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Abstract – The aim of this study is to explore the differences in student teachers’ experiences and expectations in teaching practice. For this purpose four questions were formulated to examine student teachers’ experiences and expectations in general and according to gender, type of partner school they attend for teaching practice, and number of sessions they teach during teaching practice. A total of 230 fourth year (senior) prospective teachers from English Language Teaching departments of different Faculties of Education participated in the study. A bipolar 33 item (five-point Likert-type) questionnaire with an attached short information sheet was used for data collection. One-way ANOVA and t-test were the main statistical procedures utilized for data analysis. Findings of the study revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between student teachers’ experiences and expectations, that there was a difference between male and female student teachers’ experiences, but that there were no statistically significant differences according to the number of sessions they teach at practice school they attended.

Introduction

Along with efforts to improve and professionalize teaching, how beginning teachers learn to teach has been the focus of considerable amount of research since Dewey, who emphasized learner-centered instruction and who was a strong advocate of experiential teacher education (Huling, 1998). Since the act of teaching during teaching practice (practicum) sets the scene for teaching across the life span (Mc Dermott, Gromley, Rothenberg & Hammer, 1995; Zahorik, 1988), school experience components of teacher education programs contribute a lot to the process of learning to teach. Tomlinson (1995) draws attention to the general belief that teaching needs to be learned through engagement in the practice of teaching and suggests that student teaching serves prospective teachers with the opportunity of putