38	77,87	12,96		37,04	,000
Reading	38	77,87	12,96		37,04	,000
Grammar	38	78,00	12,22		39,34	,000
Vocabulary	38	81,89	13,42		37,61	,000
Culture	38	73,18	13,99		32,26	,000
RESOURCES	38	79,85	12,07		38,97	,000
LPLAN	38	80,88	10,18		49,08	,000
Objectives	38	73,13	13,91		32,41	,000
LesContent	38	76,97	10,63		44,65	,000
Organization	38	78,29	12,43		38,84	,000
CONDESSON	38	80,31	10,95		45,38	,000
Usinglessonplans	38	76,16	13,95		33,66	,000
Content	38	76,97	10,43		45,48	,000
Intlearners	38	75,58	13,41		34,73	,000
Management	38	74,32	13,14		34,87	,000
ClassLanguage	38	75,39	12,01		38,69	,000
INDLEARNING	38	79,75	12,43		39,59	,000
Autonomy	38	79,61	12,50		39,25	,000
Homework	38	82,50	12,56		40,49	,000
Project	38	78,95	14,74		33,03	,000
Portfolio	38	78,53	16,52		29,31	,000
VirtuallearningEnv	38	79,82	19,66		25,03	,000
ExtrCurrActs	38	72,76	17,89		25,08	,000
ASSESSOLEARNING	38	80,07	8,72		45,80	,000
DesAsseTools	38	74,37	14,50		31,62	,000
Evaluation	38	75,05	12,49		37,03	,000
SelfPeerAssess	38	71,87	12,77		34,69	,000
LangPerformance	38	72,47	12,57		35,54	,000
CultureAssessoLear	38	77,03	14,10		33,69	,000
ErrorAnalysis	38	76,71	12,80		36,94	,000

In Table 4.26 One-Sample T-Test Results for Sub-Sections of EPOSTL 1 are given in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each sub-section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37)= 37.31$ for

curriculum, 37.82 for aims and need, 46.30 for the role of the language teacher, 25.71 for instructional resources and constraints, 37.99 for speaking/spoken interaction, 46.65 for writing/written interaction, 37.04 for listening, 37.04 for reading, 39.34 for grammar, 37.61 for vocabulary, 32.26 for culture, 32.41 for objectives, 44.65 for lesson content, 38.84 for organization, 33.66 for using lesson plans, 45.48 for content, 34.73 for interaction with learners, 34.87 for management, 38.69 for classroom language, 39.25 for autonomy, 40.49 for homework, 33.03 for project, 29.31 for portfolio, 25.03 for virtual learning environment, 25.08 for extra-curricular activities, 31.62 for designing assessment tools, 37.03 for evaluation, 34.69 for self- and peer assessment, 35.54 for language performance, 33.69 for culture, 36.94 for error analysis, $p < .01$. The mean values of sub-sections are calculated sequentially 68.42 for curriculum, 64.92 for aims and need, 72.89 for the role of the language teacher, 77.37 for instructional resources and constraints, 80.66 for speaking/spoken interaction, 78.24 for writing/written interaction, 77.87 for listening, 77.87 for reading, 78.00 for grammar, 81.89 for vocabulary, 73.18 for culture, 73.13 for objectives, 76.97 for lesson content, 78.29 for organization, 76.16 for using lesson plans, 76.97 for content, 75.58 for interaction with learners, 74.32 for management, 75.39 for classroom language, 79.61 for autonomy, 82.50 for homework, 78.95 for project, 78.53 for portfolio, 79.82 for virtual learning environment, 72.76 for extra-curricular activities, 74.37 for designing assessment tools, 75.05 for evaluation, 71.87 for self- and peer assessment, 72.47 for language performance, 77.03 for culture, 76.31 for error analysis, $p < .01$. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers have less competencies especially in the *curriculum*, *aims and needs* sub-sections. When the general competency levels of prospective teachers are examined, it is seen that even the highest competency level belongs to sub-section of *homework* as 82.50 which also means that all sections of EPOSTL should be incorporated in the process of English Language Teacher Education.

Table 4.27.: One-Sample T-Test Results for Sub-Sections of EPOSTL 2

Sections/Subsections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
CONTEXT	38	82,19	8,66	37	58,63	,000
Curriculum	38	79,61	13,17		37,26	,000
AimsNeeds	38	83,45	9,07		56,74	,000
RoleofLgTr	38	82,26	9,60		52,83	,000
InsResConstraints	38	82,89	15,05		33,95	,000
METHODOLOGY	38	87,22	7,58		70,95	,000
SpkSpokenInteraction	38	86,08	9,60		55,30	,000
WrtWrittenInreaction	38	87,26	8,75		61,49	,000
Listening	38	87,05	8,67		61,87	,000
Reading	38	89,76	8,43		65,67	,000
Grammar	38	88,95	11,41		48,07	,000
Vocabulary	38	87,87	11,39		47,55	,000
Culture	38	85,26	10,32		50,95	,000
RESOURCES	38	84,83	10,69		48,94	,000
LPLAN	38	85,74	8,93		59,81	,000
Objectives	38	84,29	9,99		52,02	,000
LesContent	38	86,21	9,39		56,60	,000
Organisation	38	86,58	11,10		48,10	,000
CONDESSON	38	86,43	8,84		60,29	,000
Usinglessonplans	38	86,08	10,03		52,89	,000
Content	38	88,16	10,16		53,48	,000
Intlearners	38	83,92	11,13		46,47	,000
Management	38	87,05	11,02		48,69	,000
ClassLanguage	38	87,61	10,99		49,13	,000
INDLEARNING	38	84,34	10,12		51,19	,000
Autonomy	38	84,66	11,91		43,82	,000
Homework	38	87,76	10,57		51,18	,000
Project	38	84,13	12,88		40,26	,000
Portfolio	38	84,42	11,94		43,59	,000
VirtuallearningEnv	38	81,53	17,81		28,21	,000
ExtrCurrActs	38	82,76	13,19		38,69	,000
ASSESSOLEARNING	38	85,49	10,01		52,49	,000
DesAsseTools	38	85,42	13,00		40,52	,000
Evaluation	38	85,24	10,81		48,60	,000
SelfPeerAssess	38	84,87	14,17		36,92	,000
LangPerformance	38	84,74	11,79		44,30	,000
CultureAssessoLear	38	86,97	13,59		39,46	,000
ErrorAnalysis	38	86,84	10,29		52,00	,000

In Table 4.27 One-Sample T-Test Results for Sub-Sections of EPOSTL 2 are submitted in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each sub-section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37)= 37.26$ for curriculum, 56.74 for aims and need, 52.83 for the role of the language teacher,

33.95 for instructional resources and constraints, 55.30 for speaking/spoken interaction, 61.49 for writing/written interaction, 61.87 for listening, 65.67 for reading, 48.07 for grammar, 47.55 for vocabulary, 50.95 for culture, 52.02 for objectives, 56.60 for lesson content, 48.10 for organization, 52.89 for using lesson plans, 53.48 for content, 46.47 for interaction with learners, 48.69 for management, 49.13 for classroom language, 43.82 for autonomy, 51.18 for homework, 40.26 for project, 43.59 for portfolio, 28.21 for virtual learning environment, 38.69 for extra-curricular activities, 40.52 for designing assessment tools, 48.60 for evaluation, 36.92 for self- and peer assessment, 44.30 for language performance, 39.46 for culture, 52.00 for error analysis, $p < .01$. Moreover, the mean values of sub-sections are calculated sequentially 79.61 for curriculum, 83.45 for aims and need, 82.26 for the role of the language teacher, 82.89 for instructional resources and constraints, 86.08 for speaking/spoken interaction, 87.26 for writing/written interaction, 87.05 for listening, 89.06 for reading, 88.95 for grammar, 87.87 for vocabulary, 85.26 for culture, 84.29 for objectives, 86.21 for lesson content, 86.58 for organization, 86.08 for using lesson plans, 88.16 for content, 83.92 for interaction with learners, 87.05 for management, 87.61 for classroom language, 84.66 for autonomy, 87.76 for homework, 84.13 for project, 84.42 for portfolio, 81.53 for virtual learning environment, 82.76 for extra-curricular activities, 85.42 for designing assessment tools, 85.24 for evaluation, 84.87 for self- and peer assessment, 84.74 for language performance, 86.97 for culture, 86.84 for error analysis, $p < .01$. Although these results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers' competency levels improved in a positive way, the prospective teachers still need help in the sub-sections of EPOSTL. In addition, the *curriculum* sub-section deserves to have importance in the ELT programs and should be dealt with conscientiously during the EFL teacher education process.

4.3. Findings and Discussion for to What Extent the Micro-Teaching Sessions of Sections/Subsections of 'Self-Assessment' are Effective and Useful

Research Question 3: *To what extent are the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' effective and useful?*

Related to this research question, the descriptive results of each EPOSTL section for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are presented in Table 4.28 below and these findings are supported by T-test results of gathered data.

Table 4.28.: Paired Sample T-Test Result of Each Prospective Teacher’s EPOSTL Competency Levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”

Courses	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
School Experience	38	75,5787	8,87113	37	6,349	,000
Practice Teaching	38	85,5655	8,07461			

Table 4.28 shows the paired-sample t-test results of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” According to the paired-sample t-test results, mean values for each application of EPOSTL differ meaningfully and the difference between the competency levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are significant, $t(37)=6.349$, $p<.01$. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency levels for “School Experience” is 75.57 while the competency levels for “Practice Teaching” is 85.56. The findings indicate that micro-teaching sessions for sections/subsections of self-assessments in EPOSTL scale have significant effects on prospective EFL teachers' teaching competency levels.

Table 4.29.: Paired Sample T-Test Result of EPOSTL Sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”

Pairs	Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Pair1	Context	38	76,3387	9,99291	37	3,537	,001
	Context2	38	82,1968	8,66914			
Pair2	Methodology	38	81,4681	10,43866		3,587	,001
	Methodology2	38	87,2207	7,58916			
Pair3	Resources	38	79,8565	12,07068		3,422	,002
	Resources2	38	84,8325	10,69634			
Pair4	Lesson planning	38	80,8852	10,18587		3,634	,001
	Lesson planning2	38	85,7416	8,93254			
Pair5	Conducting a lesson	38	80,3119	10,95537		4,351	,000
	Conducting a lesson2	38	86,4327	8,84726			
Pair6	Independent learning	38	79,7556	12,43768		2,676	,011
	Independent learning2	38	84,3421	10,12250			
Pair7	Assessment of learning	38	80,0774	8,72781		3,295	,002
	Assessment of learning2	38	85,4971	10,01335			

Table 4.29 includes the paired-sample t-test results of EPOSTL sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses as pre- and post-tests. According to the paired-sample t-test results, the mean values of “context”, “methodology”, “resources”, “lesson planning”, “conducting a lesson”, “independent learning” and “assessment of learning” sections are calculated respectively for School Experience and Practice Teaching courses. The results reveal that each EPOSTL application differs meaningfully and the difference between the competency levels for each labeled sections of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are significant, $t(37)= 3.53$ for *context*, 3.58 for *methodology*, 3.42 for *resources*, 3.63 for *lesson planning*, 4.35 for *conducting a lesson*, 2.67 for *independent learning*, 3.29 for *assessment of learning* respectively, $p<.01$. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “context” section for “School Experience” is 76.33 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 82.19. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “methodology” section for “School Experience” is 81.46 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.22. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “resources” section for “School Experience” is 79.85 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.83. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “lesson planning” section for “School Experience” is 80.88 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 85.74. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “conducting a lesson” section for “School Experience” is 80.31 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.43. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “independent learning” section for “School Experience” is 79.75 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.34. The mean value of prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “assessment of learning” section for “School Experience” is 80.07 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 85.49. The results show that prospective EFL teachers’ competency levels do not differ meaningfully only in terms of their general competency levels but also their competency levels differ meaningfully in terms of the sections of EPOSTL they are expected to fill during the courses.




Figure 4.1.: The Comparison of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” Competency Levels for Each 7 Section of EPOSTL

Figure 4.1 summarizes the comparison of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” competency levels for each 7 section of EPOSTL and clarifies the meaningful difference between each section of EPOSTL applied for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses visually. So, it is clearly seen that significant differences appear between all sections of EPOSTL.

Table 4.30.: Paired Sample T-Test Result of EPOSTL Sub-Sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”

Pairs	Sections	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	T	p
Pair1	Curriculum	38	68,42	13,054	37	3,647	,001
	Curriculum2	38	79,6053	13,17151			
Pair2	AimsNeeds	38	64,92	10,581	9,06641	8,874	,000
	AimsNeeds2	38	83,4474	9,06641			
Pair3	RoleofLgTr	38	72,89	9,706	9,59922	4,936	,000
	RoleofLgTr2	38	82,2632	9,59922			
Pair4	InsResConstraints	38	77,37	18,554	15,05089	1,530	,134
	InsResConstraints2	38	82,8947	15,05089			
Pair5	SpkSpokenInteraction	38	80,66	13,089	9,59556	2,504	,017
	SpkSpokenInteraction2	38	86,0789	9,59556			
Pair6	WrtWrittenInreaction	38	78,24	10,339	8,74777	4,563	,000
	WrtWrittenInreaction2	38	87,2632	8,74777			
Pair7	Listening	38	77,87	12,960	8,67412	4,240	,000
	Listening2	38	87,0526	8,67412			
Pair8	Reading	38	77,87	12,960	8,42594	5,248	,000
	Reading2	38	89,7632	8,42594			

Pair9	Grammar	38	78,00	12,223	4,402	,000
	Grammar2	38	88,9474	11,40637		
Pair10	Vocabulary	38	81,89	13,422	3,086	,004
	Vocabulary2	38	87,8684	11,39030		
Pair11	Culture	38	73,18	13,986	5,408	,000
	Culture2	38	85,2632	10,31578		
Pair12	RESOURCES	38	79,85	12,071	4,264	,000
	RESOURCES2	38	84,8326	10,69619		
Pair13	LPLAN	38	80,88	10,185	3,609	,001
	LPLAN2	38	85,7413	8,93152		
Pair14	CONTEXT	38	76,33	9,993	3,554	,001
	CONTEXT2	38	82,1968	8,66922		
Pair15	METHODOLOGY	38	81,4684	10,43833	6,524	,000
	METHODOLOGY2	38	87, 2205	7,58945		
Pair16	Objectives	38	73,13	13,911	4,841	,000
	Objectives2	38	84,2895	9,98893		
Pair17	LesContent	38	76,97	10,628	4,968	,000
	LesContent2	38	86,2105	9,38993		
Pair18	Organization	38	78,29	12,427	3,472	,001
	Organisation2	38	86,5789	11,09573		
Pair19	CONCLESSON	38	80,31	10,955	4,348	,000
	CONCLESSON2	38	86,4342	8,84742		
Pair20	Usinglessonplans	38	76,1579	13,94686	4,413	,000
	Usinglessonplans2	38	86,0789	10,03341		
Pair21	Content	38	76,97	10,433	5,023	,000
	Content2	38	88,1579	10,16227		
Pair22	Intlearners	38	75,58	13,414	3,215	,003
	Intlearners2	38	83,9211	11,13160		
Pair23	Management	38	74,32	13,140	5,289	,000
	Management2	38	87,0526	11,02074		
Pair24	ClassLanguage	38	75,39	12,012	5,835	,000
	ClassLanguage2	38	87,6053	10,99272		
Pair25	INDLEARNING	38	79,75	12,438	2,662	,011
	INDLEARNING2	38	84,3426	10,12245		
Pair26	Autonomy	38	79,61	12,502	2,426	,020
	Autonomy2	38	84,6579	11,91020		
Pair27	Homework	38	82,50	12,561	2,559	,015
	Homework2	38	87,7632	10,57134		
Pair28	Project	38	78,95	14,735	2,195	,034
	Project2	38	84,1316	12,88236		
Pair29	Portfolio	38	78,53	16,517	2,852	,007
	Portfolio2	38	84,4211	11,93820		
Pair30	VirtuallearningEnv	38	79,8158	19,65769	,657	,515
	VirtuallearningEnv2	38	81,5263	17,81244		
Pair31	ExtrCurrActs	38	72,76	17,885	3,227	,003
	ExtrCurrActs2	38	82,7632	13,18770		
Pair32	ASSESSOLEARNING	38	80,07	8,727	3,278	,002
	ASSESSOLEARNING2	38	85,4966	10,01253		

Pair33	DesAsseTools	38	74,37	14,500	3,498	,001
	DesAsseTools2	38	85,4211	12,99611		
Pair34	Evaluation	38	75,05	12,494	4,122	,000
	Evaluation2	38	85,2368	10,81149		
Pair35	SelfPeerAssess	38	71,87	12,773	4,721	,000
	SelfPeerAssess2	38	84,8684	14,17110		
Pair36	LangPerformance	38	72,47	12,569	4,737	,000
	LangPerformance2	38	84,7368	11,79254		
Pair37	CultureAssessoLear	38	77,03	14,095	3,864	,000
	CultureAssessoLear2	38	86,9737	13,58554		
Pair38	ErrorAnalysis	38	76,71	12,802	3,988	,000
	ErrorAnalysis2	38	86,8421	10,29439		

Table 4.30 includes the paired-sample t-test results of EPOSTL sub-sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses as pre- and post-tests. According to the paired-sample t-test results, mean values of sub-sections of “context” section labeled as “*curriculum*”, “*aims and needs*”, “*the role of language teacher*”, “*institutional resources and constraints*”, sub-sections of “methodology” section labeled as “*speaking/spoken interaction*”, “*writing/written interaction*”, “*listening*”, “*reading*”, “*grammar*”, “*vocabulary*”, “*culture*”, sub-sections of “resources” section, sub-sections of “lesson planning” section labeled as “*identification of learning objectives*”, “*lesson content*”, “*organization*”, sub-section of “conducting a lesson” section labeled as “*using lesson plans*”, “*content*”, “*interaction with learners*”, “*classroom management*”, “*classroom language*”, sub-sections of “independent learning” section labeled as “*learner autonomy*”, “*homework*”, “*projects*”, “*portfolios*”, “*virtual learning environments*”, “*extra-curricular activities*”, sub-sections of “assessment of learning” section labeled as “*designing assessment tools*”, “*evaluation*”, “*self- and peer assessment*”, “*language performance*”, “*culture*”, “*error analysis*” for each application of EPOSTL differ meaningfully and the difference between the competency levels for each labeled sub-sections of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are mostly significant, $t(37) = 3.55$ for context, 3.64 for curriculum, 8.87 for aims and needs, 4.93 for the role of the language teacher, 1.53 for institutional resources and constraints, 6.52 for methodology, 2.50 for speaking and spoken interaction, 4.56 for writing and written interaction, 4.24 for listening, 5.24 for reading, 4.40 for grammar, 3.08 for vocabulary, 5.40 for culture, 4.26 for resources, 3.60 for lesson planning, 4.84 for objectives, 4.96 for lesson content,

3.47 for organization, 4.34 for conducting a lesson, 4.41 for using lesson plans, 5.02 for content, 3.21 for interaction with learners, 5.28 for management, 5.83 for classroom language, 2.66 for independent learning, 2.42 for autonomy, 2.55 for homework , 2.19 for project, 2.85 for portfolio, .65 for virtual learning environment, 3.22 for extra-curricular activities, 3.27 for assessment of learning, 3.49 for designing assessment tools, 4.12 for evaluation, 4.72 for self and peer assessment, 4.73 for language performance, 3.86 for culture, 3.98 for error analysis, $p < .01$. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "curriculum" sub-section for "School Experience" is 68.42 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 79.60. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "aims and needs" sub-section for "School Experience" is 64.92. However, it is 83.44 for "Practice Teaching". The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "the role of the language teacher" sub-section for "School Experience" is 72.89, but the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 82.26. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "institutional resources and constraints" sub-section for "School Experience" is 77.37, while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 82.89. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "speaking/spoken interaction" sub-section for "School Experience" is 80.66 whereas the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 86.07. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "writing/written interaction" sub-section for "School Experience" is 78.24. On the other hand, the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 87.26. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "listening" sub-section for "School Experience" is 77.87, yet the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 87.05. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "reading" sub-section for "School Experience" is 77.87, while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 89.76. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "grammar" sub-section for "School Experience" is 78.00, but the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 88.94. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "vocabulary" sub-section for "School Experience" is 81.89 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 87.86. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency

level of “culture” sub-section for “School Experience” is 73.18 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 85.26. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “resources” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.61 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.84. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “identification of learning objectives” sub-section for “School Experience” is 73.13 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.28. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “lesson content” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.97 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.21. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “organization” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.29 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.57. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “using lesson plans” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.15 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.07. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “content” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.97 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 88.15. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “interaction with learners” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.58 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 83.92. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “classroom management” sub-section for “School Experience” is 74.32 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.05. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “classroom language” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.39 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.60. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “learner autonomy” sub-section for “School Experience” is 79.61 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.65. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “homework” sub-section for “School Experience” is 82.50 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.76. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “projects” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.95 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.13. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “portfolios” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.53

while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.42. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “virtual learning environments” sub-section for “School Experience” is 79.81 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 81.52. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “extra-curricular activities” sub-section for “School Experience” is 72.76 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 82.76. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “designing assessment tools” sub-section for “School Experience” is 74.37 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 85.42. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “evaluation” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.05 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 85.23. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “self- and peer assessment” sub-section for “School Experience” is 71.87 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.86. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “language performance” sub-section for “School Experience” is 72.47 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.73. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “culture” sub-section for “School Experience” is 77.03 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.97. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “error analysis” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.71 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.84. The results declare that prospective EFL teachers' competency levels do not differ meaningfully only in terms of the sections of EPOSTL but also the prospective teachers competency level differ significantly in the sub-sections of EPOSTL as well. In addition, although the mean values of virtual learning environment indicate difference between the “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses, this result do show significant difference statistically may be due to the fact that prospective teachers didn't have virtual learning experiences .




Figure 4.2.: The Comparison of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” Competency Levels for Each Sub-Section of EPOSTL

Figure 4.2 summarizes the comparison of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” competency levels for each sub-section of EPOSTL and clarifies the meaningful difference between each sub-section of EPOSTL applied for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses visually.

4.4. Findings and Discussion for What the Prospective Teachers’ Perceptions of EPOSTL are

Research Question 4: *What are the prospective teachers’ perceptions of EPOSTL?*

Related to this research question, one sample chi-square test χ^2 results for 15 item questionnaire which intends to reflect the EPOSTL perceptions of 38 prospective teachers at the end of the “Practice Teaching” course are presented in the table below.

Table 4.31.: Prospective Teachers’ Perceptions of EPOSTL at the end of “Practice Teaching” Course

<i>Prospective Teachers’ Perceptions About EPOSTL</i>		<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Total</i>
1-The EPOSTL made me think about different aspects of teacher education.	f	2	0	9	17	10	38
	%	5,3	0	27,7	44,7	26,3	100
2-The EPOSTL helped me to understand what competencies a teacher of foreign languages should have.	f	0	1	6	22	9	38
	%	0	2,6	15,8	57,9	23,7	100
3-The EPOSTL made me aware of the competencies I have developed as well as those still need to develop.	f	0	1	8	19	10	38
	%	0	2,6	21,1	50	26,3	100
4-The EPOSTL helped me to log my progress.	f	0	2	7	19	10	38
	%	0	5,3	21,1	50	26,3	100
5-The EPOSTL helped me to understand the relationship between underlying knowledge and practical skills in the process of teaching.	f	0	1	9	18	10	38
	%	0	2,6	23,7	47,4	23,6	100
6-The EPOSTL is a good instrument for the self assessment of teacher competencies.	f	0	0	7	17	14	38
	%	0	0	18,4	44,7	36,8	100
7-The EPOSTL is a useful teaching and learning device.	f	0	1	4	13	20	38
	%	0	2,6	10,5	34,2	52,6	100
8-The EPOSTL can be used effectively during teacher education at the faculties.	f	0	0	6	17	15	38
	%	0	0	15,8	44,7	39,5	100

9-Elective courses also contributed to the development of teacher competency.	f	0	0	13	15	10	38
	%	0	0	34,2	39,5	26,8	100
10-Personal statement section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL.	f	0	0	13	19	6	38
	%	0	0	34,2	50	15,8	100
11-Self-assessment section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL.	f	0	0	10	12	16	38
	%	0	0	26,3	31,6	42,1	100
12-Dossier section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL.	f	0	1	21	11	5	38
	%	0	2,6	55,3	28,9	13,2	100
13- EPOSTL is a waste of time for teacher education.	f	13	18	4	1	2	38
	%	34,2	47,4	10,5	2,6	5,3	100
14- Compulsory courses attributes most to the teacher competencies defined by EPOSTL.	f	1	4	15	13	5	38
	%	2,6	10,5	39,5	34,2	13,2	100
15-EPOSTL is a lifelong tool that will guide my Practice Teachings in detail.	f	0	1	3	20	14	38
	%	0	2,6	7,9	52,6	36,8	100

According to the Table 4.31 prospective teachers' perceptions of EPOSTL at the end of "Practice Teaching" course, the remarkable results will be explained in this part of the study. In accordance with the findings, 27 (71%) of the prospective teachers believe that the EPOSTL made them think about different aspects of teacher education. 31 (83.6%) of the prospective teachers think that the EPOSTL helped them to understand what competencies a teacher of foreign languages should have. 29 (86.3 %) of the prospective teachers are in an agreement that the EPOSTL made them aware of the competences they have developed as well as those they still need to develop. 29 (86.3 %) of the prospective teachers declare that the EPOSTL helped them to log their progress. 28 (71%) of the prospective teachers state that the EPOSTL helped them to understand the relationship between underlying knowledge and practical skills in the process of teaching. 31 (83.6%) of the prospective teachers indicate that the EPOSTL is a good instrument for the self-assessment of teacher competency. 33 (86.8%) of the prospective teachers believe that the EPOSTL is a useful teaching and learning device. 32 (84.2%) claim that the EPOSTL can be used effectively during teacher

education at the faculties. 25 (66.3%) of the prospective teachers think that elective courses also contributed to the development of teacher competencies. 25 (66.3%) of the prospective teachers are in an agreement that personal statement section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL. 28 (71%) of the prospective teachers believe that self-assessment section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL. Although 21 (55.3 %) prospective teachers feel neutral about the item that dossier section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL, 16 (42.1%) of them agree with the same item.

31 (83.6%) of the prospective teachers strongly disagree with the item that indicates EPOSTL is a waste of time for teacher education. While 15 (39.5 %) of the prospective teachers are not sure whether compulsory courses attributes most to the teacher competencies defined by EPOSTL, 18 (47.4 %) of the prospective teachers agree with the belief that compulsory courses attributes most to the teacher competences defined by EPOSTL.” 34 (89.4%) of the prospective teachers declare that EPOSTL is a lifelong tool that will guide their Practice Teaching in detail. To sum up, the results clarify that EPOSTL is a useful and effective tool that can be used during the EFL teacher education process.

Figure 4.3 summarizes the frequency distribution of each questionnaire item according to the prospective teachers' selections of their perceptions about EPOSTL labeled as “strongly disagree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “agree” and “strongly agree”.




Figure 4.3.: The Frequency Distribution of Each Questionnaire Item

4.5. Findings and Discussion for What the Correlation Levels of the Compulsory Didactic Courses and the Competency Levels of the Prospective Teachers are

Research Question 5: What are the correlation levels of the compulsory didactic courses and the competency levels of the prospective teachers?

With this research question, the prospective teachers are expected to estimate the levels of correlation between the outcome of the compulsory didactic courses and the teacher competency levels defined by the descriptors in the EPOSTL on a scale ranging from “1=not correlated”, “2=less correlated”, “3=correlated”, “4=very correlated” and “5=fully correlated”. Table 4.32 given below shows the prospective teachers’ estimation of the correlation levels between the outcome of the compulsory didactic courses and the teacher competency levels. In this table one sample chi-square test (χ^2) and descriptive results are combined together.

Table 4.32.: The Prospective Teachers' Estimation of the Correlation Levels Between the Outcome of the Compulsory Didactic Courses and the Teacher Competency Levels

<i>Didactic Compulsory Courses</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>		<i>Not correlated</i>	<i>Less correlated</i>	<i>Correlated</i>	<i>Very correlated</i>	<i>Fully correlated</i>	<i>Total</i>
Introduction to Teaching Profession	1,00	5,00	3,552	f	1	4	13	13	7	38
				%	2,6	10,5	34,2	34,2	18,4	100
Contextual Grammar I and II	1,00	5,00	3,105	f	5	8	7	14	4	38
				%	13,2	21,1	18,4	36,8	10,5	100
Advanced Reading I and II	2,00	5,00	3,973	f	0	1	7	16	12	38
				%	0	2,6	18,4	42,1	31,6	100
Advanced Writing I and II	2,00	5,00	4,157	f	0	1	5	19	13	38
				%	0	2,6	13,2	50	34,2	100
Listening and Phonetics I and II	2,00	5,00	4,026	f	0	5	7	8	18	38
				%	0	13,2	18,4	21,1	47,4	100
Oral Communication Skills I and II	1,00	5,00	3,710	f	1	4	10	13	10	38
				%	2,6	10,5	26,3	34,2	26,3	100
Computer Technologies I and II	1,00	5,00	3,552	f	1	8	6	15	8	38
				%	2,6	21,1	15,8	39,5	21,1	100
Teaching and Principles of Teaching	1,00	5,00	3,973	f	1	0	10	15	12	38
				%	2,6	0	26,3	39,5	31,6	100
English Literature I and II	1,00	5,00	3,263	f	3	5	15	9	6	38
				%	7,9	13,2	39,5	23,7	15,8	100
Linguistic I and II	1,00	5,00	2,973	f	6	9	9	8	6	38
				%	15,8	23,7	23,7	21,1	15,8	100
Approaches to English Language Teaching I and II	1,00	5,00	4,105	f	1	1	6	15	15	38
				%	2,6	2,6	15,8	39,5	39,5	100
English-Turkish Translation	1,00	5,00	3,289	f	2	8	14	5	9	38
				%	5,3	21,1	36,8	13,2	23,7	100
Turkish-English Translation	1,00	5,00	3,368	f	2	7	13	7	9	38
				%	5,3	18,4	34,2	18,4	23,7	100
Oral Expression and Public Speaking	1,00	5,00	3,684	f	1	2	13	14	8	38

					%	2,6	5,3	34,2	36,8	21,1	100
Language Acquisition	1,00	5,00	3,710	f	1	6	7	13	11	38	
					%	2,6	15,8	18,4	34,2	28,9	100
Testing and Evaluation in ELT	1,00	5,00	3,578	f	2	4	9	16	7	38	
					%	5,3	10,5	23,7	42,1	18,4	100
ELT Methodology I and II	3,00	5,00	4,421	f	0	0	3	16	19	38	
					%	0	0	7,9	42,1	50	100
Classroom Management	1,00	5,00	3,736	f	2	4	7	14	11	38	
					%	5,3	10,5	18,4	36,8	28,9	100
Teaching Foreign Language to Young Learners I and II	3,00	5,00	4,500	f	0	0	3	13	22	38	
					%	0	0	7,9	34,2	57,9	100
Literature and Language Teaching I and II	1,00	5,00	3,605	f	1	7	8	12	10	38	
					%	2,6	18,4	21,1	31,6	26,3	100
Teaching Technologies and Material Design	1,00	5,00	4,078	f	1	0	6	19	12	38	
					%	2,6	0	15,8	50	31,6	100
Teaching of Language Skills	2,00	5,00	4,236	f	0	1	5	16	16	38	
					%	0	2,6	13,2	42,1	42,1	100
Special Education	1,00	5,00	2,578	f	12	7	8	7	4	38	
					%	31,6	18,4	21,1	18,4	10,5	100
Guidance	2,00	5,00	3,842	f	0	3	9	17	9	38	
					%	0	7,9	23,7	44,7	23,7	100
Material Adaptation and Development in FLT	3,00	5,00	4,289	f	0	0	5	17	16	38	
					%	0	0	13,2	44,7	42,1	100
Comparative Education	1,00	5,00	3,631	f	3	1	12	13	9	38	
					%	7,9	2,6	31,6	34,2	23,7	100
Education System and School Management	1,00	5,00	3,631	f	2	5	7	15	9	38	
					%	5,3	13,2	18,4	39,5	23,7	100
School Experience	2,00	5,00	4,3947	f	0	1	4	12	21	38	
					%	0	2,6	10,5	31,6	55,3	100
Practice Teaching	2,00	5,00	4,2895	f	0	2	3	15	18	38	
					%	0	5,3	7,9	39,5	47,4	100

According to Table 4.32 the prospective teachers' estimation of the correlation levels between the outcome of the compulsory didactic courses and the teacher competency levels, the outstanding results are going to be explained in this part of the research. Depending upon the findings, 13 (34,3 %), 13 (34,3 %) and 7 (18,4) prospective teachers find "Introduction to teaching Profession" course correlated, very correlated and fully correlated with the teacher competency levels defined by the descriptors in the EPOSTL on the scale. 7 (18,4 %), 13 (36,8 %) prospective teachers find "Contextual Grammar I and II" courses correlated and very correlated with teacher competency levels. 16 (42,1 %), 12 (31,6 %) prospective teachers find "Advanced Reading I and II" courses very correlated and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 19 (50 %), 34 (34,2 %) prospective teachers find "Advanced Writing I and II" courses very correlated and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 8 (21,1 %), 18 (47,4 %) prospective teachers find "Listening and Phonetics I and II" courses very correlated and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 10 (26,3 %), 13 (34,2 %) and 10 (26,3) prospective teachers find "Oral Communication Skills I and II" courses correlated, very correlated and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 15 (39,5 %), 8 (21,1 %) prospective teachers find "Computer Technologies I and II" courses very correlated and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 10 (26,3 %), 15 (39,5 %) and 12 (31,6 %) prospective teachers find "Teaching and Principles of Teaching" course correlated, very correlated and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 9 (23,7 %) prospective teachers find "Linguistic I and II" courses less correlated and correlated with teacher competency levels. 15 (39,5 %) prospective teachers find "Approaches to English Language Teaching I and II" courses very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 14 (36,8 %) and 9 (23,7 %) prospective teachers find "English-Turkish Translation" course correlated and very correlated and with teacher competency levels. 13 (34,2 %) and 9 (23,7 %) prospective teachers find "Turkish-English Translation" course correlated and very correlated and with teacher competency levels. 13 (34,2 %) and 14 (36,8 %) prospective teachers find "Oral Expression and Public Speaking" courses correlated and very correlated and with teacher competency levels. 13 (34,2 %) and 11 (28,9 %) prospective teachers find "Language Acquisition" course very and fully correlated and with teacher competency levels. 16 (42,1 %) and 9 (23,7 %) prospective teachers find "Testing and Evaluation" course correlated and

very correlated with teacher competency levels. 16 (42,1 %) and 19 (50 %) prospective teachers find “ELT Methodology I and II” courses very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 14 (36,8 %) and 11 (28,9 %) prospective teachers find “Classroom Management” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 13 (34,2 %) and 22 (57,9 %) prospective teachers find “Teaching Foreign Language to Young Learners I and II” courses very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 12 (31,6 %) and 10 (26,3 %) prospective teachers find “Literature and Language Teaching I and II” courses very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 19 (50 %) and 12 (31,6 %) prospective teachers find “Teaching Technologies and Material Design” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 16 (42,1 %) prospective teachers find “Teaching of Language Skills” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 12 (31,6 %) and 8 (21,1 %) prospective teachers find “Special Education” course not correlated and correlated with teacher competency levels. 17 (44,7 %) and 9 (23,7 %) prospective teachers find “Guidance” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 17 (44,7 %) and 16 (42,1 %) prospective teachers find “Material Adaptation and Development in FLT” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 12 (31,6 %) and 13 (34,2 %) prospective teachers find “comparative Education” course correlated and very correlated with teacher competency levels. 15 (39,5 %) and 9 (23,7 %) prospective teachers find “Education System and School Management” course correlated and very correlated with teacher competency levels. 12 (31,6 %) and 21 (55,3 %) prospective teachers find “School Experience” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. 15 (39,5 %) and 18 (47,4 %) prospective teachers find “School Experience” course very and fully correlated with teacher competency levels. When the mean scores of correlation levels are examined, it is observed that Teaching Foreign Language to Young Learners I and II courses place at the top level. This is because the prospective teachers expect that they will teach at primary or elementary levels in state schools. After that, School Experience, Practice Teaching, Material Adaptation and Evaluation, Teaching of Language Skills, Teaching Technologies and Material Design, ELT Methodology I and II, Approaches to English Language Teaching I and II, Listening and Phonetics I and II, Advanced Writing I and II share the high correlation levels. This

emphasizes that prospective EFL teachers know the importance the methodological courses in order to improve the competency levels of their teaching studies. In addition, the non-methodological courses show the importance of the teacher educator's or lecturer's influence.

Figure 4.4 below also summarizes the frequency distribution of the prospective teachers' estimation of the correlation levels labeled as "not correlated", "less correlated", "correlated", "very correlated" and "fully correlated".




Figure 4.4.: The Frequency Distribution of the Prospective Teachers' Estimation of the Correlation Levels

4.6. Findings and Discussion for What the Prospective Teachers' Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid are

Research Question 5: *What are the prospective teachers' profiles in relation to the European Profiling Grid?*

This research question intends to explain the prospective teachers' teaching profile according to "European Profiling Grid". For this reason, the EPG was adapted into a likert-type format and carried out to different three groups of people who were the mentors, the course supervisors and course registration advisors of

prospective teachers during the “Practice Teaching” course. EPG was explained in detail to all of these responsible people, given with its guide in order to make it easy, and referenced to the desired competences that the prospective teachers are expected to have. Thus, all parts included in the guide of EPG were labeled as “1.1=extremely not developed=0”, “1.2=not developed=1”, “2.1=less developed=2”, “2.2= developed=3”, “3.1=very developed=4”, “3.2=fully developed=5” and “No idea= $\sqrt{}$ ”. According to the gathered data, Table 4.33 presented below shows the prospective teachers’ profiles in relation to the European Profiling Grid.

Table 4.33.: The Prospective Teachers' Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid with Respect to the Supervisors of İDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" Course

Participants	N of Items N	Minimum Min.	Maximum	Mean Max.	Frequency f	Percent %	Std. Deviation
Student1	13	65	65	100,0	2	5,3	1,01
Student2	13	33	65	50,76	1	2,6	,77
Student3	13	35	65	53,84	1	2,6	,77
Student4	13	47	65	72,30	1	2,6	,63
Student5	13	59	65	90,76	3	7,9	,44
Student6	13	48	65	73,84	3	7,9	,49
Student7	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	,00
Student8	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	,00
Student9	13	44	65	67,69	2	5,3	,44
Student10	13	48	65	73,84	3	7,9	,55
Student11	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	,66
Student12	13	65	65	100,0	2	5,3	1,12
Student13	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	,63
Student14	13	58	65	89,23	2	5,3	,48
Student15	13	60	65	92,30	1	2,6	,44
Student16	13	56	65	86,15	3	7,9	,69
Student17	13	25	65	38,46	1	2,6	,69
Student18	13	59	65	90,76	3	7,9	1,12
Student19	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	,28
Student20	13	62	65	95,38	3	7,9	1,39
Student21	13	62	65	95,38	3	7,9	,83
Student22	13	56	65	86,15	3	7,9	,51
Student23	13	55	65	84,61	1	2,6	1,01
Student24	13	48	65	73,84	3	7,9	,28
Student25	13	44	65	67,69	2	5,3	,88
Student26	13	64	65	98,46	2	5,3	,44
Student27	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	1,12
Student28	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	,65
Student29	13	41	65	63,07	1	2,6	,77
Student30	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	1,75
Student31	13	39	65	60,00	1	2,6	,51
Student32	13	58	65	89,23	2	5,3	,52
Student33	13	50	65	76,92	1	2,6	,48
Student34	13	56	65	86,15	3	7,9	,88
Student35	13	62	65	95,38	3	7,9	,78
Student36	13	64	65	98,46	2	5,3	,44
Student37	13	59	65	90,76	3	7,9	,75
Student38	13	61	65	93,84	9	23,7	1,85
Total (38)	13	2071 54,5	65	3186,154 83,84	38	100	27,05

Table 4.33 above indicates the prospective EFL teachers' profiles in relation to the "European Profiling Grid" with respect to the supervisors of İDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" course. This table shows the number of the items included in the

research, minimum and maximum scores taken from the scale, the mean values of scores for each student, the frequency of each student's profile and its percentage, and finally the standard deviation of the data. Thus, the prospective EFL teachers' teaching profiles differ from each other widely as paid attention to the frequencies of levels. Among the general scores taken from the EPG scale, 100.00, 98.46, 89.23, 67.69 are repeated for twice ($f=2$); 95.38, 90.76, 86.15, 73.84 are repeated for three times ($f=3$); 93.84 is repeated for nine times ($f=9$) but the other scores exist only once for each student ($f=1$), which also means that the data are distributed very successfully and meaningfully. Focusing on each student's profile, it is clearly seen that the scores of prospective teachers' profiles differ from 38.46 to 100.0. Seen that this research includes 38 prospective teacher participants, the competency levels of prospective teachers differ very much from each other. Although huge differences occur between the prospective teachers, the general mean score of prospective teachers' profile levels is calculated as 83.84, which requires the needs of average level of competency.

Tables from 4.34 to 4.37 present the each section's of "European Profiling Grid" results which refer to the prospective teachers' teaching profiles with respect to the supervisors of İDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" course.

Table 4.34.: EPG Results of “Training and Qualification” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course

Section/Sub-Sections	Training and Qualifications	Language Proficiency	Education and Training	Assessed Teaching	Teaching Experience
N of Item/Phase	4	6	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	100	100	100	100	100
Student 2	20	40	40	0	0
Student 3	20	40	40	0	0
Student 4	70	60	80	80	60
Student 5	75	80	100	100	20
Student 6	60	60	80	80	20
Student 7	80	100	100	100	20
Student 8	80	100	100	100	20
Student 9	20	40	40	0	0
Student 10	65	80	80	80	20
Student 11	80	100	100	100	20
Student 12	100	100	100	100	100
Student 13	80	100	100	100	20
Student 14	75	80	100	100	20
Student 15	75	80	100	100	20
Student 16	70	80	100	80	20
Student 17	20	40	40	0	0
Student 18	75	80	100	100	20
Student 19	80	100	100	100	20
Student 20	85	100	100	100	40
Student 21	85	100	100	100	40
Student 22	80	80	100	100	40
Student 23	75	80	100	80	40
Student 24	65	80	80	80	20
Student 25	20	40	40	0	0
Student 26	95	100	100	100	80
Student 27	80	100	100	100	20
Student 28	80	100	100	100	20
Student 29	20	40	40	0	0
Student 30	85	100	100	100	40
Student 31	20	40	40	0	0
Student 32	75	80	100	100	20
Student 33	70	100	80	80	20
Student 34	80	80	100	100	40
Student 35	85	80	100	100	60
Student 36	100	100	100	100	100
Student 37	85	80	100	100	60
Student 38	80	100	100	100	20
Total (38)	68,68	80	86,31	77,89	30,52

Scanning all the tables in detail, it is clearly seen that in Table 4.34 the teaching profiles of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “training and qualification” section are explained and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 68.68%. In terms of the sub-sections, the profile level of prospective teachers for “language proficiency” is found as 80%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “education and training” sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 80%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “assessed teaching” sub-section is 77.89% and “teaching experience” sub-section is 30.52%.

Table 4.35.: EPG Results of “Key Teaching Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course

Section/Sub-Sections	Key Teaching Competences	Methodology: Knowledge and Skills	Assessment	Lesson and Course Planning	Interaction, Management and Monitoring
N of Item/Phase	4	6	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	100	100	100	100	100
Student 2	70	80	60	80	60
Student 3	75	80	60	80	80
Student 4	70	60	80	60	80
Student 5	95	100	80	100	100
Student 6	80	80	80	80	80
Student 7	100	100	100	100	100
Student 8	100	100	100	100	100
Student 9	80	80	60	100	80
Student 10	85	100	80	80	80
Student 11	100	100	100	100	100
Student 12	100	100	100	100	100
Student 13	100	100	100	100	100
Student 14	95	100	80	100	100
Student 15	100	100	100	100	100
Student 16	95	100	100	100	80
Student 17	35	60	20	60	0
Student 18	100	100	100	100	100
Student 19	100	100	100	100	100
Student 20	100	100	100	100	100
Student 21	100	100	100	100	100
Student 22	85	100	80	80	80
Student 23	85	100	80	80	80
Student 24	75	80	80	60	80
Student 25	90	100	60	100	100
Student 26	100	100	100	100	100
Student 27	100	100	100	100	100
Student 28	100	100	100	100	100
Student 29	80	80	60	100	80
Student 30	95	100	100	100	80
Student 31	80	100	60	80	80
Student 32	95	100	100	80	100
Student 33	65	80	60	60	60
Student 34	85	100	80	80	80
Student 35	100	100	100	100	100
Student 36	95	100	80	100	100
Student 37	95	100	100	80	100
Student 38	100	100	100	100	100
Total (38)	89,60	94,21	85,26	90,52	88,42

Table 4.35 informs the detail profile levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “key teaching competences” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 89.60%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “methodology: knowledge and skills” sub-section are explained and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 94.21%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “assessment” sub-section is 85.26%. While the total profile level for “lesson and course planning” sub-section is calculated as 90.52, for “interaction, management and monitoring” sub-section the general profile is found as 88.42%.

Table 4.36.: EPG Results of “Enabling Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course

Section/Sub-Sections	Enabling Competences	Intercultural Competence	Language Awareness	Digital Media
N of Item/Phase	3	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%
Student 1	100	100	100	100
Student 2	60	60	60	60
Student 3	67	60	80	60
Student 4	67	60	60	80
Student 5	100	100	100	100
Student 6	80	80	80	80
Student 7	100	100	100	100
Student 8	100	100	100	100
Student 9	93	100	100	80
Student 10	67	40	80	80
Student 11	100	100	100	100
Student 12	100	100	100	100
Student 13	100	100	100	100
Student 14	93	80	100	100
Student 15	100	100	100	100
Student 16	87	80	80	100
Student 17	47	60	40	40
Student 18	93	80	100	100
Student 19	100	100	100	100
Student 20	100	100	100	100
Student 21	100	100	100	100
Student 22	87	80	80	100
Student 23	87	80	80	100
Student 24	80	60	80	100
Student 25	93	100	100	80
Student 26	100	100	100	100
Student 27	100	100	100	100
Student 28	100	100	100	100
Student 29	73	80	80	60
Student 30	100	100	100	100
Student 31	73	80	60	80
Student 32	93	80	100	100
Student 33	100	100	100	100
Student 34	87	80	80	100
Student 35	100	100	100	100
Student 36	100	100	100	100
Student 37	87	80	80	100
Student 38	100	100	100	100
Total (38)	89,84	87,36	90	92,10

Table 4.36 presents the detail profile levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “enabling competences” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 89.84%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “intercultural competence” sub-section are given and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 87.36%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “language awareness” sub-section is 90% while the total profile level for “digital media” sub-section is calculated as 92.10%.

Table 4.37.: EPG Results of “Professionalism” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course

Section/Sub-Sections	Professionalism	Professional Conduct	Administration
N of Item/Phase	2	6	6
Participant	%	%	%
Student 1	100	100	100
Student 2	60	60	60
Student 3	60	60	60
Student 4	90	100	80
Student 5	100	100	100
Student 6	80	80	80
Student 7	100	100	100
Student 8	100	100	100
Student 9	100	100	100
Student 10	80	80	80
Student 11	100	100	100
Student 12	100	100	100
Student 13	100	100	100
Student 14	100	100	100
Student 15	100	100	100
Student 16	100	100	100
Student 17	70	60	80
Student 18	100	100	100
Student 19	100	100	100
Student 20	100	100	100
Student 21	100	100	100
Student 22	100	100	100
Student 23	100	100	100
Student 24	80	80	80
Student 25	80	80	80
Student 26	100	100	100
Student 27	100	100	100
Student 28	100	100	100
Student 29	100	100	100
Student 30	100	100	100
Student 31	80	80	80
Student 32	100	100	100
Student 33	80	80	80
Student 34	100	100	100
Student 35	100	100	100
Student 36	100	100	100
Student 37	100	100	100
Student 38	100	100	100
Total (38)	93,68	93,68	93,68

Table 4.37 shows the detail profile levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “professionalism” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 93.68%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “professional conduct” sub-section are resented and the mean sum of the values indicate that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 93.68%. Furthermore, in this table the total profile mean value of “administration” sub-section is calculated as 90.68%.

Table 4.38.: One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the Supervisors of İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” Course

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
TRAINING and QUALIFICATIONS	38	68,68	25,03	37	16,91	,000
Language Proficiency	38	80,00	22,30		29,54	,000
Education&Training	38	86,31	23,29		22,21	,000
Assessed Teaching	38	77,89	38,28		21,64	,000
Teaching Experience	38	30,52	27,79		13,88	,000
KEY TEACHING COMPETENCES	38	89,60	13,91		39,68	,000
Methodology: Knowledge&Skills	38	94,21	11,30		32,05	,000
Assessment	38	85,26	18,99		22,92	,000
Lesson and Course Planning	38	90,52	13,74		36,89	,000
Interaction,Management&Monitoring	38	88,42	18,96		27,39	,000
ENABLING COMPETENCES	38	89,84	13,85		39,97	,000
Intercultural Competence	38	87,36	16,38		21,78	,000
Language Awareness	38	90,00	15,24		31,70	,000
Digital Media	38	92,10	15,09		20,80	,000
PROFESSIONALISM	38	93,68	11,72		49,26	,000
Professional Conduct	38	93,68	12,39		26,90	,000
Administration	38	93,68	11,48		24,06	,000

In Table 4.38 One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the Supervisors of İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” are presented in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 6. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section and sub-section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections and sub-sections of “European Profiling Grid” is significant, $t(37)= 16.91$ for training and qualifications, 29.54 for language proficiency, 22.21 for education and training, 21.64 for assessed teaching, 13.88 for teaching experience, 39.68 for key teaching competences, 32.05 for methodology: knowledge and skills, 22.92 for assessment, 36.38 for lesson and course planning, 27.39 for interaction, management and monitoring, 39.93 for

enabling competences, 21.78 for intercultural competence, 31.70 for language awareness, 20.80 for digital media, 49.26 for professionalism, 26.90 for professional conduct, 24.06 for administration respectively, $p < .01$. The mean values are calculated sequentially 68.68 for training and qualifications, 80.00 for language proficiency, 86.31 for education and training, 77.89 for assessed teaching, 30.52 for teaching experience, 89.60 for key teaching competences, 94.21 for methodology: knowledge and skills, 85.26 for assessment, 90.52 for lesson and course planning, 88.42 for interaction, management and monitoring, 87.36 for intercultural competence, 90.00 for language awareness, 92.10 for digital media, 93.68 for professionalism, 93.68 for professional conduct, 93.68 for administration. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers teaching profile level are very low especially in the "training and qualification" section and "teaching experience" sub-section in EPG which makes strong reference to the importance of this research again.

In Figure 4.5 the Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for "Practice Teaching" course below summarizes the general profile levels of sections and sub-sections of 'European Profiling Grid'. This figure also clarifies the meaningful difference between sections and sub-sections of EPG applied for "Practice Teaching" course by the supervisors who are responsible for this course.




Figure 4.5.: The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to Course Supervisors

Table 4.39.: Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the “Practice Teaching” Course Supervisors

Supervisors	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>sd</i>	χ^2	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Difference</i>
A	21	23,53	2	17,09	.000	C-A, C-B, B-A
B	10	21,90				
C	7	4,00				

In this dissertation, Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples was used a non-parametric method for comparing two or more samples that are independent, and that may be different sample sizes. Table 4.39 reports Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the “Practice Teaching” Course Supervisors and indicates that the teaching profiles of prospective teachers differ meaningfully from each other in terms of the supervisors responsible for the “Practice Teaching” course, χ^2 ($sd=2$, $n=38$) =17,09 $p<.05$. According to this finding, it is clarified that each supervisor had different effects on defining the

teaching profiles of prospective teachers. Paid attention to the mean ranks, it is clearly seen that the most successful teaching profile levels of prospective teachers belong to the supervisor A's group.

Table 4.40.: The Prospective Teachers' Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid with Respect to the School Mentors of İDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" Course

Participant s	N of Items N	Minimum Min.	Maximum	Mean Max.	Frequency f	Percen t	Std. Deviation
Student1	13	58	65	89,23	1	2,6	,51
Student2	13	54	65	83,08	2	5,3	,37
Student3	13	50	65	76,92	1	2,6	,37
Student4	13	42	65	64,62	1	2,6	,59
Student5	13	47	65	72,31	1	2,6	,77
Student6	13	8	65	12,31	1	2,6	1,7
Student7	13	51	65	78,46	1	2,6	,68
Student8	13	37	65	56,92	5	13,2	1,0
Student9	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student10	13	7	65	10,77	1	2,6	1,6
Student11	13	31	65	47,69	1	2,6	,50
Student12	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student13	13	45	65	69,23	1	2,6	,86
Student14	13	46	65	70,77	2	5,3	,87
Student15	13	37	65	56,92	5	13,2	1,0
Student16	13	46	65	70,77	2	5,3	,27
Student17	13	32	65	49,23	1	2,6	,51
Student18	13	37	65	56,92	5	13,2	1,0
Student19	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student20	13	26	65	40,00	2	5,3	1,7
Student21	13	63	65	96,92	1	2,6	,37
Student22	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student23	13	39	65	60,00	1	2,6	,57
Student24	13	26	65	40,00	2	5,3	1,7
Student25	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student26	13	33	65	50,77	1	2,6	1,2
Student27	13	37	65	56,92	5	13,2	1,0
Student28	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student29	13	54	65	83,08	2	5,3	,37
Student30	13	40	65	61,54	3	7,9	,49
Student31	13	49	65	75,38	1	2,6	,43
Student32	13	37	65	56,92	5	13,2	1,0
Student33	13	35	65	53,85	1	2,6	1,1
Student34	13	40	65	61,54	3	7,9	,49
Student35	13	52	65	80,00	7	18,4	,00
Student36	13	53	65	81,54	1	2,6	,75
Student37	13	40	65	61,54	3	7,9	,75
Student38	13	36	65	55,38	1	2,6	,43
Total (38)	13	1600	65	2461,54	38	100	24, 95
		42,10		64,78			

Table 4.40 above indicates the prospective EFL teachers' profiles in relation to the "European Profiling Grid" with respect to the school mentors of İDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" course. This table shows the number of the items included in the

research, minimum and maximum scores taken from the scale, the mean values of scores for each student, the frequency of each student's profile and its percentage, and finally the standard deviation of the data. Thus, the prospective EFL teachers' teaching profiles differ from each other widely as paid attention to the frequencies of levels. Among the general scores taken from the EPG scale, 80.00 are repeated for seven times ($f=7$), 56,92 ,s repeated for 5 times ($f=5$), 61.54 is repeated for three times ($f=3$), 83,08, 70.77 and 40.00 are repeated for twice ($f=2$) but the other scores exist only once for each student ($f=1$), which also means that the data are distributed very successfully and meaningfully. Focusing on each student's profile, it is clearly seen that the scores of prospective teachers' profiles differ from 10.77 to 96.92. Seen that this research includes 38 prospective teacher participants, the competency levels of prospective teachers differ very much from each other. Although huge differences occur between the prospective teachers, the general mean score of prospective teachers' profile levels is calculated as 64.78, which reflects the prospective teachers' deficiencies in teaching competency by the school mentors point of view.

Tables from 4.41 to 4.44 present the each section's of "European Profiling Grid" results which refer to the prospective teachers' teaching profiles with respect to the school mentors of IDÖ 478 "Practice Teaching" course.

Table 4.41.: EPG Results of “Training and Qualification” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors

Section/Sub-Sections	Training and Qualifications	Language Proficiency	Education and Training	Assessed Teaching	Teaching Experience
N of Item/Phase	4	6	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	80	80	95	80	100
Student 2	80	80	80	80	80
Student 3	80	80	75	80	60
Student 4	55	40	70	60	60
Student 5	80	80	85	80	80
Student 6	5	0	5	20	0
Student 7	90	80	100	100	100
Student 8	40	0	60	60	60
Student 9	80	80	80	80	80
Student 10	5	0	5	20	0
Student 11	55	40	45	40	40
Student 12	80	80	80	80	80
Student 13	75	80	85	80	80
Student 14	85	80	80	80	60
Student 15	40	0	60	60	60
Student 16	75	60	75	80	80
Student 17	60	60	40	40	40
Student 18	40	0	60	60	60
Student 19	80	80	80	80	80
Student 20	5	0	55	40	20
Student 21	100	100	95	100	100
Student 22	80	80	80	80	80
Student 23	55	40	65	60	60
Student 24	5	0	55	40	20
Student 25	80	80	80	80	80
Student 26	25	40	65	60	40
Student 27	40	0	60	60	60
Student 28	80	80	80	80	80
Student 29	80	80	90	80	80
Student 30	55	40	65	60	60
Student 31	80	80	75	80	80
Student 32	40	0	60	60	60
Student 33	50	40	65	60	60
Student 34	55	40	65	60	60
Student 35	80	80	80	80	80
Student 36	70	40	90	80	80
Student 37	55	40	70	60	60
Student 38	55	40	60	60	60
Total (38)	59,86	50,00	68,81	66,84	63,68

Scanning all the tables in detail, it is clearly seen that in Table 4.41 the teaching profiles of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “training and qualification” section are clarified and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 59.86%. In terms of the sub-sections, the profile level of prospective teachers for “language proficiency” is found as 50%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “education and training” sub-section are given and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 68.81%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “assessed teaching” sub-section is 66.84% and “teaching experience” sub-section is 63.68%.

Table 4.42.: EPG Results of “Key Teaching Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors

Section/Sub-Sections	Key Teaching Competences	Methodology: Knowledge and Skills	Assessment	Lesson and Course Planning	Interaction, Management and Monitoring
N of Item/Phase	4	6	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	95	100	100	87	80
Student 2	80	80	80	93	80
Student 3	75	80	80	80	80
Student 4	70	80	80	67	60
Student 5	85	100	80	93	100
Student 6	5	0	0	13	0
Student 7	100	100	100	87	80
Student 8	60	60	60	67	60
Student 9	80	80	80	80	80
Student 10	5	0	0	13	0
Student 11	45	40	60	47	40
Student 12	80	80	80	80	80
Student 13	85	100	80	87	80
Student 14	80	100	80	87	100
Student 15	60	60	60	67	60
Student 16	75	80	60	67	60
Student 17	40	40	40	40	40
Student 18	60	60	60	67	60
Student 19	80	80	80	80	80
Student 20	55	80	80	53	40
Student 21	95	100	80	100	100
Student 22	80	80	80	80	80
Student 23	65	80	60	60	40
Student 24	55	80	80	53	40
Student 25	80	80	80	80	80
Student 26	65	80	80	60	60
Student 27	60	60	60	67	60
Student 28	80	80	80	80	80
Student 29	90	100	100	80	80
Student 30	65	80	60	67	60
Student 31	75	80	60	67	60
Student 32	60	60	60	67	60
Student 33	65	60	80	73	60
Student 34	65	80	60	67	60
Student 35	80	80	80	80	80
Student 36	90	100	100	87	80
Student 37	70	100	60	60	40
Student 38	60	60	60	60	60
Total (38)	68,81	74,73	70,00	69,55	64,21

Table 4.42 gives the detail profile levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “key teaching competences” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 68.81%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “methodology: knowledge and skills” sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 73.73%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “assessment” sub-section is 70%. While the total profile level for “lesson and course planning” sub-section is calculated as 69.55, for “interaction, management and monitoring” sub-section the general profile is found as 64.21%.

Table 4.43.: EPG Results of “Enabling Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors

Section/Sub-Sections	Enabling Competences	Intercultural Competence	Language Awareness	Digital Media
N of Item/Phase	3	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%
Student 1	87	80	100	100
Student 2	93	100	100	80
Student 3	80	80	80	70
Student 4	67	60	80	70
Student 5	93	80	100	0
Student 6	13	0	40	40
Student 7	87	80	100	0
Student 8	67	60	80	70
Student 9	80	80	80	80
Student 10	13	0	40	30
Student 11	47	60	40	40
Student 12	80	80	80	80
Student 13	87	80	100	0
Student 14	87	80	80	0
Student 15	67	60	80	70
Student 16	67	60	80	60
Student 17	40	40	40	60
Student 18	67	60	80	70
Student 19	80	80	80	80
Student 20	53	40	80	60
Student 21	100	100	100	90
Student 22	80	80	80	80
Student 23	60	60	80	60
Student 24	53	40	80	60
Student 25	80	80	80	80
Student 26	60	40	80	60
Student 27	67	60	80	70
Student 28	80	80	80	80
Student 29	80	80	80	80
Student 30	67	60	80	60
Student 31	67	60	80	80
Student 32	67	60	80	70
Student 33	73	80	80	10
Student 34	67	60	80	60
Student 35	80	80	80	80
Student 36	87	80	100	80
Student 37	60	60	80	60
Student 38	60	60	60	40
Total (38)	59,55	65,26	78,94	59,47

Table 4.43 shows the detail profile levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “enabling competences” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 59.55%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “intercultural competence” sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 62.26%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “language awareness” sub-section is 78.94% while the total profile level for “digital media” sub-section is calculated as 59.47%.

Table 4.44.: EPG Results of “Professionalism” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the School Mentors

Section/Sub-Sections	Professionalism	Professional Conduct	Administration
N of Item/Phase	2	6	6
Participant	%	%	%
Student 1	100	100	100
Student 2	80	80	80
Student 3	70	60	80
Student 4	70	80	60
Student 5	0	0	0
Student 6	40	40	40
Student 7	0	0	0
Student 8	70	60	80
Student 9	80	80	80
Student 10	30	20	40
Student 11	40	40	40
Student 12	80	80	80
Student 13	0	0	0
Student 14	0	0	0
Student 15	70	60	80
Student 16	60	60	60
Student 17	60	60	60
Student 18	70	60	80
Student 19	80	80	80
Student 20	60	60	60
Student 21	90	100	80
Student 22	80	80	80
Student 23	60	60	60
Student 24	60	60	60
Student 25	80	80	80
Student 26	60	60	60
Student 27	70	60	80
Student 28	80	80	80
Student 29	80	80	80
Student 30	60	60	60
Student 31	80	80	80
Student 32	70	60	80
Student 33	10	20	0
Student 34	60	60	60
Student 35	80	80	80
Student 36	80	80	80
Student 37	60	60	60
Student 38	40	40	40
Total (38)	59,47	58,42	60,52

Table 4.44 conveys the detail profile levels of prospective teachers during İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” for “professionalism” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 59.47%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “professional conduct” sub-section are shown and the mean sum of the values indicate that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 58.42%. Furthermore, in this table the total profile mean value of “administration” sub-section is calculated as 60.52%.

Table 4.45.: One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the School Mentors of İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” Course

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
TRAINING and QUALIFICATIONS	38	59,87	25,72	37	14,35	,000
Language Proficiency	38	50,00	33,13		9,31	,000
Education&Training	38	68,82	20,45		20,75	,000
Assessed Teaching	38	66,84	18,76		21,96	,000
Teaching Experience	38	63,68	24,10		16,29	,000
KEY TEACHING COMPETENCES	38	68,82	20,45		20,75	,000
Methodology: Knowledge&Skills	38	74,74	24,02		19,18	,000
Assessment	38	70,00	21,69		19,90	,000
Lesson and Course Planning	38	69,55	18,96		22,62	,000
Interaction,Management&Monitoring	38	64,21	22,85		17,32	,000
ENABLING COMPETENCES	38	69,55	18,96		22,62	,000
Intercultural Competence	38	65,26	21,65		18,58	,000
Language Awareness	38	78,95	16,07		30,28	,000
Digital Media	38	59,47	26,81		13,68	,000
PROFESSIONALISM	38	59,47	26,81		13,68	,000
Professional Conduct	38	58,42	26,87		13,41	,000
Administration	38	60,53	27,70		13,47	,000

Table 4.45 reports One-Sample T-Test Results which is a statistical procedure often performed for testing the mean value of a distribution. One-sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the School Mentors of İDÖ 478 “Practice Teaching” is presented in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 6. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section and sub-section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections and sub-sections of “European Profiling Grid” is significant, $t(37)= 14.35$ for training and qualifications, 9.31 for language proficiency , 20.75 for education and training , 21.96 for assessed teaching, 16.29 for teaching experience , 20.75 for key teaching competences, 19.18 for methodology: knowledge and skills, 19.90

for assessment, 22.62 for lesson and course planning, 17.32 for interaction, management and monitoring, 22.62 for enabling competences, 18.58 for intercultural competence, 30.28 for language awareness, 13.68 for digital media, 13.68 for professionalism, 13.41 for professional conduct and 13.41 for administration, $p < .01$. The mean values are calculated sequentially 59.87 for training and qualifications, 50.00 for language proficiency, 68.82 for education and training, 66.84 for assessed teaching, 63.68 for teaching experience, 68.82 for key teaching competences, 74.74 for methodology: knowledge and skills, 70.00 for assessment, 69.55 for lesson and course planning, 64.21 for interaction, management and monitoring, 69.55 for enabling competences, 65.26 for intercultural competence, 78.95 for language awareness, 59.47 for digital media, 59.47 for professionalism, 58.42 for professional conduct, 60.53 for administration. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers teaching profile level are very low especially in the “training and qualification” and “professionalism” sections with their sub-sections in EPG which emphasize the importance of Practice Teaching and makes strong reference to the importance of this research again.

Figure 4.6 shows the Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” course below and summarizes the general profile levels of sections and sub-sections of “European Profiling Grid”. This table also clarifies the meaningful difference between sections and sub-sections of EPG applied for “Practice Teaching” course by the school mentors who are responsible for the Practice Teaching course of prospective teachers at schools.




Figure 4.6.: The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to School Mentors

Table 4.46.: Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the “Practice Teaching” Course Mentors

Mentors	N	Mean Rank	sd	X^2	p	Significant Difference
A	5	3,40	11	21,01	.033	L-K, L-J, L-I, L-H, L-G, L-F, L-E, L-D, L-C, L-B, L-A,
B	5	12,00				K-J, K-I, K-H, K-G, K-F, K-E, K-D, K-C, K-B, K-A,
C	1	15,00				J-I, J-H, J-G, J-F, J-E, J-D, J-C, J, B, J-A,
D	4	18,50				I-H, I-G, I-F, I-E, I-D, I-C, I-B, I-A,
E	5	20,80				H-G, H-F, H-E, H-D, H-C, H-B, H-A
F	1	21,50				G-F, G-E, G-D, G-C, G-B, G-A,
G	4	22,63				F-E, F-D, F-C, F-B, F-A,
H	5	25,10				E-D, E-C, E-B, E-A,
I	3	27,63				D- C, D-B, D-A,
J	1	30,00				C-B, C-A, B-A
K	2	30,00				
L	2	30,25				

In Table 4.46 the Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples results were presented. This non-parametric method was used in order to compare 12 different independent samples that are also different in size consisting of the mentors of prospective teachers. As it is seen in Table 4.46, Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the “Practice Teaching” Course Mentors, it is indicated that the teaching profiles of prospective teachers differ meaningfully from each other in terms of the mentors responsible for the “Practice Teaching” course, χ^2 (sd=11, n=38) =21,01 $p<.05$. According to this finding, it is clarified that each mentors had different effects on defining the teaching profiles of prospective teachers. Paid attention to the mean ranks, it is clearly seen that teaching profile levels of prospective teachers range sequentially as L, K, J, I, H, G, F, E, D, C, B and A from the most to the least successful group.

Table 4.47.: The Prospective Teachers' Profiles in Relation to the European Profiling Grid with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors

Participants	N of Items N	Minimum Min.	Maximum	Mean Max.	Frequency f	Percent %	Std. Deviation
Student1	13	43	65	66,15	3	7,9	,48
Student2	13	42	65	64,62	3	7,9	,44
Student3	13	43	65	66,15	3	7,9	,48
Student4	13	29	65	44,62	1	2,6	,44
Student5	13	49	65	75,38	1	2,6	,73
Student6	13	51	65	78,46	1	2,6	,28
Student7	13	44	65	67,69	4	10,5	,51
Student8	13	42	65	64,62	3	7,9	,44
Student9	13	46	65	70,77	1	2,6	,52
Student10	13	42	65	64,62	3	7,9	,44
Student11	13	61	65	93,85	1	2,6	,48
Student12	13	41	65	63,08	6	15,8	,38
Student13	13	62	65	95,38	2	5,3	,44
Student14	13	38	65	58,46	1	2,6	,49
Student15	13	59	65	90,77	1	2,6	,52
Student16	13	60	65	92,31	2	5,3	,51
Student17	13	34	65	52,31	1	2,6	,51
Student18	13	36	65	55,38	2	5,3	,44
Student19	13	43	65	66,15	3	7,9	,63
Student20	13	41	65	63,08	6	15,8	,38
Student21	13	40	65	61,54	3	7,9	,49
Student22	13	55	65	84,62	7	18,4	,44
Student23	13	48	65	73,85	1	2,6	,85
Student24	13	60	65	92,31	2	5,3	,51
Student25	13	45	65	69,23	1	2,6	,66
Student26	13	44	65	67,69	4	10,4	,51
Student27	13	39	65	60,00	1	2,6	,58
Student28	13	41	65	63,08	6	15,8	,55
Student29	13	62	65	95,38	2	5,3	,44
Student30	13	58	65	89,23	1	2,6	,66
Student31	13	40	65	61,54	3	7,9	,28
Student32	13	44	65	67,69	6	15,8	,51
Student33	13	55	65	84,62	1	2,6	,44
Student34	13	41	65	63,08	6	15,8	,38
Student35	13	41	65	63,08	6	15,8	,38
Student36	13	44	65	67,69	4	10,5	,51
Student37	13	41	65	63,08	6	15,8	,38
Student38	13	40	65	61,54	3	7,9	,49
Total (38)	13	1739	65	2675,38	38	100	18,6
		45,76		70,40			

Table 4.47 above indicates the prospective EFL teachers' profiles in relation to the "European Profiling Grid" with respect to the Course registration advisors . This table shows the number of the items included in the research, minimum and

maximum scores taken from the scale, the mean values of scores for each student, the frequency of each student's profile and its percentage, and finally the standard deviation of the data. Thus, the prospective EFL teachers' teaching profiles differ from each other widely as paid attention to the frequencies of levels. Among the general scores taken from the EPG scale, 63.08 are repeated for six times ($f=6$), 67,69 is repeated for four times ($f=4$), 61.54, 64.62 and 66.15 is repeated for three times ($f=3$), 84.62, 92.31 and 95.38 are repeated for two times ($f=2$), but the other scores exist only once for each student ($f=1$), which also means that the data are distributed very successfully and meaningfully. Focusing on each student's profile, it is clearly seen that the scores of prospective teachers' profiles differ from 46.62 to 95.38. Seen that this research includes 38 prospective teacher participants, the competency levels of prospective teachers differ very much from each other. Although huge differences occur between the prospective teachers, the general mean score of prospective teachers' profile levels is calculated as 70.40, which reflects the prospective teachers' deficiencies in teaching competency by the course registration advisors' point of views.

Tables from 4.48 to 4.51 present the each section's of "European Profiling Grid" results which refer to the prospective teachers' teaching profiles with respect to course registration advisors.

Table 4.48.: EPG Results of “Training and Qualification” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors

Section/Sub-Sections	Training and Qualifications	Language Proficiency	Education and Training	Assessed Teaching	Teaching Experience
N of Item/Phase	4	6	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	75	80	60	80	80
Student 2	70	60	60	80	80
Student 3	70	80	80	60	60
Student 4	40	40	40	40	40
Student 5	80	80	80	80	80
Student 6	80	80	80	80	80
Student 7	70	80	80	60	60
Student 8	65	80	60	60	60
Student 9	75	80	80	80	60
Student 10	65	80	60	60	60
Student 11	100	100	100	100	100
Student 12	60	60	60	60	60
Student 13	100	100	100	100	100
Student 14	60	80	60	60	40
Student 15	100	100	100	100	100
Student 16	100	100	100	100	100
Student 17	60	60	60	60	60
Student 18	60	60	60	60	60
Student 19	70	100	60	60	60
Student 20	60	60	60	60	60
Student 21	65	80	60	60	60
Student 22	80	80	80	80	80
Student 23	65	80	60	60	60
Student 24	100	100	100	100	100
Student 25	75	80	60	80	80
Student 26	65	80	60	60	60
Student 27	65	80	60	60	60
Student 28	65	80	60	60	60
Student 29	100	100	100	100	100
Student 30	85	100	80	80	80
Student 31	65	80	60	60	60
Student 32	65	80	60	60	60
Student 33	80	80	80	80	80
Student 34	65	80	60	60	60
Student 35	65	80	60	60	60
Student 36	70	80	60	60	80
Student 37	65	80	60	60	60
Student 38	65	60	60	60	80
Total (38)	72,76	80,00	70,00	70,52	70,52

Scanning all the tables in detail, it is clearly seen that in Table 4.48 the teaching profiles of prospective teachers for “training and qualification” section are given and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 72.76%. In terms of the sub-sections, the profile level of prospective teachers for “language proficiency” is found as 80%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “education and training” sub-section are indicated and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 70%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “assessed teaching” sub-section is 70.52% and “teaching experience” sub-section is 70.52%.

Table 4.49.: EPG Results of “Key Teaching Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors

Section/Sub-Sections	Key Teaching Competences	Methodology: Knowledge and Skills	Assessment	Lesson and Course Planning	Interaction, Management and Monitoring
N of Item/Phase	4	6	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%	%
Student 1	65	60	60	60	80
Student 2	60	60	60	60	60
Student 3	65	60	80	60	60
Student 4	45	60	40	40	40
Student 5	65	80	60	60	60
Student 6	80	80	80	80	80
Student 7	70	80	80	60	60
Student 8	70	80	80	60	60
Student 9	70	60	80	80	60
Student 10	60	60	60	60	60
Student 11	80	80	80	80	80
Student 12	65	80	60	60	60
Student 13	100	100	100	100	100
Student 14	55	60	60	40	60
Student 15	80	80	80	80	80
Student 16	100	100	100	100	100
Student 17	45	40	60	40	40
Student 18	55	40	60	60	60
Student 19	70	80	80	60	60
Student 20	65	80	60	60	60
Student 21	55	60	60	40	60
Student 22	80	80	80	80	80
Student 23	70	80	60	80	60
Student 24	100	100	100	100	100
Student 25	75	80	80	80	60
Student 26	80	80	80	80	80
Student 27	65	60	60	80	60
Student 28	65	80	60	60	60
Student 29	100	100	100	100	100
Student 30	95	100	100	100	80
Student 31	60	60	60	60	60
Student 32	70	80	80	60	60
Student 33	80	80	80	80	80
Student 34	65	60	60	80	60
Student 35	65	60	60	80	60
Student 36	65	60	80	60	60
Student 37	60	60	60	60	60
Student 38	65	60	60	80	60
Total (38)	70,52	72,63	72,10	70,00	67,36

Table 4.49 gives the detail profile levels of prospective teachers for “key teaching competences” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 70.52%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “methodology: knowledge and skills” sub-section are presented and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 72.63%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “assessment” sub-section is 72.10%. While the total profile level for “lesson and course planning” sub-section is calculated as 70, for “interaction, management and monitoring” sub-section the general profile is found as 67.36%.

Table 4.50.: EPG Results of “Enabling Competences” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors

Section/Sub-Sections	Enabling Competences	Intercultural Competence	Language Awareness	Digital Media
N of Item/Phase	3	6	6	6
Participant	%	%	%	%
Student 1	60	60	60	60
Student 2	67	80	60	60
Student 3	67	80	60	60
Student 4	53	60	40	60
Student 5	93	100	100	80
Student 6	80	80	80	80
Student 7	67	60	60	80
Student 8	60	60	60	60
Student 9	73	60	80	80
Student 10	73	60	80	80
Student 11	100	100	100	100
Student 12	67	80	60	60
Student 13	80	80	80	80
Student 14	60	60	60	60
Student 15	87	80	80	100
Student 16	80	80	80	80
Student 17	53	40	60	60
Student 18	53	40	60	60
Student 19	60	60	60	60
Student 20	67	60	60	80
Student 21	67	60	60	80
Student 22	100	100	100	100
Student 23	100	100	100	100
Student 24	80	80	80	80
Student 25	67	60	60	80
Student 26	60	60	60	60
Student 27	60	60	60	60
Student 28	67	60	60	80
Student 29	87	100	80	80
Student 30	100	100	100	100
Student 31	60	60	60	60
Student 32	73	80	80	60
Student 33	100	100	100	100
Student 34	60	60	60	60
Student 35	60	60	60	60
Student 36	73	60	80	80
Student 37	67	60	60	80
Student 38	60	60	60	60
Total (38)	72,13	71,05	71,05	74,21

Table 4.50 implies the detail profile levels of prospective teachers for “enabling competences” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 72.13%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “intercultural competence” sub-section are indicated and the mean sum of the values show that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 71.05%. Moreover, in this table the total profile mean value of “language awareness” sub-section is 71.05% while the total profile level for “digital media” sub-section is calculated as 74.21%.

Table 4.51.: EPG Results of “Professionalism” Section for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors

Section/Sub-Sections	Professionalism	Professional Conduct	Administration
N of Item/Phase	2	6	6
Participant	%	%	%
Student 1	60	60	60
Student 2	60	60	60
Student 3	60	60	60
Student 4	40	40	40
Student 5	60	60	60
Student 6	70	80	60
Student 7	60	60	60
Student 8	60	60	60
Student 9	60	60	60
Student 10	60	60	60
Student 11	100	100	100
Student 12	60	60	60
Student 13	100	100	100
Student 14	60	60	60
Student 15	100	100	100
Student 16	80	80	80
Student 17	50	40	60
Student 18	50	40	60
Student 19	60	60	60
Student 20	60	60	60
Student 21	60	60	60
Student 22	80	80	80
Student 23	60	60	60
Student 24	80	80	80
Student 25	50	60	40
Student 26	60	60	60
Student 27	40	40	40
Student 28	50	60	40
Student 29	90	80	100
Student 30	70	80	60
Student 31	60	60	60
Student 32	60	60	60
Student 33	80	80	80
Student 34	60	60	60
Student 35	60	60	60
Student 36	60	60	60
Student 37	60	60	60
Student 38	50	60	40
Total (38)	64,21	64,73	63,68

Table 4.51 presents the detail profile levels of prospective teachers for “professionalism” section and according to the mean sum of the values, the total profile mean value of this section is 64.21%. The profile levels of prospective teachers for “professional conduct” sub-section are shown and the mean sum of the values indicate that the total profile mean value of this sub-section is 64.73%. Furthermore, in this table the total profile mean value of “administration” sub-section is calculated as 63.68%.

Table 4.52.: One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors of Prospective Teachers

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
TRAINING and QUALIFICATIONS	38	72,76	14,27	37	31,43	,000
Language Proficiency	38	80,00	13,95		35,35	,000
Education&Training	38	70,00	15,94		27,07	,000
Assessed Teaching	38	70,53	15,93		27,29	,000
Teaching Experience	38	70,53	16,59		26,20	,000
KEY TEACHING COMPETENCES	38	70,53	14,18		30,66	,000
Methodology: Knowledge&Skills	38	72,63	15,71		28,49	,000
Assessment	38	72,11	15,10		29,45	,000
Lesson and Course Planning	38	70,00	17,24		25,03	,000
Interaction,Management&Monitoring	38	67,37	15,01		27,67	,000
ENABLING COMPETENCES	38	72,13	14,54		30,59	,000
Intercultural Competence	38	71,05	17,21		25,45	,000
Language Awareness	38	71,05	15,90		27,54	,000
Digital Media	38	74,21	14,64		31,26	,000
PROFESSIONALISM	38	64,21	14,82		26,71	,000
Professional Conduct	38	64,74	15,02		26,57	,000
Administration	38	63,68	16,01		24,52	,000

Table 4.52 indicates the results of One-Sample T-Test because it aims to test the mean value distribution of prospective teachers in terms of the course registration advisors. In addition, Table 4.52 One-Sample T-Test Results for EPG Sections with Respect to the Course Registration Advisors is presented in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 6. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section and sub-section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections and sub-sections of “European Profiling Grid” is significant, $t(37)= 14.27$ for training and qualifications, 13.95 for language proficiency, 15.94 for education and training, 15.93 for assessed teaching, 16.59 for teaching experience, 14.18 for key teaching competences, 15.71 for

methodology: knowledge and skills, 15.10 for assessment, 17.24 for lesson and course planning, 15.01 for interaction, management and monitoring, 14.54 for enabling competences, 17.21 for intercultural competence, 15.90 for language awareness, 14.64 for digital media, 14.82 for professionalism, 15.02 for professional conduct, 16.01 for administration, $p < .01$. The mean values are calculated sequentially 72.76 for training and qualifications, 80.00 for language proficiency, 70.00 for education and training, 70.53 for assessed teaching, 70.53 for teaching experience, 70.53 for key teaching competences, 72.63 for methodology: knowledge and skills, 72.11 for assessment, 70.00 for lesson and course planning, 67.37 for interaction, 72.13 for enabling competence, 71.05 for intercultural competence, 71.05 for language awareness, 74.21 for digital media, 64.21 for professionalism, 64.74 for professional conduct, 63.68 for administration. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers teaching profile levels are very low especially in the “professionalism” sections with their sub-sections in EPG and “interaction, management, monitoring” sub-section of “key teaching competences”, which emphasize the importance of professionalism and teaching competences of teacher education.

Figure 4.7 The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to Course Registration Advisors below summarizes the general profile levels of sections and sub-sections of “European Profiling Grid”. This table also clarifies the meaningful difference between sections and sub-sections of EPG applied for “Practice Teaching” course by the course registration advisors who are responsible for the prospective teachers during their education at the faculty.




Figure 4.7.: The Profile Levels of EPG Sections and Sub-sections for “Practice Teaching” Course with Respect to Course Registration Advisors

Table 4.53.: Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of the Course Registration Advisors

Advisors	N	Mean Rank	sd	X^2	p	Significant Difference
A	13	12,81	2	18,22	.000	C-B, C-A, B-A
B	18	18,39				
C	7	34,79				

Table 4.53 presents the Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples which intends to compare different independent samples of prospective teachers who are different in size in terms of course registration advisors. Table 4.53 Kruskal Wallis H Test for Independent Samples Results in Terms of Course Registration Advisors indicates that the teaching profiles of prospective teachers differ meaningfully from each other in terms of the mentors responsible for the “Practice Teaching” course, x^2 (sd=2, n=38) =18.22 p<.05. According to this finding, it is

clarified that each mentor had different effects on defining the teaching profiles of prospective teachers. Paid attention to the mean ranks, it is clearly seen that teaching profile levels of prospective teachers range sequentially as C, B and A from the most to the least successful group and it means that the most successful teaching profile levels of prospective teachers belongs to the class supervisor C's group.




Figure 4.8.: The Distribution of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors' Preferences while Filling in the EPG Scale

Figure 4.8 presents the distribution of mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors' preferences while filling in the EPG scale. According to the given statistics, though mentors use the "extremely not developed" label for 24 times, course supervisors and course registration advisors didn't use that label to define the competency levels of prospective teachers. Meanwhile, "not developed" label was preferred nearly the same by both mentors who chose this label 11 times and course supervisors for 13 times but the course registration advisors didn't use this label to define the competency levels of prospective teachers. The "less developed" label was used 53 times by mentors, 32 times by course supervisors but 25 times by course registration advisors. Furthermore, "developed" label was chosen 132 times by school mentors and 95 times by course supervisors while the same label was chosen 251 times by course registration advisors. The distribution of "very developed" are almost the same as

mentors chose it 216 times and course supervisors chose it 211 times. However, the course registration advisors chose it for 146 times. The “fully developed” label differs in number of preferences because mentors use it 54 times course registration advisors and course supervisors use it 71 and 132 times. Surprisingly, ‘no idea’ label is almost the same in number of preferences since the mentors chose it 16 times and course supervisors use it 11 times during the supervision of prospective teachers although it wasn’t preferred by course registration advisors .

Table 4.54.: Descriptive Statistics of ANOVA Results of Prospective Teachers’ EPG Levels in Terms of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors

EPG Supervision	N	\bar{X}	S
Course Supervisors	3	83,84	15,24
Course Registration Advisors	3	71,01	16,16
Mentors	12	64,37	15,91
Total	18	73,07	15,77

According to the descriptive statistics of ANOVA Results of Prospective Teachers’ EPG Levels in Terms of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors , it is clearly seen that the mean value of profiles differ with respect to the supervision applied by different people. In detail, profile levels of prospective teachers under the supervision of course supervisors are the most successful ones. The profile levels of prospective teachers under the supervision of course registration advisors place in the second row in terms of their mean value. Finally, the least successful profile levels of prospective teachers are placed under the supervision of mentors with their mean value. Specifically, it would be useful to pay attention that 38 prospective teachers are under the EPG supervision of 3 course supervisors, 3 course registration advisors and 12 mentors.

Table 4.55.: One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features of Prospective Teachers' EPG Levels in Terms of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
Between Subjects	9746,402	37	263,416	15,39	.000	2-1, 3-1
Measure	7444,498	2	3722,249			
Error	17897,407	74	241,857			
Total	35088,31	113	4227,522			

In this part of the analysis, One Way ANOVA was used as a parametric method which refers the normal distribution of the participants or the data about the participants to compare the independent samples consisting of EPG level scores of prospective teachers in terms of mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors. Thus, the prospective teachers EPG level scores filled by mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors were compared by this analysis. As for Table 4.55 One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features of Prospective Teachers' EPG Levels in Terms of Mentors, Course Supervisors and Course Registration Advisors , it is clearly seen that there are significance differences between the EPG levels of prospective teachers with respect to the different supervisions by mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors , $F(2, 74)= 15.39$, $p < .01$. EPG levels of prospective teachers by course supervisors ($\bar{X} = 83.84$) are higher than the supervision by the course registration advisors ($\bar{X} = 71.01$) and supervision by the mentors ($\bar{X} = 64.37$). Thus, the meaningful significance appears mostly between course supervisors and mentors in addition to the course supervisors and course registration advisors; moreover, there is no significant difference between the prospective teachers' profile levels under the supervision of mentors and course registration advisors. Thus, the EPG competency levels of prospective teachers filled by the mentors and course registration not differing significantly from each other means that in defining the competency levels of prospective teachers these group need to work in collaboration with the course supervisors of prospective teachers.

4.7. Findings and Discussion for Whether Prospective Teachers' EPOSTL Practices are Compatible with European Profiling Grid Filled by Mentors/Supervisors/Advisors

Research Question 7: *Are the prospective teachers' EPOSTL practices compatible with European Profiling Grid filled by mentors/supervisors/advisors?*

This research question intends to figure out whether EPOSTL and EPG scales work out in compatible with each other. The compatibility of the scales are examined in terms of the EPOSTL which was filled by the prospective teachers, EPG scale which was filled under the supervision of mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors of prospective teachers. Thus, this research question takes importance as for the data used for this analysis was gathered from four different groups and aims to reach meaningful results, which will be applicable for teacher education and in future as well.

Table 4.56.: Descriptive Statistics of ANOVA Results of How Compatible the EPOSTL Results Are with EPG Scale

Scales	N	\bar{X}	S
EPOSTL	38	88,55	9,07
EPG by Course Supervisors	3	83,84	15,24
EPG by Course Registration Advisors	3	71,01	16,16
EPG by Mentors	12	64,37	15,91
Total	56	307,77	56,38

According to the descriptive statistics of ANOVA Results of How Compatible the EPOSTL Results Are with EPG Scale, it is clearly seen that the mean values of profiles differ with respect to the supervision applied by different people. In detail, profile levels of prospective teachers seem more successful under the application of EPOSTL and the supervision of EPG scale by the course supervisors than the profile levels of prospective teachers under the supervision of EPG scale carried out by the course registration advisors and mentors. In particular, it would be useful to pay attention that 38 prospective teachers are under the scope of EPOSTL and EPG applications and their competency levels tried to be defined by different responsible people in this research.

Table 4.57.: One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features of How Compatible the EPOSTL Results Are with EPG Scale

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
Between Subjects Measure	8078,706	37	218,343	57,05	.000	1-4, 1-3, 2-4, 2-3
Error	11781,666	3	10911,982			
Total	22344,128	111	191,263			
	42204,5	151	11321,59			

One Way ANOVA was used as a parametric method here in order to find out whether these scales filled by prospective teachers, mentors, course supervisors or course registration advisors are compatible with each other or not. As for Table 4.57 One Way ANOVA Results for Repeated Features of How Compatible the EPOSTL Results Are with EPG Scale, it is clearly seen that there are significance differences between the EPG levels of prospective teachers with respect to the different supervisions by mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors , and EPOSTL competency levels $F(3, 111)= 57.05$, $p < .01$. EPOSTL competency levels of prospective teachers places at the most successful part in the table ($\bar{X} = 88.55$) The EPG levels of prospective teachers by course supervisors ($\bar{X} = 83.84$) are higher than the supervision by the course registration advisors ($\bar{X} = 71.01$) and supervision by the mentors ($\bar{X} = 64.37$). Thus, the meaningful significance appears mostly between EPOSTL and EPG scale applied by mentors, EPOSTL and EPG scale applied by course registration advisors in addition to the course supervisors and mentors and course supervisors and course registration advisors; moreover, there is no significant difference between the prospective teachers' profile levels under the application of EPOSTL competency and EPG levels carried out by course supervisors, which conveys the research to the place that the levels of these groups are compatible with each other. In addition, no significance appears between the EPG levels carried out by course registration advisors and mentors, which means that the competency levels of these groups are also compatible with each other. These findings call for urgent need of collaboration and in-service training for mentors and course registration advisors during the process of teacher education. Moreover, the

prospective teachers should be a part of candidacy process of teaching and collaborate with all the other stakeholders of teacher education.

4.8. Findings and Discussion for What the Ways of Enhancing the Practices and Implementation of EPOSTL in Hacettepe University English Language Teaching Program are and Making it Common for Teacher Education in ELT

Research Question 8: *What are the ways of enhancing the practices and implementation of EPOSTL in Hacettepe University English Language Teaching Program and making it common for teacher education in ELT?*

This research question intends to figure out how the prospective teachers used or would prefer to use EPOSTL or EPOSTL sections in their teacher education process. For this purpose, the prospective teachers are asked which sections of EPOSTL they would prefer to use before, while and after their Practice Teaching. The descriptive results of the prospective teachers' answers to this research question are reported in the table below.

Table 4.58.: Descriptive Results of How Prospective Teachers Would Prefer to Use the Sections of EPOSTL in Their Practice Teaching

Sections of EPOSTL		Personal Statement	Self-Assessment	Dossier	Total
Before	F	25	10	3	38
	%	65,8	26,3	7,9	100
While	F	5	30	3	38
	%	13,2	78,9	7,9	100
After	F	3	18	17	38
	%	7,9	47,4	44,7	100

The descriptive methods are used here for the Research Question 8 for giving a general figure about what preferences have the prospective teachers about how to and where to use the sections of EPOSTL in the teacher education process. Thus, Table 4.58 shows the Descriptive Results of How Prospective Teachers Would Prefer to Use the Sections of EPOSTL in Their Practice Teachings and describes

the use of the EPOSTL preferences of prospective teachers. According to the gathered data, 25 (65.8%) of prospective teachers prefer to use the EPOSTL's personal statement section before their Practice Teachings. While 10 (26.3%) and 3 (7.9%) of them prefer to use the self-assessment and dossier sections of EPOSTL before their teacher education. Moreover, 30 (78.9%) of prospective teachers prefer to use self-assessment section of the EPOSTL while their Practice Teachings, however; 5 (13,2%) and 3 (7,9%) of them prefer to use the personal statement and dossier sections of EPOSTL while their Practice Teachings. Finally, 18 (47.4%) and 17 (44.7%) of the prospective teachers prefer to use the self-assessment and dossier sections of the EPOSTL after their Practice Teachings, but 3 (7.9%) of them prefer to use the personal statement section after their Practice Teachings, which emphasize the importance of the use of EPOSTL in teacher education process and directs how to use the sections of EPOSTL according to the needs of prospective teachers during the teacher education.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of the study aims to reveal a summary of the findings of the study and recommendations for further research. Findings in the analysis of the gathered data will be summarized in this part of the study in order to shed light on the overall findings and reach conclusions. Finally, the recommendations based on the findings of the study and related to the study area of this research are emphasized for the researchers.

5.1. Conclusion

When the importance of teachers and the quality of education for societies are considered, the quality of teacher education gains high vitality as much as other important educational issues. For that reason, this study started with the general discussion on the importance of teacher education which is among very important factors as effective teacher preparation. However, the preparation process of teacher candidates is also debatable, since there are many options offered by various institutions for the ones who want to be a teacher. These options may be discussed as different teacher education alternatives and models for further studies. Nonetheless, this study does not aim to refer to this general teacher education policies. Instead, under the influence of different teacher education policies or studies, this research intends to reflect what can be done for better foreign language teacher education process in Turkey.

As in other countries, in Turkey there is also an emphasis on bringing up the effective teachers through effective teacher education programs which responds to the needs of today's world as well (Senemoğlu, 2011). Therefore, politicians, educators, and educational researchers should be in constant struggle to reform or to restructure the teacher education process for better and more qualified teacher training processes. These struggles are very necessary for the current century not only by Turkey but also by many other countries in the world. Within this respect, there have been some major developments and restructuring efforts in relation to the teacher education process in Turkey. Upon this, the reviews of literature for different related studies tell much about the issue of teacher education. Referring to most of them, the Council of Higher Education (CHE) directs most of the institutions in Turkey nowadays. This process started in 1982 when the duty of

teacher education process or the preparation of teachers was given to the universities. Since then, the council gathered for many times and took many important decisions about the teacher education process. One of the critical suggestions made by Ministry of Education (1982, p.204, as cited in Okçabol, et al., 2003) given below emphasizes still how the search for better teacher education carries importance in Turkey today especially in terms of the content of the programs, student selection, multi-dimensional development of teacher candidates, and teaching certificate procedures as well:

In any institution educating teachers, there should be certainly a teaching atmosphere and ambiance. Otherwise, it becomes similar to growing a cherry tree in the vase. Today, if these teacher education institutions are scattered to universities one by one, they are crushed and they disappear. In this case, the ones, who graduate from the other faculties' department and cannot find a job, will also be teachers with just a teaching certificate; and then teaching becomes no longer a profession.

At the European Union (EU) level, the cooperation on teacher education among member states have increased in recent years in the context of the increased political cooperation on education since the launch of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000. Especially language teacher education gets the most important part of the recent improvements and reconstruction changes in Europe. Among these tremendous advances, EPOSTL and EPG applications serve a vital importance in the process of language teacher education. Paying attention and examining these advances in detail, it seems that at first language teacher education should be taken into consideration as a unique part of teacher education as the other subject fields should be handled separately from each other. In addition, the process of language teacher education and the competencies the whole process underlines differ very much from the prescribed one in Turkey. Since the assessment of teacher candidates or the assessment of the prospective teachers by mentors or teacher trainers for all teacher education departments are the same. Thus, the prospective teachers are assessed or their Practice Teachings are observed very generally and as if they were teachers of the same subject field. Such as the prescribed scale by the CHE for the assessment of prospective teachers include totally four sections with their sub-sections named as subject field knowledge, subject field education, teaching and learning process, classroom management, evaluation and keeping records, other professional competences which consist of 46 items for teacher competences labeled in three likert type format, such as “has deficiencies”, “acceptable” and “well-trained”. When the scale for Practice

Teachings is compared with the European scales such as EPOSTL and EPG, it is observed that the language teacher education deserves to take a new breath into its place in teacher education process. For these reasons, this study intends to serve a small sample of new trend language teacher education applications with the help of these new instruments called as EPOSTL and EPG in the Turkey setting. More detailed and complicated than the CHE's scale, the applications of EPOSTL and EPG for English Language Teacher Education at Hacettepe University, Education Faculty the conclusions reached from the findings and mentioned below worth much consideration for the future of English Language Teacher Education in Turkey.

Starting with the findings and the results of the first research question which tries to find out the answer of what the competency levels of the prospective teachers are while taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses, it seems that the competency levels of prospective ELT teachers at Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education differ not only from each other but also the competency levels of teaching abilities change in terms of the courses taken in the fall and spring semester as well. Paying attention to the competency levels of the prospective teachers in the fall semester, the competency levels range between 53.84 to 98.46 which underlines the individual differences of prospective teachers at the teacher education level. Although the mean value of the prospective teachers is 75.48 in the fall semester for the "School Experience" course, keeping in mind that this EPOSTL application was carried out after the middle of the semester, the prospective teachers should take more practices in order to come nearer or decrease the individual differences in their teacher education process. The second application of the EPOSTL was carried out in the middle of the spring term and it is observed that the competency levels of prospective teachers differ from 62.76 to 99.07. However, the competency levels of prospective teachers and the mean value of 85.56 competency level are higher than the fall semester, the prospective teachers' competency levels change from each other again. From this point of view, the importance of "School Experience" and the effects of this course on competency levels of prospective teachers are irresistible. As the findings of the study emphasize the "School Experience" course serve as a prerequisite stage in teacher education process and gives a better way for "Practice

Teachings". As Wallace (1998, p. 89) states that, while there was a huge time allotted for the knowledge base for the teaching profession provided by the university professors or teacher trainers, nowadays the experiences of the teachers and pupils in the classroom are just as very important in the teaching and learning process. This should be a strong belief, with which we, as researchers, should be in complete agreement. Parallel to the findings for this research question, aside from the importance of the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses, the teacher education comes to the gate of "in harmony" stage. Since, as the teaching is a profession and the teachers are the agent of change, perhaps the most crucial task of teacher education should be applied in harmony that it will decrease the individual differences while they are carrying out their jobs. As Pathak (2012) proclaims that holistic perception through proper education provides also correct understanding of the human reality. In recent years, although all across the globe several attempts are being made towards evolving suitable models and methodologies, integrating the harmony in the teacher education gained necessity as the students of English language teachers deserves equal education process, which demands the harmony in the teaching competency levels of ELT prospective teachers.

The findings and the results of the second research question which tries to find out the answer to what sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' the prospective teachers need to develop show that the prospective teachers competency levels are lower in the context section than the other sections as the mean value is 76.33 while taking the "School Experience" course in the fall semester. Supporting that finding the sub-sections of context section's mean values are also lower than the other sections' sub-sections which announces the urgent need of support for prospective teachers to be more experienced for the context section of EPOSTL. Although the mean values of context section and sub-sections of this part are higher than the fall semester that is calculated as 82.19 during the Practice Teaching course in the spring term, it is observed that again the mean value of prospective teachers' competency level is lower than the other sections of EPOSTL. Thus, here the ELT prospective teachers are expected to have more knowledge about the related subjects of their own context. Here, context refers not only the classroom where prospective teachers are going to teach something but

also it means a kind of an abstract condition of their teaching which will underline the national and international requirements, and directs the way how they will teach in their classrooms. Because context competency for prospective teachers mean that they should have knowledge about the curriculum, aims and needs, the role of the language teacher and institutional resources and constrains. Moreover, the prospective teachers may be well prepared for their profession but if they don't know national requirements, the prescribed norms of teaching or the desired results of this long journey, they may fail and feel unsuccessful themselves since the ELT prospective teacher should know what to teach, under what conditions and also where to reach at the end of this process. As experienced the same situation in the faculty of education many years before, the prospective teachers need to know all the formal procedures and anticipated results of their own teaching. These underlying features of the context section deserve to pay attention through the process of teacher education since if the ELT prospective teachers do not have knowledge about all these prominent features of the context, they may get confused in the early days of their teaching process. Thus, during the teacher education process the importance of the context which is the professional part of ELT prospective teachers should be focused on heavily because the regulations and the real situations of our nation and the institution where the prospective teachers will work is as important as how to teach our pupils in the classrooms. As Wedell (2008) argues

If English teachers working to help learners achieve the outcomes of a particular EFL curriculum are to become 'qualified', it is necessary for those planning to support them to be clear about what knowledge and skills the curriculum expects of them, and so how teacher educators can help them become qualified (p. 23).

In addition, when EPOSTL results are compared terms of sections, it seems that the prospective teachers' competency levels are higher in the spring semester during the Practice Teaching course than the fall semester during the School Experience course. The mean values of competency levels of prospective teachers for each section of EPOSTL applied both during the School Experience and Practice Teaching present that the ELT prospective teachers competency levels range from 76.33 to 81.46 for School Experience and from 82.19 to 87.22 for Practice Teaching courses. This finding underlines the need for urgent changes in the procedure of ELT teacher education in Turkey because Hacettepe University is among the most successful universities in Turkey. Although the

results are satisfying for ELT prospective teachers at Hacettepe University, the results and findings for other universities may be catastrophic. Thus, ELT teacher education process needs to be reconstructed with respect to the international requirements and by taking into consideration the updated scales being used for not only all teachers of different subject fields but also for only English language teachers in pre-in and post-service of their profession.

The findings and the results of the third research question which tries to find out the answer to what extent the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of EPOSTL are effective and useful, starting with the effect of micro-teaching sessions about the section and sub-sections of EPOSTL when the results of this part are examined, it is clearly seen that these sessions have significant effects on prospective teachers competency levels. Since the mean value of the prospective teachers' competency levels is 75.57 in the fall semester during the School Experience course while the mean value of teaching competency level in the spring semester during the Practice Teaching course found as 85.56. After the analysis it can be claimed that the effects of micro-teaching sessions of EPOSTL to prospective teachers' competency levels are very remarkable and worth considering. Thus, the general results of competency levels are very significant. Moreover, it is claimed that although the micro-teaching sessions or video recordings are conveyed through distance education, it proposes that teacher education process may also be followed theoretically in distance and the results of this process may be as observable as the one in this study. Supporting this conclusion, the seven sections of EPOSTL for School Experience and Practice Teaching courses are calculated and it is seen that from the most to the least significant ones in *conducting a lesson, context, methodology, lesson planning, resources, assessment of learning and independent learning* sections, there are meaningful effects of teaching sessions between the EPOSTL applications for the two different semesters when School Experience and Practice Teachings courses are taken. The effects of micro-teaching sessions can be accepted in positive way since the competency levels of prospective teachers are higher in the semester when they take Practice Teaching course after the micro-teaching sessions than the semester they are obliged to take School Experience course. In detail, the effects of micro-teaching recordings have also seen in the sub-sections of

EPOSTL applications as well. When the results are checked it is clearly seen that apart from the institutional resources and constraints, and virtual learning environments all the other sub-sections differs significantly from each other again. Although the above mentioned sub-sections' mean values are higher during the Practice Teaching course than the School Experience one, the competency levels of prospective teachers do not have significant difference but they have more successful competency levels than the fall semester. Thus, although the significant levels of other sub-sections are different from each other, it should be paid attention that they all have significant effects. Perhaps, the institutional resources and constraints, and virtual learning environments not being significant lies under the truth that these prospective teachers are not teaching in their real environments, they do not need to know all the details about their teaching context meanwhile their experiences about virtual learning environment are only limited to their own learning experiences and they mostly do not have allotted time for virtual teaching process as their Practice Teaching hours are scheduled before and very limited because of the mentors' own programs. These results and conclusions refer to not only the importance of the use of EPOSTL but also to the claim by Newby (2011) ultimately, the usefulness of EPOSTL must be evaluated by its main target audience who are student teachers undergoing their pre-service education. Therefore, particularly or as a whole EPOSTL also provides a means of analyzing and assessing the content of teacher education curricula, so it can be used as a way of planning and determining the content of pre-service courses. Here, the effects of technology or the distance education which proves the recordings to the prospective teachers should be emphasized and focused on utilizing them for teacher education process of continuing professional development during the teaching profession. At that point, Burns (2011) deserves to be remembered as the researcher claims that distance education not about technology; it is about people, about improving the knowledge, skills, attitudes, aptitudes, and values of teachers with the ultimate aim of improving the learning and achievement of our students of today and tomorrow.

As for the findings and the results of the fourth research question which searches the answer to what the prospective teachers' perceptions of EPOSTL are, the results of this research question aim to support the given statistics and finding

mentioned beforehand. Even if the policy makers, trainers, educators, professors and mentors agree with the usefulness and effectiveness of EPOSTL in teacher education, the most important agreement should come from the real stakeholders who are the prospective teachers in this research. The prospective teachers agree mostly with the idea that EPOSTL makes them think about different aspects of teaching, help them to understand what competencies a teacher of a foreign language should have, make them aware of the competencies they have developed as well as those still need to develop, help them to log their progress, help them to understand the relationship between underlying knowledge and practical skills in the process of teaching. They, furthermore; believe that it is a good instrument for the self-assessment of teacher competencies, is also a useful teaching and learning device and can be used effectively during teacher education at the faculties. Moreover, although they believe that elective courses also contribute to the development of teacher competency, self-assessment section is the most important part of EPOSTL and EPOSTL. It is a lifelong tool that will guide their Practice Teachings in detail. However, many prospective teachers feel neutral to the idea that personal statement and dossier sections are the most important parts of EPOSTL. The understanding and the objectivity of prospective teachers come from the reality that this research deals only with the self-assessment section of EPOSTL. They also feel neutral about the idea that compulsory courses attribute most to the teacher competencies defined by EPOSTL, which also reflect their support to the elective courses inclusion to EPOSTL practices and elective courses also contribute to the development of teacher competency. Finally, most of the prospective teachers' disagreement with the belief of EPOSTL is a waste of time for teacher education fulfills the mission and the role of EPOSTL in teacher education process successfully. Thus, the perceptions of ELT prospective teachers at Hacettepe University deserves much attention and calls the need of widespread use of EPOSTL that will be promising for the future of ELT teacher education. As Bagaric (2011) summarizes that the best recognized functions of EPOSTL seem to be those which help students to develop awareness of their strength and weakness through giving reflections about the EPOSTL applications, to chart their progress and to understand the relationship between the underlying knowledge and practical skills in a better way

a teacher strives to develop through giving reflections about the process and the tools the process includes.

The findings and the results of the fifth research question aims to answer the question to what the correlation levels of the compulsory didactic courses and the competency levels of prospective teachers are. According to the findings, it is concluded that especially methodological courses are seen as more correlated with the competency levels of teaching than the other courses. Among the courses given to the prospective teacher to think about the relation between the competency levels of teaching and the correlation of the courses, School Experience and Practice Teaching courses are seemed as the very and the fully correlated courses. These two courses are followed by material adaptation and development in FLT, teaching of language skills, teaching technologies and material design, teaching foreign language to young learners, ELT methodology, approaches to English language teaching, listening and phonetics, advanced writing courses. Besides, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers have the awareness of the importance of the course, which will develop them for subject field education and teaching situation, by keeping in touch to the pedagogical sides of their own subject field. Apart from these courses such as advanced writing, listening and phonetics courses may be the prospective teachers' interest because of the influence of the professors or educators and the prospective teachers' own desires to be a researcher in this subject field in which speaking ability and advanced writing skills are required mostly. In addition, while the prospective teachers were filling or grading the correlation levels of that section, the researcher encountered some reflections as what the meaning of "guidance" was. Here, while designing the courses or the programs of ELT departments at the universities, the question of who should teach the pedagogical knowledge in different subject field departments in the educational faculties appears again. The observations and the comments of the prospective teachers on this scale bring a new point of view that the pedagogical courses conveyed by the professors of other departments may continue in a better way only if the contents of these courses are conveyed by the ELT professors in English language. By this way, prospective teachers may gain more knowledge about the pedagogical sides of their profession and may feel more qualified when mentioned about the terms or

knowledge about this field in their taught language. Turning back to the most correlated courses among the given ones, School Experience and Practice Teaching courses have real and important effects on prospective teachers in their teacher education process. Therefore, these courses may be scattered to the other years as well because ELT prospective teachers deserve to feel and be more qualified and equipped with the requirements of teaching in the real life situations because linking inputs and the impact of inputs, such as teacher preparation and curriculum intend to improve teacher and student outcomes transmitted through a set of social and instructional interactions that the teachers may only implement in the real classroom settings.

Considering the findings and the results of the sixth research question which aims to answer what the prospective teachers' profiles are in relation to the European Profiling Grid, it is articulated that EPG can be used by different people who are responsible for the teacher education process. Because this research proves samples of applications that the EPG scale was used by course supervisors, course registration advisors and mentors as well. In this study, as carried out the same process for EPOSTL, EPG scale was taken into consideration by its sections and sub-sections. EPG scale, which consist of the training and qualifications section including language proficiency, education and training, assessed teaching, teaching experience sub-sections; key teaching competences section including methodology: knowledge and skills, assessment, lesson and course planning, interaction, management and monitoring; enabling competences section that includes intercultural competence, language awareness, digital media sub-sections; and the final part including professional conduct and administration sub-sections, exemplifies the practical and comprehensive use of the scale for ELT teacher education. Starting with the course registration advisors EPG results for prospective teachers, individually the profiles of prospective teachers differ meaningfully from each other, and among the four comprehensive sections of EPG, the profiles of prospective teachers are lower in the training section than the other sections. Since the course supervisors reflect the insufficiency of the teaching experience of the prospective teachers. Moreover, it is concluded that the profile levels of prospective teachers differ in terms of the course supervisors as well. Continuing with the results of EPG with respect to the mentors, it is seen that

the lowest profile levels of prospective teachers are in the professionalism, training and qualifications sections that follow each other sequentially. Thus, mentors agree with the point of the prospective teachers have deficiency in training and qualifications section. Moreover, they think that the prospective teachers need more help in professionalism part of EPG. Perhaps, this conclusion reminds the prospective students' competency levels they define for School Experience and Practice Teaching courses in the context section of EPOSTL which these sections can also be interrelated. Again, the prospective teachers' profile levels differ meaningfully from each other in terms of the mentors. Finally, the EPG results of prospective teachers filled by the course registration advisors inform that the prospective teachers have deficiency in professionalism and key teaching competences sections of EPG. Therefore, the mentors and course registration advisors agree with the idea that the prospective teachers are in need of professionalism. For this reason, the School Experience and Practice Teaching courses that will increase the prospective teachers' professional and also key teaching competences should be given in the earlier stages of their education process not limited only for one semester in the whole teacher education years. The profile levels of prospective teachers with respect to the course registration advisors are meaningfully different from each other as they differ from mentors and course supervisors. This meaningful difference between the mentors, class and course supervisors defined with the results of the research question underlies the importance of collaboration not only between the mentors, course supervisors and course registration advisors but also they should cooperate with themselves and keep in touch with each other as the better education systems depend on more collaboration between the universities and the schools the prospective teachers are sent for observation and Practice Teaching. As Christianakis (2010) mentions the collaborative teacher research provides a way for teachers to participate in examination of classrooms and schools in order to shape policies, as well as bridge the division between teachers, academics, and statehouses (Rust & Meyers, 2003). Over the last 15 years, there have been numerous research on collaborations between teachers, students, administrators, and university professors (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Olson, 1997; Pine, 2009; Wells, 2001; Wells et al., 1994). Such collaborations have made educational research more accessible to teachers, and thus, have helped redress some of the unequal

power dynamics subjugating teachers in educational research. Moreover, collaboration efforts in teacher education will also help the prospective teachers navigate the complexity of practice and theory.

The findings and the results of the seventh research question aims to answer the question of whether EPOSTL practices are compatible with the EPG scale filled by course, course registration advisors and mentors. The descriptive results of this research question reveals that the competency levels of prospective teachers differ meaningfully and the significant difference appears mostly between EPOSTL and EPG scale filled by mentors, course registration advisors. Moreover, EPG scale filled by course supervisors differ meaningfully from the EPG scale filled by mentors and course registration advisors . This conveys the research to the reality of the EPOSTL competency levels of prospective teachers are parallel to the profile levels of EPG scale filled by the course supervisors. Although EPOSTL includes self-assessment descriptors about the competencies of teaching and are expected to be filled by the prospective teachers and EPG scale consists of more general competency defining sections that makes it very handy for the educators during the observation of the prospective teachers, they both seem very compatible with each other and are practical as well. Perhaps the reason of EPOSTL competency levels are more compatible with the course supervisors' profile levels is the course supervisors are more and directly related with the teaching competencies of prospective teachers. At that point, it can be proposed that all the stakeholders of teacher education should come and work together in this journey. So, during the teacher education process the importance of cooperation, or the support of in-service training for mentors may be possible. The professional continuing development sections or the in-service training for the university trainers, educators and mentors may provide the chance of cooperation between themselves and discussion about the needs and expectations from prospective teachers and teacher education. The EPG scale offering specific guidance to the three major groups of users in line with the Common European Framework of Reference for the Languages (CEFR) views the teacher competences from a positive perspective such as focusing on what teachers know and are able to do at a particular moment of their career. The principle of EPG also reflects the action-oriented approach promoted by the CEFR in the areas of

learning, teaching and assessment. Mateva et al. (2013) states that the aim of the EPG is to support language teachers, whichever language they teach, in their own professional development. It also serves as a tool for managers and coordinators who are responsible for assuring the quality of language education, and for trainers and mentors who provide support and in-service development opportunities for language teachers and prospective language teachers.

In conclusion, the eighth question of the research seeks to answer to what the ways of enhancing the practices and the implementation of EPOSTL in Hacettepe University English Language Teaching Program are and to make it common for English Language Teacher Education across the country. This research question gains its roots from the reflections of prospective teachers. As most of the prospective teachers need to use the personal statement, intending to help the prospective teachers reflect on aspects related to teaching in general and to think about questions that may be important at the beginning of their teaching education, section of EPOSTL before their Practice Teachings while most of them prefer to use the self-assessment section during their Practice Teachings. Moreover, most of the prospective teachers prefer to use the self-assessment and dossier sections of EPOSTL after the Practice Teaching courses they are expected to have during their teacher education at the faculty. The prospective teachers' being in favor of using the self-assessment and dossier sections of EPOSTL refer that they also think and agree with the idea that EPOSTL can be used for a lifelong source for continuing professional development. Moreover, the prospective teachers' perceptions and reflections about the sections of EPOSTL may direct the future events, organizations and reconstruction of teacher education as it is used as a reflection tool in this process. As mentioned beforehand, reflection plays an important role in teacher education, greatly influenced by the pragmatic theories of Dewey (1922, 1933 and 1966) and Schön (1983). Especially Schön's concepts of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action are frequently referred to. Both these philosophers focus primarily on practical situations and their theories are, consequently, most useful in a school practice context. As change is required in order to improve foreign language teaching, reflection based on critical thinking and dialogue is important throughout a teacher education programme and must be linked not only to practice but to theory as well.

Habermas (1974) sees reflection as informed judgment by a group of people, which requires dialogue. At that point, it is useful to remind how Kemmis (1985, p. 140) defines this kind of reflection:

- Reflection is not a purely 'internal', psychological process: it is action oriented and historically embedded.
- Reflection is not a purely individual process: like language, it is a social process.
- Reflection is shaped by ideology; in turn, it shapes ideology.
- Reflection is a practice which expresses our power to reconstitute social life by the way we participate in communication, decision making and social action.

Consequently, the results and findings of this research prove the idea that EPOSTL can be used as a reflection tool for English language teacher education in Turkey as well. Although the process is very long and the actions that need to be taken are struggling, the products of this lifelong process is observable and satisfying in terms of individual, national and international desires and expectations from the language teaching situations. Furthermore, this study is promising for the further research because it takes into consideration the EPOSTL descriptors with the EPG teaching profile sections, which also exemplifies such a complementary study by including many kinds of people who put the teaching, learning and teacher education issues into practice for different purposes.

5.2. Recommendations

In this part of the study, at first all the limitations given before can be transformed into valuable recommendations for future researches. Starting with the scope of the study, as the participants included into this research is limited in number, the researchers may apply the similar research to the larger population. In addition, this study restricts itself only with the English language prospective teachers at Hacettepe University, Education Faculty. So, the similar research may be carried out by including other universities and a sample of comparative study using these scales may be more promising and a first step to make the effects of these scales pervasive and stimulating. Also, the different kinds of participants in terms of their department may be included in the study and it would aim how the scales will work

on prospective teachers of other languages. This study aims to present samples of the applications which are related with the prospective teachers of English language during their teacher education and it deals with the pre-service situations of teacher education, so it might yield interesting results to carry out empirical studies investigating the effects of EPOSTL and EPG in in-service teacher education by considering the bachelor of arts degrees of English teachers who are in action. By larger population, the future studies may be a part of some European Union projects. The scales used here in the study, may not be applied only for two semesters, they may be observed during the language teaching and other pedagogical courses that the students are expected to take these courses in order to get reliable sources of the applications considering the longitudinal aspect of language education. By this way, the further researches may not only include the prospective teachers of English language teaching departments but also they may involve the other grades of students at the educational faculties. Since this research only deals with the self-assessment part of the EPOSTL, the coming studies dealing with the personal section and/or dossier section will gain much importance for teacher education process in Turkey. Especially the dossier section of EPOSTL may serve as a kind of journal where the students, prospective teachers or teachers may reflect their own and impromptu experiences of teaching and may have the chance of mirroring themselves which comes the same way of self-assessment again. As the micro-teaching or video recording sessions have been done in distance, on the spot micro-teaching sessions may be carried out by including alive discussions or webinars. That's why this research deserves to be handled with minor changes under the heading of continuing professional development in teacher education. For this purpose, in-service training sessions and seminars can be the subject of another research and may have prevalent effects on the practitioners. If the institutions give chance to the researchers, the pedagogical courses that the language teacher need to take during the teacher education process may be given by a language teacher and it would be useful to observe whether there will be a significant difference on students or prospective teachers' competency levels of teaching. All of these applications require the curriculum development for the educational faculties English language teaching departments. Therefore, a suggested syllabus for English language teaching departments in Turkey may gain importance in the literature that this syllabus will

be an example for teacher education and also it may be proposed to the Council of Higher Education as it is urgent and necessary to educate the teachers of different subject fields considering their own situations, desires, aspirations, and competencies of teaching. To sum up, in spite of relatively large body of the research, there are still many aspects of phenomenon to be explored and ever-improving educational issues equip us with new tools, settings, technology to investigate the application of EPOSTL and EGP over and over.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. R. (1997). *Questionnaires and Inventories: Surveying Opinions and Assessing Personality*. New York: J. Wiley.
- Akyüz, Y. (2007). *Türk Eğitim Tarihi : M.Ö. 1000 – M.S.2007 [History of Turkish Education: 1000 BC – 2007 AC]* (11. ed). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Altan, Z. M. (1998). A call for change and pedagogy: a critical analysis of teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(4), 407-417.
- Altundiş, E. (2006). *İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Eğitimsel Kökenleri ve Dil Öğretiminde Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar (Kayseri ili örneği)*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Erciyes University, Kayseri.
- Aoki, N. (2002). Aspects of Teacher Autonomy: Capacity, Freedom, and Responsibility. In P. Benson & S. Toogood (Eds.), *Learner autonomy 7: Challenges to research and practice* (pp. 110-124). Dublin: Authentik.
- Aydın, R. (2007). *Türkiye'de Eğitimle İlgili Yapılan Bilimsel Toplantılarda ve Millî Eğitim Şuralarında Ele Alınan Öğretmen Sorunları ile Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının Politika ve Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi (1980–2004)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Aygün, S. (2008). *Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Eğitimi ve Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Beykent University, İstanbul.
- Azar, A., (2011). Türkiye'deki öğretmen eğitimi üzerine bir söylem: nitelik mi, nicelik mi? *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(1), 36-38.
- Bagaric, V. (2011). The Role of the EPOSTL in the Evaluation and Development of Teacher Education Programmes in Croatia. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B. & Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bainer, D. L., & Cantrell, D. (1992). Nine Dominant Reflection Themes Identified for Pre-service Teachers by a Content Analysis of Essays. *Education*, 112, 571–578.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barfield, A., Ashwell, T., Carroll, M., Collins, K., Cowie, N., Critchley, M., Head, E., Nix, M., Obermeier, A., & Robertson, M.C. (2001). *Exploring and defining teacher autonomy: a collaborative discussion*. In A. S. Mackenzie & E. McCafferty (Eds.), *Developing Autonomy, Proceedings of the College and University Educators' 2001 Conference* (pp. 217-222). Tokyo: The Japan Association for Language Teaching. Retrieved from:
- <http://www.encounters.jp/mike/professional/publications/tchauto.html> on April 4, 2009.
- Barfield, A. & Brown, S.H. (2007). *Reconstructing Autonomy in Language Education: Inquiry and Innovation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bektaş-Altıok, G. R. (2006). *Türkiye'de İlköğretim Okullarında Etkili Yabancı Dil Öğretimi: Tarihsel Gelişim ve Açılımları*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. London: Longman.
- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning. State of The Art Article. *Language Teaching*, 40, (1), 21-40.
- Bainer, D. L., & Cantrell, D. (1992). Nine Dominant Reflection Themes Identified for Pre-service Teachers by a Content Analysis of Essays. *Education*, 112, 571–578.
- Bilir, A. (2011). The Historical Evolution of Teacher Training and Employment Policies in Turkey. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 44(2), 223-246.
- Binbaşıoğlu, C. (1995). *Türkiye’de Eğitim Bilimleri Tarihi (History of Turkish educational sciences): the series of research and examination*. Ankara, Turkey: MEB Publication.
- Block, D. (2006). *Multilingual Identities in a Global City. London Stories*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Block, D. (2007). *Second Language Identities*. London: Continuum.
- Brown, A., S.Kirpal & F.Rauner (eds.) (2007). *Identities at Work*. Dordrecht:Springer.
- Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a Theory of Instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burkert, A., and Schwienhorst, K. (2008). Focus on the Student Teacher: The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) As a Tool to Develop Teacher Autonomy. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 2,(3),238-252.
- Burn, M. (2011). *Distance Education for Teacher Training: Modes, Models, and Methods*. Education Development Center, Inc, Washington, DC.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı*, Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Candy, P. (1991). *Self-Direction for Lifelong Learning*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Cephe, P. T. (2009). An Analysis of the Impact of Reflective Teaching on the Beliefs of Teacher Trainees. *Education and Science*. Vol. 34, No 152
- Chan, D. W. (2008). General, Collective and Domain-Specific Teacher Self-Efficacy Among Chinese Prospective and In-service Teachers in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1057-1069.
- Christianakis, M. (2010). Collaborative Research and Teacher Education. *Issues in Teacher Education*, Volume 19, Number 2, Fall.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for The Next Generation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Council of Europe. (2004). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Council for Cultural Cooperation Education Committee Modern Languages Division. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2000). *European Language Portfolio (ELP): Principles and Guidelines*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Document DGIV/EDU/LANG(2000) 33)
- Council of Europe. (2007). (Available at <http://www.ecml.at/EPOSTL>)
- Council of Europe. (2011). *European Language Portfolio: Principles and Guidelines*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available at: www.coe.int/portfolio
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). In TASC model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf
- Council of Higher Education (CHE). (2007). *Teacher Education Guide Book*. Ankara: CHE Publications.
- Çakır, A., Balçıkınlı, C. (2012). The Use of the EPOSTL to Foster Teacher Autonomy: ELT Student Teachers' and Teacher Trainers' Views. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. Volume, 37, Issue, 3, Article 2.
- Çakıroğlu, E. & Çakıroğlu, J. (2003). Reflections on teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(2), 253-264.
- Çekiç, A. (2011). Impacts of Integrated Input on Incidental Vocabulary Learning By Freshman Turkish ELT Trainees in a Virtual Learning Environment. Published Ph. D. Dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Çubukçu, Z. (1997). Öğretmen lisesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelimleri. *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3(2), 163-172.
- Dam, L. (1995). *Learner Autonomy 3: From Theory to Classroom Practice*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The Right to Learn: A Blueprint for Creating Schools That Work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Dellinger, A. B., Bobbett, J.J., Oliver, D.F. & Ellette, C. D. (2008). Measuring teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs: Development and Use of The TEBS-Self. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 751-766.
- Demircan, Ö. (2001). *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Demirel, Ö. (1991). Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil Öğretmeni Yetiştirmede Karşılaşılan Güçlükler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6, 25-39.
- Demirezen, M. (2007). Identity Problems of Non-native Teachers of English in Teacher Education. *TESL Journal*, Vol. XIII, No. 8. <http://iteslj.org/>
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Free Press.

- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we Think: A Restatement of The Relation of Reflective Thinking to The Educative Process*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dursunoğlu, H. (2003). Cumhuriyet Döneminde İlköğretime Öğretmen Yetiştirmenin Tarihi Gelişimi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 160.
- European Agency. (2010). *Teacher training -basic and specialist teacher Training – Germany*. Retrieved from <http://www.european-agency.org/>
- European Commission. (2005). *Common European principles for teacher competencies and qualifications*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Eurydice. (2006). *Quality assurance in teacher education in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice>.
- Ewing, R. and Le Cornu, R. (2010). From Practice Teaching to Practicum to Profession Experience. In: Ewing, R. Lowrie, T. and Higgins, J. (eds). *Teaching and Communication. Rethinking Professional Experience*. Melbourne: Oxford Press, 31-41.
- ETUCE. (2008). *Teacher education in Europe: An ETUCE policy paper*. Retrieved from http://etuce.homestead.com/Publications2008/ETUCE_PolicyPaper_en_web.df
- Farrell, T.S.C. (2007). *Reflective Language Teaching. From Research to Practice*. London: Continuum.
- Fenner, A.-B. (2011). The EPOSTL As a Tool for Reflection in Three Contexts of Language Teacher Education. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B.& Jones, B. (Ed.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- Ferraro, J.M. (2000). *Reflective practice and professional development*. Retrieved from <http://www.ericdigests.org/2001-3/reflective.htm> on May 19, 2008.
- Freeman, D. and K.E. Johnson (1998). Reconceptualizing The Knowledgebase of Language Teacher Education". *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No.3: 397-418.
- Galvez-Martin, M. E., Bowman, C.L., & Morrison, M.A. (1998). An Exploratory Study of The Level of Reflection Attained by Pre-service Teachers. *Midwestern Educational Researcher*, 11(2), 9–18.
- Gilpin, A. (1999). A Framework for Teaching Reflection. In H. Trappes-Lomax, & I. McGrath, (Eds.), *Theory in language teacher education* (pp. 109- 118). Harlow: Longman.
- Güneş, B. (2009). 1945-1980 Arası Türkiye’de İngilizce Eğitimi. Unpublished master’s dissertation, Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta.
- Harford, J.A., & MacRuairc, G. (2008). Engaging Student Teachers in Meaningful Reflective Practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(7), 1884-1892.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 4th edition.

- Harris, M. (1997). Self-Assessment of Language Learning in Formal Settings. *ELT Journal Volume 51/1*. Oxford University Press.
- Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in Teacher Education: Toward Definition and Implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 33-49.
- Hiřmanođlu, M. (2013). Does English Language Teacher Education Curriculum Promote CEFR Awareness of Prospective EFL Teachers. 3rd World Conference on Learning, Teaching and Educational Leadership (WCLTA-2012). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 93 (2013) 938-945.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Huang, J. (2005). Teacher autonomy in Language Learning: A review of The Research. In K.R. Katyal, H.C. Lam & X.J. Ding (Eds.), *Research studies in Education* (pp. 203-218). Faculty of Education, the University of Hong Kong.
- Iřık, A. (2008). Yabancı Dil Eđitimimizdeki Yanlıřlar Nereden Kaynaklanıyor? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4 (2), 15-26.
- Ingvarsdottir, H. (2011). The EPOSTL in Iceland: Getting The Mentors on Board. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B. & Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- Jiménez-Raya, M., Lamb, T., & Vieira, F. (2007). *Pedagogy for Autonomy in Language Education- Towards a Framework for Teacher and Learner development*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Jones, B. (2011). The Use of tThe EPOSTL in a Bilateral Teacher-Education Programme. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B. & Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- Karaata, C. (2010). Milli Eđitim Bakanlıđında Grevli İngilizce đretmenlerinin Hizmet İin Eđitimine İliřkin neriler. *Milli Eđitim Dergisi*, 185, 107-129.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel Arařtırma Yntemi*. Ankara. Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kelly, G. (1955). *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. New York: Norton Publishing.
- Kelly, M. and Grenfell, M. (2004). *European profile for language teacher education – a frame of reference* available at www.lang.soton.ac.uk/profile/index.html.
- Kelly, M., Grenfell, M., Allan, R., Kriza, C. and McEvoy, W. (2004). *European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference*. A Report to the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture.
- Kızılcıaođlu, A. (2006). Eđitim fakltelerinde yeniden yapılandırma srecine iliřkin eleřtiriler ve neriler. *Balıkesir niversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstits Dergisi*, 8(14), 132-140.
- Kirkgoz, Y. (2005). English Language Teaching in Turkey: Challenges for the 21st Century. In G. Braine, (Ed.), *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum, and Practice* (pp. 159-175). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Kumaravallivedu, B. (2001). Toward a Post-method Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 35/4: 537-560. [Online document] Available <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0039-8322%28200124%2935%3A4%3C537%3ATAPP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>
- Kütük, M. (1992). *Öğretmen Lisesi Öğrencilerinin Yükseköğretime İlişkin Yönelimleri*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Lamb, T.E. (2008). Learner Autonomy and Teacher Autonomy. Synthesising an Agenda. In T. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, Realities and Responses* (pp. 269-285). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lamb, T.E., and Reinders, H. (2008). *Learner and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, Realities and Responses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lier, V. (1992). Not the Nine O'clock Linguistics Class: Investigating Contingency Grammar. *Language Awareness*, 1 (2), 91-108.
- Ling, I. (2007). Fostering Teacher Autonomy in The Use of English Teaching Materials. *CELEA Journal*, 30(1), 96-102.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D. (1995). Learning As Dialogue: The Dependence of Learner Autonomy on Teacher Autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175-182.
- Little, D., Ridley, J., & Ushioda, E. (2003). *Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Classrooms: Teacher, Learner, Curriculum and Assessment*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D. (2009). *The European language portfolio: where pedagogy and assessment meet*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available at www.coe.int/portfolio
- Makinen, K. (2011). The Use of The Personal Statement. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B. & Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- Mann, S. (2005). The Language Teacher's Development in Language Teaching. Vol.38.2
http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/staff/teaching/mann/mann_s/stateof.pdf
- Mateva, G., Vitanova, A. & Tashevskva, S. (2013). *European Profiling Grid User Guide*. Lifelong Learning Programme. European Union.
- McGrath, I. (2000). Teacher Autonomy. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*. London: Longman. 100-110.
- MEB. (1982). 11. Milli Eğitim Şurası. Retrieved from http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_06/06021545_11_sura.pdf
- MEB (2009). Ortaöğretim kurumları haftalık ders çizelgeleri ve açıklamaları. *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Tebliğler Dergisi*, 72(2624), 534-593.
- MEB. (2010). Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu. Retrieved from www.meb.gov.tr

- MEB. (2010). Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Eğitimi Genel Müdürlüğünün Görev, Yetki ve Sorumluluklarına İlişkin Yönerge. *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Tebliğler Dergisi*, 73(2631), 227-238.
- Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. (2011). 'Die Implementierung des EPOSA am Fachdidaktischen Zentrum Englisch der Universität Wien'. In: Newby, D. and Horak, A. (eds), *Die Implementierung des Europäischen Portfolios für Sprachlehrende in Ausbildung (EPOSA) in der Lehrer/innenbildung in Österreich*. Graz: Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum, 15-20.
- Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. (2011). Implementing the EPOSTL in The Early Phase of Pre-Service EFL Teacher Education. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B.& Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- Millerson, G. (1964) The Qualifying Association London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Mirici, İ.H., Öztürk, Z. (2003). Some Suggestions for Global Citizenship Education. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*. October 2003. Vol.5 No.1. June 2003, SanDiego, USA: AIU ISSN 1562-0500.
- Mirici, İ.H. (2004). European Language Portfolio:A Tool for A Common Language Education Policy in Europe. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Education*, Volume 6, No.1. USA: WCCI North American Chapter.
- Mirici, İ.H. (2006). Electronic In-Service Teacher-Training for the New National EFL Curriculum in Turkey. *TOJDE*. January 2006, Volume 7, Number 1, Eskişehir: Anadolu University ISSN 1302-6488
- Mirici, İ.H. (2007). *Training Multicultural and Plurilingual Children With an Identity of European Citizenship*. Proceedings of the International Academic Conference Children's Identity and Citizenship in Visegrad Context, Presov University, 29-31.
- Mirici, İ. H. (2008). Development and Validation Process of a European Language Portfolio Model for Young Learners. *TOJDE*. April 2008, Volume: 9 Number: 2, Eskişehir: Anadolu University ISSN 1302-6488
- Mirici, İ.H. & Demirbaş, S. (2013). How to Turn EPOSTL into an Electronic Setting: The E-EPOSTL. 4th International Conference on New Horizons in Education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 106 (2013) 1368-1377.
- Nergis, A. (2011). Foreign Language Teacher Education in Turkey: A Historical Overview. WCES 2011. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 15 (2011) 181-185.
- Newby, D., Fenner, A. B., Komorowska, H. & Jones, B. (Eds.) (forthcoming), *Insights from the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Newby, D. (2007). *The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. *Babylonia*, 3: 07, 23-26, www.babylonia-ti.ch.
- Newby, D. (2011). Issues in Using the EPOSTL. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B.& Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.

- Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A.-B., Jones, B., Komorowska, H. and Soghikyan, K. (2007). *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages. A Reflection Tool for Language Teacher Education*. Strasbourg/Graz: Council of Europe Publishing, <http://EPOSTL2.ecml.at>.
- Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B., Jones, B. (2011). *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Nihlen, C. (2011). What Goes into The EPOSTL Dossier and Why?. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B. & Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.
- North, B., Mateva, G. (2006). *A Profiling Grid for Language Teaching Professionals*. EAQUALS in-house document.
- North, B. (2009). *A Profiling Grid for Language Teachers in Diadori, Pierangela*. Proceedings of the Second TQAC Conference. Siena, Università per Stranieri.
- North, B. (2009). *A Profiling Grid for Language Teachers*. In International Meeting on Training, Quality and Certification in Foreign Language Teaching Siena, 9-10 February 2009. EAQUALS.
- North, B., Ortega, A. & Sheehan, S. (2010). *Core Inventory for General English*. British Council/EAQUALS(European Association for Quality Language Services).
- OECD. (2011). *Teachers matter: attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers: pointers for policy development*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/preschoolandschool/48627229.pdf>
- OECD. (2012). *Education at a glance 2012: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2012-en>
- Okçabol, R., Akpınar, Y., Caner, A., Erkin, E., Gök, F. & Ünlühisarcıklı, Ö. (2003). *Öğretmen Yetiştirme Araştırması (Survey of Teacher Training)*. Eğitim Sen Yayınları: Ankara.
- Olson, M. (1997). Collaboration: An Epistemological Shift. In H. Christiansen, L.Goulet, C. Krentz, & H. Maeers (Eds.), *Recreating Relationships: Collaboration and Educational Reform* (pp. 13-25). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Orafi, S. M. (2008). ELT curriculum intentions and teachers' classroom practices: how to bridge the gap. <http://www.litu.tu.ac.th/journal/FLLTCP/Proceeding/227.pdf>
- Orlova, N. (2010). *Reflecting on The Use of The EPOSTL: Pre-service Teachers' Voices*. Conference Proceedings of the Seventh International and Eleventh National Conference of the Association of Teachers of English of the Czech Republic.
- Orlova, N. (2011). Challenges of Integrating the EPOSTL into Pre-service Teacher Training. Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B. & Jones, B. (Eds.) *Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe Publishing.

- Oskarsson, M., 1992: *Self-assessment of Foreign Language Skills: A Survey of Research and Development Work*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Osterman, K.F., & Kottkamp, R.B. (2004). *Reflective Practice for Educators: Professional Development to Improve Student Learning*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Ottesen, E. (2007). Reflection in Teacher Education. *Reflective Practice*, 8(1), 31–46.
- Öztürk, C. (2005). Türkiye’de Düünden Bugüne Öğretmen Yetiştiren Kurumlar. İstanbul: MEB Yayınları.
- Pathak, S. (2012). International seminar on teacher education for peace and harmony. <http://www.iaseuniversity.org.in/intSeminar/index.asp>
- Pearson, L.C. & Hall, B.C. (1993). Initial Construct Validation of The Teaching Autonomy Scale. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86(3), 172–177.
- Philip, G. Mirici İ.H &, Aksu, M. B. (2005). Preparing for the European Language Portfolio: Internet Connections, *TOJDE*, Volume 6, Number 1, Eskişehir: Anadolu University ISSN 1302-6488
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The Moral Judgment of The Child*. New York: Free Press.
- Pine, G. (2009). *Teacher Action Research: Building Knowledge Democracies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pollard, A. (2005). *Reflective Teaching Evidence-informed Professional Practice*. New York: Continuum.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (2000). *Interactive Language Teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Rossner, R. (2008). *A Profiling Grid for Language Teaching Professionals*. In Diadori, Pierangela Proceedings of the First TQAC Conference. Siena, Università per Stranieri.
- Rossner, R. (2009). *Methods of Teacher Assessment and the EAQUALS Profiling Grid for Language Teachers*. In International Meeting on Training, Quality and Certification in Foreign Language Teaching Siena, 9-10 February 2009. EAQUALS.
- Rust, F. & Meyers, E. (2003). Introduction. In E. Meyers & F. Rust (Eds.), *Taking Action With Teacher Research* (pp. 1-16). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Sağlam, M. & Kürüm, D. (2005). Türkiye ve Avrupa Birliği Ülkelerinde Öğretmen Eğitiminde Yapısal Düzenlemeler ve Öğretmen Adaylarının Seçimi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 167, 53-70.
- Sarıboğa Alagöz, N. (2006). Türkiye’deki ve Hollanda’daki İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programlarının Karşılaştırılması. Unpublished master’s dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

- Savuran, Y. (2014). Life-Long Learning Competencies of Prospective English Language Teachers In Comparison With Their Mentors. Published Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating The Reflective Practitioner*. San Fransico: Jossey-Bass.
- Schön, D.A. (Ed.). (1991). *The Reflective Turn: Case Studies in and on Educational Practice*. New York: Teachers College.
- Schön, D.A. (1995). Knowing in action: The new scholarship requires a new epistemology, *Change*, 27, 27–34.
- Seferoğlu, G. (2004). A Study of Alternative English Teacher Certification Practices in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30 (2). 151- 159
- Senemoğlu, N. (2011). How Effective Are Initial Primary Teacher Education Curricula in Turkey: Student Teacher Faculty and Teachers Let us Know. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 1 (1), 35-47.
- Shaw, J. (2002). *Team-teaching as negotiating autonomy and shared understandings of what we are doing*. Retrieved from <http://lc.ust.hk/%7Eailasc/symposium/Responses08Shaw.pdf> on January 19, 2008.
- Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher Self-efficacy and Teacher Burnout: A Study of Relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1059-1069.
- Smith, R.C. (2001) Learner and Teacher Development: Connections and Constraints. *The Language Teacher*, 25(6), 43-44.
- Smith, R.C. (2003). *Teacher education for teacher-learner autonomy*. Retrieved from http://www.warwick.ac.uk/~elsdr/Teacher_autonomy.pdf symposium/Responses08Shaw.pdf on October 21, 2009.
- Smith, R.C., & Erdoğan, S. (2008). Teacher-learner Autonomy: Programme Goals and Student-teacher Constructs. In T. E. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, Realities and Responses* (pp. 83-103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stallings, J. A. (1989). *Quality in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Stern, H.H. (2003). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Street, M.S., & Licata, J.W. (1989). Supervisor Expertise: Resolving The Dilemma Between Bureaucratic Control and Teacher Autonomy. *Planning and Changing*, 20(2), 97-107.
- Şahin, Y. (2006). Yabancı Dil Öğretmenlerinin Eğitimsel ve Alan Bilgisi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Şişman, M. (2001). *Öğretmenliğe Giriş*. Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.

- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (2006). PreK–12 English language proficiency standards. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Tok, H. (2006). Avrupa Birliği Ülkelerinde ve Türkiye’de Uygulanan Yabancı Dil Öğretimi Programlarının Karşılaştırılması. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, İnönü University, Malatya.
- Taylor, G. R. (2005). *Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Research*. Oxford:University Press of America.
- TESOL International Association. (2010). TESOL P–12 professional teaching standards (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- TESOL International Association. (2013, April). *Implementing the Common Core State Standards for ELs: The Changing Role of the ESL Teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Thavenius, C. (1999). Teacher Autonomy for Learner Autonomy. In S. Cotterall & D. Crabbe (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining The Field and Effecting Change* (pp.159–163). Frankfurt: Lang.
- Tican-Başaran, S. (2004). Effectiveness of Anatolian Teacher High Schools in terms of serving their intended purpose. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Tican-Başaran, S. & Aksu, M. (2007). Anatolian teacher high schools: advantages, limitations and suggestions for improvement. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 40(1), 157-179.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A. & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher Efficacy: Capturing an Elusive Concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805.
- Underhill, A. (1986). *Editorial. Teacher Development*. Newsletter. 1, p1.
- Underhill, A. (1988). *Training, Development and Teacher Education. Teacher Development*. Newsletter. 9. p. 4.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, P. (1997) "Teacher training and teacher development: A useful dichotomy?" *The Language Teacher*, October 97 [Online Document] Available: <http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/97/oct/ur.html>. Retrieved 19.05.2004
- Valsiner, J. (2000). *Culture and Human Development: An Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wedell, M. (2008). Developing a Capacity to Make "English for Everyone" Worthwhile: Reconsidering Outcomes and How to Start Achieving Them. *International Journal of Educational Development*.

- Wells, G. (2001). The Development of a Community of Inquirers. In G. Wells (Ed.), *Action, talk, & text: Learning and teaching through inquiry* (pp. 1-22). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wells, G., Bernard, L., Gianotti, M., Keating, C., Konjevic, C., Kowal, M., Maher, A., Mayer, A., Moscoes, T., Orzechowska, E., Smieja, A., & Swartz, L. (1994). *Changing Schools from within: Creating Communities of Inquiry*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Wallace, M.J. (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, M.J. (1991). *Training Foreign Language Teachers. A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westhoff, G. (1999). *The European Language Portfolio as an Instrument for Documenting Learning Experiences – Implementing the Pedagogical Function or How Hard Can We Make the Soft Pages?* Presentation at the 4th European Portfolio Seminar, Enschede, The Netherlands, on 22-25 April 1999.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1984). The Incentive Value of Theory in Teacher Education. *ELT Journal*, Vol 38/2: 86-90.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, cited in: <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/authenticmaterials.html>
- Williams, M., & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, T. (1987). *Roles of Teachers and Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yapıcı, Ş. & Yapıcı, M. (2004). Öğretmen adaylarının Okul Deneyimi I dersine ilişkin görüşleri. *İlköğretim-Online*, 3(2), 54-59.
- YÖK. (2007). *Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Eğitim Fakülteleri (1982-2007): Öğretmenin Üniversitede Yetiştirilmesinin Değerlendirilmesi*. Ankara: Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu Yayını.
- YÖK (2012a). 2011-2016 BTİK strateji ve eylem planı-Eğitim fakültesi müfredatlarına proje yapma ve popüler bilim derslerinin eklenmesi. B.30.0.ONS-1365 No'lu 14.09.2012 tarihli yazı.
- YÖK (2012b). Pedagojik formasyon programları. B.30.0.EÖB-104.01.07-3598- 024410 No'lu 05.06.2012 tarihli yazısı.
- Yüksel, B. T. (2010). *Teacher Efficacy Beliefs of Turkish EFL Teachers: A Study with Turkish EFL Teachers Working at State Primary Schools*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Eskisehir: Anadolu University Institute of Educational Sciences.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantitative_research

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Approval of Ethical Board



T.C.
HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Sayı: 51944218-010.99/1239 **103 - 624**
Konu: Ayfer Su BERGİL
(Etik Kurul İzni)

01/07/2014

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞINA

Enstitümüz Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Doktora programı öğrencisi **Ayfer Su BERGİL**'in **Doç. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN** danışmanlığında yürüttüğü "**Avrupa Profil Belirleme Gridi ile İlişkili Öğretmen Adaylarına Yönelik Avrupa Dil Portfolyosu Üzerine Tamamlayıcı Bir Çalışma**" başlıklı tez çalışması Üniversitemiz Senatosu Etik Komisyonunun 13 Haziran 2014 tarihinde yapmış olduğu toplantıda etik açıdan uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilgilerinizi ve belgenin ilgiliye tebliğini rica ederim.

1
Prof.Dr. **BERRİN AKMAN**
Enstitü Müdürü

EKLER :
7 sayfa yazı.

Enstitü Sekreter V. : O. ERUYSAL (Paraf)



APPENDIX 2: European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

(for Prospective Teachers)

Please read the statements below carefully and write your responses in the spaces provided. With questions consisting of choices, please mark the most appropriate choice with a tick (✓).

Level of English:

Did you have preparatory class at the university: Yes No

Gender:

Male

Female

Age: (.....)

18-24

25-34

35-44

45-54

55+

Do you benefit from other programs?:

Yes (Which program? Erasmus-Mevlana...etc.) None

.....

Are you an international student? No

Yes (If yes, what is your native language?)

.....

Do you have teaching experience:

No experience

Yes months/years

Will you teach English after your graduation:

Yes No (I will.....)

Gönüllü Katılım Formu

Bu çalışma, Doç. Dr. Arif Sariçoban ve Ayfer SU BERGİL tarafından “Avrupa Profil Belirleme Gridi İle İngiliz Dili Öğretmen Adaylarına Yönelik Avrupa Portfolyosu Üzerine Tamamlayıcı Bir Çalışma “ başlıklı doktora tezinin bir parçası olarak yürütülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi öğrencilerinin 4. sınıfta aldıkları okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamalarına yönelik yeterlilikleri hakkındaki görüşlerini belirlemeye çalışmak ve öğrenci olan öğretmen adaylarının yeterliliklerini Avrupa Konseyi tarafından kabul gören bir portfolyo çalışması ile izlemektir. Ayrıca yapılan tespitler ışığında, İngilizce Öğretmenliği 4. sınıf öğrencileri için söz konusu uygulamaya dayalı "bir öğretmen adayı değerlendirme modeli" önerisi amaçlanmaktadır. Ankette, sizden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamimiyle gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Anket, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek soruları içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda, anketi uygulayan kişiye, anketi tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır. Anket sonunda, bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü öğretim üyelerinden Doç. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN (E-posta: arifs@hacettepe.edu.tr) ya da doktora öğrencisi Ayfer SU BERGİL (E-posta: ayfer_su@yahoo.com) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad	Tarih	İmza	Alınan Ders
	----/----/----		İDÖ478Öğretmenlik Uygulamaları

European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL)

Dear participants, totally 195 descriptors of EPOSTL are given below with sections and subsections of its 'self-assessment' part which will help you visualize and chart your own competence of teaching English language process. Each descriptor is accompanied by a 5 point likert scale ranging from '1=not developed, 2=less developed, 3=developed, 4=very developed, 5=fully developed' and you can date and color the following bar according to your own assessment that may take place at different stages of your teacher education. The data gathered via the EPOSTL will be used in my doctoral dissertation “A Complementary Study on European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) Which Is Used as a Reflection Tool for Teacher Education Programme in Relation to the European Profiling Grid”, which I write as a part of my doctoral studies at Hacettepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences. The answers will be kept confidential. Thank you for reflecting your thoughts truly and sincerely.

Inst. Ayfer SU BERGİL, MA

European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL)					
	Not developed	Less developed	Developed	Very developed	Fully developed
	1	2	3	4	5
Context					
A. Curriculum					
1. I can understand the requirements set in national and local curricula.					
2. I can design language courses around the requirements of the national and local curricula.					
3. I can understand the principles formulated in relevant European documents (e.g. Common European Framework of Reference, European Language Portfolio).					
4. I can understand and integrate content of European documents (e.g. Common European Framework of Reference, European Language Portfolio) as appropriate in my teaching.					
B. Aims and Needs					
1. I can understand the personal, intellectual and cultural value of learning other languages.					
2. I can take account of overall, long-term aims based on needs and expectations.					
3. I can take into account differing motivations for learning another language.					
4. I can take into account the cognitive needs of learners (problem solving, drive for communication, acquiring knowledge etc.).					
5. I can take into account the affective needs of learners (sense of achievement, enjoyment etc.).					
6. I can take into account and assess the expectations and impact of educational stakeholders (employers, parents, funding agencies etc.).					
7. I can take into account attainment target levels set in curricula (e.g. deriving from the <i>Common European Framework of Reference</i>)					
C. The Role of the Language Teacher					
1. I can promote the value and benefits of language learning to learners, parents and others.					
2. I can appreciate and make use of the value added to the classroom environment by learners with diverse cultural backgrounds.					
3. I can take into account the knowledge of other languages learners may					

already possess and help them to build on this knowledge when learning additional languages.					
4. I can draw on appropriate theories of language, learning, culture etc. and relevant research findings to guide my teaching.					
5. I can critically assess my teaching on the basis of experience, learner feedback and learning outcomes and adapt it accordingly.					
6. I can critically assess my teaching in relation to theoretical principles.					
7. I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build this into my teaching.					
8. I can observe my peers, recognize different methodological aspects of their teaching and offer them constructive feedback.					
9. I can locate relevant articles, journals and research findings relating to aspects of teaching and learning.					
10. I can identify and investigate specific pedagogical/ didactic issues related to my learners or my teaching in the form of action research.					
D. Institutional Resources and Constraints					
1. I can assess how I might use the resources available in my school (OHP, computers, library etc.).					
2. I can recognize the organizational constraints and resource limitations existent at my school and adapt my teaching accordingly.					
Methodology					
A. Speaking/Spoken Interaction					
1. I can create a supportive atmosphere that invites learners to take part in speaking activities.					
2. I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to encourage learners of differing abilities to participate.					
3. I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to encourage learners to express their opinions, identity, culture etc.					
4. I can evaluate and select a range of meaningful speaking and interactional activities to develop fluency (discussion, role play, problem solving etc.).					
5. I can evaluate and select different activities to help learners to become aware of and use different text types (telephone conversations, transactions, speeches etc.).					
6. I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials etc.).					
7. I can evaluate and select activities which help learners to participate in ongoing spoken exchanges (conversations, transactions etc.) and to initiate or respond to utterances appropriately.					
8. I can evaluate and select various activities to help learners to identify and					

use typical features of spoken language (informal language, fillers etc.).					
9. I can help learners to use communication strategies (asking for clarification, comprehension checks etc.) and compensation strategies (paraphrasing, simplification etc) when engaging in spoken interaction.					
10. I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of, discriminate and help them to pronounce sounds in the target language.					
11. I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and help them to use stress, rhythm and intonation.					
12. I can evaluate and select a range of oral activities to develop accuracy (grammar, word choice etc.).					
B. Writing/Written Interaction					
1. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to encourage learners to develop their creative potential.					
2. I can evaluate and select a range of meaningful writing activities to help learners become aware of and use appropriate language for different text types (letters, stories, reports etc).					
3. I can evaluate and select texts in a variety of text types to function as good examples for the learners' writing.					
4. I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate writing (authentic materials, visual aids etc.).					
5. I can evaluate and select activities which help learners to participate in written exchanges (emails, job applications etc.) and to initiate or respond to texts appropriately.					
6. I can help learners to gather and share information for their writing tasks.					
7. I can help learners to plan and structure written texts (e.g. by using mind maps, outlines etc.).					
8. I can help learners to monitor, reflect on, edit and improve their own writing.					
9. I can use peer-assessment and feedback to assist the writing process.					
10. I can use a variety of techniques to help learners to develop awareness of the structure, coherence and cohesion of a text and produce texts accordingly.					
11. I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and use spelling patterns and irregular spelling.					
12. I can evaluate and select writing activities to consolidate learning (grammar, vocabulary, spelling etc.).					
C. Listening					
1. I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learners.					

2. I can provide a range of pre-listening activities which help learners to orientate themselves to a text.					
3. I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when listening.					
4. I can design and select different activities in order to practice and develop different listening strategies (listening for gist, specific information etc.)					
5. I can design and select different activities which help learners to recognize and interpret typical features of spoken language (tone of voice, intonation, style of speaking etc.).					
6. I can help learners to apply strategies to cope with typical aspects of spoken language (background noise, redundancy etc.).					
7. I can help learners to apply strategies to cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary of a text.					
8. I can evaluate and select a variety of post-listening tasks to provide a bridge between listening and other skills.					
D. Reading					
1. I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learners.					
2. I can provide a range of pre-reading activities to help learners to orientate themselves to a text.					
3. I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when reading.					
4. I can apply appropriate ways of reading a text in class (e.g. aloud, silently, in groups etc.).					
5. I can set different activities in order to practice and develop different reading strategies according to the purpose of reading (skimming, scanning etc.).					
6. I can help learners to develop different strategies to cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary in a text.					
7. I can evaluate and select a variety of post-reading tasks to provide a bridge between reading and other skills.					
8. I can recommend books appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learners.					
9. I can help learners to develop critical reading skills (reflection, interpretation, analysis etc.).					
E. Grammar					
1. I can introduce a grammatical item and help learners to practice it through meaningful contexts and appropriate texts.					

2. I can introduce, and help students to deal with, new or unknown items of grammar in a variety of ways (teacher presentation, awareness-raising, discovery etc.).					
3. I can deal with questions learners may ask about grammar and, if necessary, refer to appropriate grammar reference books.					
4. I can use grammatical metalanguage if and when appropriate to the learners' needs.					
5. I can evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities, which support learning and encourage oral and written communication.					
F. Vocabulary					
1. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to learn vocabulary.					
2. I can evaluate and select tasks which help learners to use new vocabulary in oral and written contexts.					
3. I can evaluate and select activities which enhance learners' awareness of register differences.					
G. Culture					
1. I can evaluate and select a variety of texts, source materials and activities which awaken learners' interest in and help them to develop their knowledge and understanding of their own and the other language culture (cultural facts, events, attitudes and identity etc.).					
2. I can create opportunities for learners to explore the culture of target language communities out of class (Internet, emails etc).					
3. I can evaluate and select a variety of texts, source materials and activities which make learners aware of similarities and differences in socio-cultural 'norms of behavior'.					
4. I can evaluate and select activities (role plays, simulated situations etc.) which help learners to develop their socio-cultural competence.					
5. I can evaluate and select a variety of texts, source material and activities which help learners to reflect on the concept of 'otherness' and understand different value systems.					
6. I can evaluate and select texts, source materials and activities to make the learners aware of stereotyped views and challenge these.					
7. I can evaluate and select activities which enhance the learners' intercultural awareness.					
8. I can evaluate and select a variety of texts and activities to make learners aware of the interrelationship between culture and language.					
Resources					
1. I can identify and evaluate a range of course books/materials appropriate for the age, interests and the language level of the learners.					

2. I can select those texts and language activities from course books appropriate for my learners.					
3. I can locate and select listening and reading materials appropriate for the needs of my learners from a variety of sources, such as literature, mass media and the Internet.					
4. I can make use of ideas and materials included in teachers' handbooks and resource books.					
5. I can design learning materials and activities appropriate for my learners.					
6. I can recommend dictionaries and other reference books useful for my learners.					
7. I can guide learners to produce materials for themselves and for other learners.					
8. I can select and use ICT materials and activities in the classroom which are appropriate for my learners.					
9. I can design ICT materials and activities appropriate for my learners.					
10. I can guide learners to use the Internet for information retrieval.					
11. I can use and critically assess ICT learning programmes and platforms.					
Lesson Planning					
A. Identification of Learning Objectives					
1. I can identify curriculum requirements and set learning aims and objectives suited to my learners' needs and interests.					
2. I can plan specific learning objectives for individual lessons and/or for a period of teaching.					
3. I can set objectives which challenge learners to reach their full potential.					
4. I can set objectives which take into account the differing levels of ability and special educational needs of the learners.					
5. I can decide whether to formulate objectives in terms of skills, topics, situations, linguistic systems (functions, notions, forms etc.).					
6. I can set objectives which encourage learners to reflect on their learning.					
B. Lesson Content					
1. I can structure lesson plans and/or plan for periods of teaching in a coherent and varied sequence of content.					

2. I can vary and balance activities to include a variety of skills and competences.					
3. I can plan activities to ensure the interdependence of listening, reading, writing and speaking.					
4. I can plan activities to emphasize the interdependence of language and culture.					
5. I can plan activities which link grammar and vocabulary with communication.					
6. I can plan to teach elements of other subjects using the target language (cross- curricular teaching, CLIL etc.).					
7. I can identify time needed for specific topics and activities and plan accordingly.					
8. I can design activities to make the learners aware and build on their existing knowledge.					
9. I can vary and balance activities to enhance and sustain the learners' motivation and interest.					
10. I can vary and balance activities in order to respond to individuals learners' learning styles.					
11. I can take on board learners' feedback and comments and incorporate this in future lessons.					
12. I can involve learners in lesson planning.					
C. Organization					
1. I can select from and plan a variety of organizational forms (frontal, individual, pair, group work) as appropriate.					
2. I can plan for learner presentations and learner interaction.					
3. I can plan when and how to use the target language, including metalanguage I may need in the classroom.					
4. I can plan lessons and periods of teaching with other teachers and/or student teachers (team teaching, with other subject teachers etc.).					
Conducting a Lesson					
A. Using Lesson Plans					
1. I can start a lesson in an engaging way.					
2. I can be flexible when working from a lesson plan and respond to learner					

interests as the lesson progresses.					
3. I can ensure smooth transitions between activities and tasks for individuals, groups and the whole class.					
4. I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur.					
5. I can time classroom activities to reflect individual learners' attention spans.					
6. I can finish off a lesson in a focused way.					
B. Content					
1. I can present language content (new and previously encountered items of language, topics etc.) in ways which are appropriate for individuals and specific groups of learners.					
2. I can relate what I teach to learners' knowledge and previous language learning experiences.					
3. I can relate what I teach to current events in local and international contexts.					
4. I can relate the language I am teaching to the culture of those who speak it.					
C. Interaction with Learners					
1. I can settle a group of learners into a room and gain their attention at the beginning of a lesson.					
2. I can keep and maximize the attention of learners during a lesson.					
3. I can be responsive and react supportively to learner initiative and interaction.					
4. I can encourage learner participation whenever possible.					
5. I can cater for a range of learning styles.					
6. I can make explicit and help learners to develop appropriate learning strategies.					
D. Classroom Management					
1. I can take on different roles according to the needs of the learners and requirements of the activity (resource person, mediator, supervisor etc.).					
2. I can create opportunities for and manage individual, partner, group and whole class work.					

3. I can make and use resources efficiently (flashcards, charts etc.).					
4. I can manage and use instructional media efficiently (OHP, ICT, video etc.).					
5. I can supervise and assist learners' use of different forms of ICT both in and outside the classroom.					
E. Classroom Language					
1. I can conduct a lesson in the target language.					
2. I can decide when it is appropriate to use the target language and when not to.					
3. I can use the target language as metalanguage.					
4. I can use various strategies when learners do not understand the target language.					
5. I can encourage learners to use the target language in their activities.					
6. I can encourage learners to relate the target language to other languages they speak or have learned where and when this is helpful.					
Independent Learning					
A. Learner Autonomy					
1. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to reflect on their existing knowledge and competences.					
2. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to identify and reflect on individual learning processes and learning styles.					
3. I can guide and assist learners in setting their own aims and objectives and in planning their own learning.					
4. I can evaluate and select tasks which help learners to reflect on and develop specific learning strategies and study skills.					
5. I can assist learners in choosing tasks and activities according to their individual needs and interests.					
6. I can help learners to reflect on and evaluate their own learning processes and evaluate the outcomes.					
B. Homework					
1. I can evaluate and select tasks most suited to be carried out by learners at home.					
2. I can set homework in cooperation with learners.					

3. I can provide necessary support for learners in order for them to do homework independently and assist them with time management.					
4. I can assess homework according to valid and transparent criteria.					
C. Projects					
1. I can plan and manage project work according to relevant aims and objectives.					
2. I can plan and organize cross-curricular project work myself or in cooperation with other teachers.					
3. I can assist the learners in their choices during the various stages of project work.					
4. I can encourage learners to reflect on their work (diaries, logs etc.).					
5. I can help learners to use relevant presentation tools.					
6. I can assess the process and outcome of project work in cooperation with learners.					
D. Portfolios					
1. I can set specific aims and objectives of portfolio work (for coursework, for continuous assessment etc.).					
2. I can plan and structure portfolio work.					
3. I can supervise and give constructive feedback on portfolio work.					
4. I can assess portfolios in relation to valid and transparent criteria.					
5. I can encourage self- and peer assessment of portfolio work.					
E. Virtual Learning Environments					
1. I can use various ICT resources (email, web sites, computer programmes etc.).					
2. I can advise learners on how to find and evaluate appropriate ICT resources (web sites, search engines. computer programmes etc.).					
3. I can initiate and facilitate various learning environments (learning platforms, discussion forums, web pages etc.).					
F. Extra-curricular Activities					
1. I can recognize when and where the need for extra-curricular activities to enhance learning arises (learner magazines, clubs, excursions etc.).					
2. I can set aims and objectives for school trips, exchanges and international					

cooperation programmes.					
3. I can help to organize exchanges in cooperation with relevant resource persons and institutions.					
4. I can evaluate the learning outcomes of school trips, exchanges and international cooperation programmes.					
Assessment of Learning					
A. Designing Assessment Tools					
1. I can evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (tests, portfolios, self-assessment etc.) appropriate to learning aims and objectives.					
2. I can negotiate with learners how their work and progress should best be assessed.					
3. I can design and use in-class activities to monitor and assess learners' participation and performance.					
B. Evaluation					
1. I can identify strengths and areas for improvement in a learner's performance.					
2. I can assess a learner's ability to work independently and collaboratively.					
3. I can use the process and results of assessment to inform my teaching and plan learning for individuals and groups (i.e. formative assessment).					
4. I can present my assessment of a learner's performance and progress in the form of a descriptive evaluation, which is transparent and comprehensible to the learner, parents and others.					
5. I can use appropriate assessment procedures to chart and monitor a learner's progress (reports, checklists, grades etc.).					
6. I can use assessment scales from the Common European Framework of Reference.					
7. I can use a valid institutional/national/international grading system in my assessment of a learner's performance.					
8. I can assign grades for tests and examinations using procedures which are reliable and transparent.					
C. Self- and Peer Assessment					
1. I can help learners to set personal targets and assess their own performance.					
2. I can help learners to engage in peer assessment.					
3. I can help learners to use the <i>European Language Portfolio</i> .					
D. Language Performance					
1. I can assess a learner's ability to produce a spoken text according to					

criteria such as content, range, accuracy, fluency, appropriacy of register etc.					
2. I can assess a learner's ability to produce a written text according to criteria such as content, range, accuracy, cohesion and coherence etc.					
3. I can assess a learner's ability to understand and interpret a spoken text such as listening for gist, specific or detailed information, implication etc.					
4. I can assess a learner's ability to understand and interpret a written text such as reading for gist, specific or detailed information, implication etc.					
5. I can assess a learner's ability to engage in spoken interaction according to criteria such as content, range, accuracy, fluency and conversational strategies.					
6. I can assess a learner's ability to engage in written interaction according to criteria such as content, range, accuracy and appropriacy of response etc.					
E. Culture					
1. I can assess the learners' knowledge of cultural facts, events etc. of the target language communities.					
2. I can assess the learners' ability to make comparisons between their own and the culture of target language communities.					
3. I can assess the learner's ability to respond and act appropriately in encounters with the target language culture.					
F. Error Analysis					
1. I can analyze learners' errors and identify the processes that may cause them.					
2. I can provide constructive feedback to learners concerning their errors/interlanguage.					
3. I can deal with errors that occur in class in a way which supports learning processes and communication.					
4. I can deal with errors that occur in spoken and written language in ways which support learning processes and do not undermine confidence and communication.					

APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire I

THE USE OF THE EPOSTL

This questionnaire has been prepared in order to assess the ELT students' perceptions of EPOSTL practices at Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Program. The data gathered via this questionnaire will be used in my doctoral dissertation "A Complementary Study on European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) Which Is Used as a Reflection Tool for Teacher Education Programme in Relation to the European Profiling Grid", which I write as a part of my doctoral studies at Hacettepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences. The answers will be kept confidential. Thank you for answering the questions truly and sincerely.

Inst. Ayfer SU BERGİL, MA

A. Please give information about your impressions of EPOSTL.

1. What was your first impression of the EPOSTL?

2. Which sections of the EPOSTL did you use/would you prefer to use before, during and after your Practice Teaching – Personal Statement, Self-Assessment, Dossier?

Before Practice Teaching: a) Personal Statement b) Self-Assessment c) Dossier

While Practice Teaching: a) Personal Statement b) Self-Assessment c) Dossier

After Practice Teaching: a) Personal Statement b) Self-Assessment c) Dossier

B. Estimate the level of correlation between the learning outcomes of the compulsory courses and the teacher competences defined by the descriptors in the EPOSTL.

3. Please select one option on a scale ranging from 1=not correlated, 2= less correlated, 3= correlated, 4= very correlated to 5= fully correlated.

Compulsory subject-specific courses	Correlation Levels				
	Not Correlated	Less Correlated	Correlated	Very Correlated	Fully Correlated
	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction to Teaching Profession	1	2	3	4	5
Contextual Grammar I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Advanced Reading I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Advanced Writing I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Listening and Phonetics I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Oral Communication Skills I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Computer Technologies I and II	1	2	3	4	5

Teaching and Principles of Teaching	1	2	3	4	5
English Literature I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Linguistics I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Approaches to English Language Teaching I and II	1	2	3	4	5
English-Turkish Translation	1	2	3	4	5
Turkish- English Translation	1	2	3	4	5
Oral Expression and Public Speaking	1	2	3	4	5
Language Acquisition	1	2	3	4	5
Testing and Evaluation in ELT	1	2	3	4	5
ELT Methodology I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Classroom Management	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Foreign Language to Young Learners I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Literature and Language Teaching I and II	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Technologies and Material Design	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching of Language Skills	1	2	3	4	5
Special Education	1	2	3	4	5
Guidance	1	2	3	4	5
Material Adaptation and Development in FLT	1	2	3	4	5
Comparative Education	1	2	3	4	5

Education System and School Management	1	2	3	4	5
School Experience	1	2	3	4	5
Practice Teaching	1	2	3	4	5

C. Do you agree with the following statements?

4. Please circle the number on a scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, to 5=strongly agree.

Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
1-The EPOSTL made me think about different aspects of teacher education.	1	2	3	4	5
2-The EPOSTL helped me to understand what competencies a teacher of foreign languages should have.	1	2	3	4	5
3-The EPOSTL made me aware of the competencies I have developed as well as those I still need to develop.	1	2	3	4	5
4-The EPOSTL helped me to log my progress.	1	2	3	4	5
5-The EPOSTL helped me to understand the relationship between underlying knowledge and practical skills in the process of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
6-The EPOSTL is a good instrument for the self-assessment of teacher competencies.	1	2	3	4	5
7-The EPOSTL is a useful teaching and learning device.	1	2	3	4	5
8-The EPOSTL can be used effectively during teacher education at the faculties.	1	2	3	4	5
9-Elective courses also contributed to the development of teacher competency.	1	2	3	4	5
10-Personal statement section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL.	1	2	3	4	5
11-Self-assessment section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL.	1	2	3	4	5
12-Dossier section of EPOSTL is the most useful part of EPOSTL.	1	2	3	4	5
13-EPOSTL is a waste of time for teacher education.	1	2	3	4	5
14-Compulsory courses attributes most to the teacher competencies defined by EPOSTL.	1	2	3	4	5
15-EPOSTL is a lifelong tool that will guide my Practice Teachings in detail.	1	2	3	4	5

7b. Do you have any suggestions for improvement of any sections of the EPOSTL? If so, what would your suggestions be?

APPENDIX 4: European Profiling Grid Scale (EPG)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

(for Mentors and Supervisors)

Please read the statements below carefully and write your responses in the spaces provided. With questions consisting of choices, please mark the most appropriate choice with a tick (√).

The name of school you are attending now:

Gender:

- Male Female

Age:

- 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55+

Years of Experience:

- No experience 1-3 4-5 6-10 11+

Department:

- English Language Teaching (ELT)
 English Language and Literature (ELL)
 American Language and Literature (ALL)
 Linguistics (LIN)
 Translation and Interpreting (Tr&In)
 OTHER

Education:

- BA MA PhD

A Guide for Filling in The European Profiling Grid for Each Student

The European Profiling Grid						
TRAINING AND QUALIFICATIONS						
	Developmental Phase 1		Developmental Phase 2		Developmental Phase 3	
	1.1.	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2
Language proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is studying the target language at tertiary level has achieved B1 proficiency in the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is studying the target language at tertiary level has achieved B2 proficiency in the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has gained a B2 examination certificate in the target language and has oral competence at C1 level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has gained a C1 examination certificate in the target language, or: has a degree in the target language and proven proficiency at C1 level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has gained a C2 examination certificate, or: has a degree in the target language and proven proficiency at C2 level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a language degree or C2 examination certificate plus a natural command of the target language, or: has native speaker competence in the target language
Education & Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is undertaking preliminary training as a language teacher at a teacher training college, university or a private institution offering a recognized language teaching qualification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has completed part of her/his initial training in language awareness and methodology, enabling her/him to begin teaching the target language, but has not yet gained a qualification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has gained an initial qualification after successfully completing a minimum of 60 hours of documented structured training in teaching the target language, which included supervised Practice Teaching or: has completed a number of courses or modules of her/his degree in the target language and/or language teaching pedagogy without yet gaining the degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a degree in the target language with a language pedagogy component involving supervised Practice Teaching, or: has an internationally recognized (minimum 120 hour) certificate in teaching the target language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a degree or degree module in the target language involving supervised Practice Teaching, or: has an internationally recognized (minimum 120 hour) certificate in teaching the target language and also: has participated in at least 100 hours of further structured in-service training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has completed a master's degree or degree module in language pedagogy or applied linguistics, involving supervised Practice Teaching if this was not part of earlier training, or: has a post graduate or professional diploma in language teaching (min. 200 hours course length) has had additional training in specialist areas (e.g. teaching the language for specific purposes, testing, teacher training)
Assessed Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is gaining experience by teaching parts of lessons and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has had experience of being supervised, observed and positively assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in initial training, has had a total of at least 2 hours of successful documented, assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in training, has had a total of at least 6 hours of successful documented, assessed Practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has been observed and assessed for at least 10 hours during Practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has been observed and assessed for at least 14 hours during Practice Teaching and real teaching, and has

	sharing experience with a colleague who is providing feedback	while teaching individual lessons • has had experience of running teaching activities with small groups of students or fellow trainees ('micro-teaching')	Practice Teaching at least two levels • in real teaching has been observed and had positive documented feedback on 3 hours of lessons	Teaching at least two levels • in real teaching has been observed and had positive documented feedback on 6 hours of lessons at three or more levels	Teaching and real teaching at various levels and with different types of learner, and has received positive documented feedback on this	received documented feedback on this • has been assessed as a mentor or observer of less experienced teachers
Teaching Experience	• has taught some lessons or parts of lessons at one or two levels,	• has own class(es) but only experience at one or two levels	• has between 200 and 800 hours, documented unassisted teaching experience • has taught classes at several levels	has between 800 and 2,400 hours, documented teaching experience: • at various levels • in more than one teaching and learning context	has between 2,400 and 4,000 hours of documented teaching experience, including: • at all levels except C2 • in several different teaching and learning contexts	• has at least 6,000 hours, documented teaching • has taught in many different teaching and learning contexts • has experience of mentoring/training other teachers

KEY TEACHING COMPETENCES						
Development phase	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2
Methodology: knowledge and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has basic understanding of different language learning theories and methods can select new techniques and materials, with advice from colleagues can identify techniques and materials for different teaching and learning contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has basic understanding of different language learning theories and methods can select new techniques and materials, with advice from colleagues can identify techniques and materials for different teaching and learning contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is familiar with language learning theories and methods is familiar with techniques and materials for two or more levels can evaluate from a practical perspective the suitability of techniques and materials for different teaching contexts can take into account the needs of particular groups when choosing which methods and techniques to use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is well acquainted with language learning theories and methods, learning styles and learning strategies can identify the theoretical principles behind teaching techniques and materials can use appropriately a variety of teaching techniques and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can provide theoretical justification for the teaching approach being used and for a very wide range of techniques and materials can use a very wide range of teaching techniques, activities and materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a detailed knowledge of theories of language teaching and learning and shares it with colleagues can follow up observation of colleagues with practical, methodologically sound feedback to develop their range of teaching techniques can select and create appropriate tasks and materials for any level for use by colleagues
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can conduct and mark end of unit tests from the course book 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can conduct and mark progress tests (e.g. end of term, end of year) when given the material to do so can conduct oral tests when given the material to do so can prepare and conduct appropriate revision activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can conduct regular progress tests including an oral component, can identify areas for students to work on from the results of tests and assessment tasks can give clear feedback on the strengths and weaknesses identified and set priorities for individual work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can select and conduct regular assessment tasks to verify learners' progress in language and skills areas can use an agreed marking system to identify different types of errors in written work in order to increase learners' language awareness can prepare for and coordinate placement testing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can design materials and tasks for progress assessment (oral and written) can use video recordings of learners' interactions to help them recognize their strengths and weaknesses can apply CEFR criteria reliably to assess learners' proficiency in speaking and writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can develop assessment tasks for all language skills and language knowledge at any level can apply CEFR criteria reliably to assess learners' proficiency in speaking and writing at all levels and help less experienced colleagues to do so. can create valid formal tests to determine whether learners have reached a given CEFR level. can run CEFR standardization

<p style="text-align: center;">Lesson and course planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can link a series of activities in a lesson plan, when given materials to do so 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can find activities to supplement those in the textbook • can ensure coherence between lessons by taking account of the outcomes of previous lessons in planning the next • can adjust lesson plans as instructed to take account of learning success and difficulties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can use a syllabus and specified materials to prepare lesson plans that are balanced and meet the needs of the group • can plan phases and timing of lessons with different objectives • can compare learners' needs and refer to these in planning main and supplementary objectives for lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can plan a course or part of a course taking account of the syllabus, the needs of different students and the available materials • can design tasks to exploit the linguistic and communicative potential of materials • can design tasks to meet individual needs as well as course objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can conduct a thorough analysis and use it to develop a detailed and balanced course plan that includes recycling and revision • can design different tasks based on the same source material for use with learners at different levels • can use analysis of learner difficulties in order to decide on action points for upcoming lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can design specialized courses for different contexts that integrate communicative and linguistic content appropriate to the specialism • can guide colleagues in assessing and taking account of differing individual needs in planning courses and preparing lessons • can take responsibility for reviewing the curriculum and syllabuses for different courses
<p style="text-align: center;">Interaction management and monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can give clear instructions and organize an activity, with guidance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can manage teacher-class interaction • can alternate between teaching the whole class and pair or group practice giving clear instructions • can involve learners in pair and group work based on activities in a course book 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can set up and manage pair and group work efficiently and can bring the class back together • can monitor individual and group activities • can provide clear feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can set up a varied and balanced sequence of class, group and pair work in order to meet the lesson objectives • can organize task-based learning • can monitor learner performance effectively • can provide/ elicit clear feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can set up task-based learning in which groups carry out different activities at the same time • can monitor individual and group performances accurately & thoroughly • can provide/ elicit individual feedback in various ways • can use the monitoring and feedback in designing further acts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can set up, monitor and provide support to groups and individuals at different levels in the same classroom working on different tasks • can use a wide range of techniques to provide/ elicit feedback

ENABLING COMPETENCES						
Development phase	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2
Intercultural competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> understands that the relationship between language and culture is an important factor in language teaching and learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is learning about the relevance of cultural issues in teaching can introduce learners to relevant differences in cultural behavior and traditions can create an atmosphere of tolerance and understanding in classes where there is social and cultural diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> understands and is able to take account of relevant stereotypical views can use own awareness to expand students' knowledge of relevant cultural behavior, e.g. politeness, body language etc. can recognize the importance of avoiding intercultural problems in the classroom and promotes inclusivity and mutual respect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can help learners to analyze stereotypical views and prejudices can integrate into lessons key areas of difference in intercultural behavior (e.g., politeness, body language, etc.) can select materials that are well matched to the cultural horizon of learners and yet extends this further using activities appropriate to the group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can use web searches, projects and presentations to expand own and learners understanding and appreciation of intercultural issues can develop learners' ability to analyze and discuss social and cultural similarities and differences can anticipate and manage effectively areas of intercultural sensitivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can use her/his extensive knowledge of intercultural issues when this is appropriate to assist less experienced colleagues can develop colleagues' ability to deal with cultural issues, suggesting techniques to defuse disagreements and critical incidents if they arise can create activities, tasks and materials for own and colleagues' use and CAN seek feedback on these
Language awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can use dictionaries and grammar books etc as reference sources can answer simple questions about language that are frequently asked at levels she/he is teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can give correct models of language form and usage adapted to the level of the learners at lower levels can give answers to language queries that are not necessarily complete but that are appropriate for lower level learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can give correct models of language form and usage appropriate for the level concerned, except at advanced levels (C1-2) can give answers to questions about the target language appropriate for the level concerned, except at advanced levels (C1-2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can give correct models of language form and usage, for all levels up except at C2 on almost all occasions can recognize and understand the language problem that a learner is having can give answers to questions about the target language that are appropriate for the level concerned except at C2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can select and give correct models of language form and usage on almost all occasions at all levels can answer almost all language queries fully and accurately and give clear explanations, can use a range of techniques to guide learners in working out answers to their own language queries and correcting their errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can always give full, accurate answers to queries from students about different aspects of language and usage can explain subtle differences of form, meaning and usage at C1 and C2 levels

<p style="text-align: center;">Digital Media</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can use word-processing software to write a worksheet, following standard conventions • can search for potential teaching material on the internet • can download resources from websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can create lessons with downloaded texts, pictures, graphics, etc. • can organize computer files in logically ordered folders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can use software for handling images, DVDs, and sound files • can use any standard Windows/Mac software, including media players • can recommend appropriate online materials to students and colleagues • can use a data projector for lessons involving the internet, a DVD etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can set and supervise on-line work for learners • can use software for handling images, DVDs, and sound files 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can train students to select and use on-line exercises appropriate to their individual needs • can edit and adapt sound and video files • can show colleagues how to use new software and hardware • can coordinate project work with digital media (using, for example, a camera, the internet, social networks) • can troubleshoot most problems with classroom digital equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can train students to use any available classroom digital equipment (IWB incl.), their mobiles, tablets etc. profitably for language learning • can show colleagues how to exploit the teaching potential of available digital equipment and internet-based resources • can design blended learning modules using a learning management system e.g. Moodle
---	---	--	--	--	---	--

PROFESSIONALISM						
Development phase	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2
Professional conduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • seeks feedback on her/his Practice Teaching and other work • seeks advice from colleagues and handbooks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acts in accordance with the mission and regulations of the institution. • liaises with other teachers about students and lesson preparation • acts on trainers' feedback after lesson observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welcomes opportunities to share class teaching (team-teach) with colleagues at one or two levels • acts on feedback from colleagues who observe her/his teaching • contributes to the institution's development and good management and reacts positively to changes and challenges in the institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welcomes opportunities to be observed by managers and colleagues and receive feedback on teaching • prepares for and participates actively in professional development activities • actively participates in the development of the institution and its educational and administrative systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acts as mentor to less experienced colleagues • leads training sessions with support from a colleague or when given material to use • observes colleagues and provides useful feedback • when the opportunity arises, takes responsibility for certain projects related to the development of the institution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creates training modules for less experienced teachers • runs teacher development programmes • observes and assesses colleagues who are teaching at all levels • organizes opportunities for colleagues to observe one another
Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completes routine tasks like taking the attendance register, giving out/collecting/returning materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delivers required plans and records of lessons correctly completed and on time • marks homework and tests efficiently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • handles marking and report writing efficiently • keeps clear, well-organized records of lessons • hands in documents and feedback by time requested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • handles administrative tasks around the job efficiently • anticipates regular but less frequent tasks and completes them in good time • deals with students' issues, enquiries, feedback appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coordinates administrative tasks with others; collates information, reports, opinions, etc. if asked to do so • takes responsibility for certain administrative tasks such as organizing teachers' meetings, gathering, analyzing and reporting on end of course feedback etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acts as course coordinator if asked to do so • liaises with enrolment dept / finance dept / sponsors / parents etc. as necessary • contributes actively to the design or review of administrative systems

The Name of Mentor:

The Name of Prospective Teacher:

Description of Developmental Phase:

0= extremely not developed (0-10%)

1= not developed (10-20%)

2= less developed (20-40%)

3= developed (40-60%)

4= very developed (60-80%)

5= fully developed (80-100%)

√=No idea

The European Profiling Grid								
Developmental Phases	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3		No Idea	
	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2		
TRAINING AND QUALIFICATIONS	0	1	2	3	4	5	√	
Lg. Proficiency								
Education & Training								
Assessed Teaching								
Teaching Experience								
KEY TEACHING COMPETENCES	0	1	2	3	4	5	√	
Methodology: knowledge and skills								
Assessment								
Lesson and course planning								
Interaction management and monitoring								
ENABLING COMPETENCES	0	1	2	3	4	5	√	
Intercultural competence								
Language awareness								
Digital Media								
PROFESSIONALISM	0	1	2	3	4	5	√	
Professional conduct								
Administration								

APPENDIX 5: Originality Report

The originality of this dissertation named as "**A Complementary Study on European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages in Relation to The European Profiling Grid**" by Ayfer SU BERGİL has been calculated 11% via the internet site of <http://turnitin.com/tr/>. This originality percentage excludes the references and includes citations of this dissertation.

The screenshot displays the Turnitin Document Viewer interface. The main document content is as follows:

A COMPLEMENTARY STUDY ON EUROPEAN PORTFOLIO FOR STUDENT TEACHERS OF LANGUAGES IN RELATION TO THE EUROPEAN PROFILING GRID

DİL ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARINA YÖNELİK AVRUPA PORTFOLYOSU ÜZERİNE AVRUPA PROFİL BELİRLEME GRİDİ İLE İLİŞKİLİ TAMAMLAYICI BİR ÇALIŞMA

Ayfer SU BERGİL

Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bilim Dalı İçin Öngördüğü
Doktora Tezi
olarak hazırlanmıştır.

2015

The 'Match Overview' sidebar on the right lists the following matches:

Match Number	Source	Percentage
1	Nergis, Aysegül "Fn" Publication	2%
2	www.slideshare.net Internet source	1%
3	epost2.ecml.at Internet source	1%
4	wolf.philippe.free.fr Internet source	1%
5	www.cpg-project.eu Internet source	1%
6	egrid.epg-project.eu Internet source	1%
7	www.professorjackrich... Internet source	<1%
8	www.casli.org Internet source	<1%

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information

<i>Name Surname</i>	Ayfer SU BERGİL
<i>Place of Birth</i>	Muri/İSVİÇRE
<i>Date of Birth</i>	23.04.1981

Education

<i>Highschool</i>	İçel 75. Yıl Anatolian Teacher's High School	2000
<i>BA</i>	Gazi University	2004
<i>MA</i>	Gaziosman Paşa University	2010
<i>Foreign Language</i>	English: Reading (Very good), Writing (Very good), Speaking (Very good)	

Work Experience

<i>Internships</i>	Ankara Atatürk Anatolian High School	2001(Spring)
	Ankara Yüce College	2003-2004
<i>Çalıştığı Kurumlar</i>	Tokat Çat Şehit Üsteğmen Ragıp Yılmaz Elementary School	2004-2006
	Amasya Merkez Girls' Vocational High School	2006-2009
	Amasya University	2009-

Academic Studies

Publications (National, international article, paper, poster etc.)

Su Bergil, A. (2009). How Does Speaking Achievement Differ in EFL classrooms in Accordance with Teaching Methods and Gender? Poster Presentation, 7th International METU Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics and Language Teaching on December 3rd-4th.

Su Bergil, A. & Atli, I. (2012). Different Perspectives on Teaching. 4th World Conference on Educational Sciences

Atli, I. & Su Bergil, A. (2012). The Effect of Pronunciation Instruction on Students' Overall Speaking Skills. 4th World Conference on Educational Sciences

Su Bergil, A. Sariçoban, A. , Atli, I. (2012). A Solution for Classroom Management Problems in EFL. The 3rd Black Sea ELT Conference "Technology: A Bridge to Language Learning". 15-17 November, 2012.

Atli, I., Sariçoban, A. , Su Bergil, A. (2012). Short Term Benefits of the Use of Self-Transcription Exercises in Speaking Classes. The 3rd Black Sea ELT Conference “Technology: A Bridge to Language Learning”. 15-17 November, 2012.

Sariçoban, A. , Su Bergil, A. (2015). The Use of EPOSTL to Determine The Self-Efficacy Of Prospective EFL Teachers: Raising Awareness in English Language Teacher Education. IInd International Eurasian Educational Research Congress.

Seminars and Workshops

MEB İngilizce Öğretim Yöntemleri Semineri 2007

TÜBİTAK Bilgilendirme ve Eğitim Semineri 2012

Türkiye’de İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programlarının İşleyişi, Sorunları ve Çözüm Önerileri Çalıştayı 2014

British Council Continuing Professional Development Seminars (Online) 2014

Contact Information

E-mail address	ayfersubergil@amasya.edu.tr ayfersubergil@gmail.com ayfer_su@yahoo.com
-----------------------	--

Date of Jury	31.07.2015
---------------------	------------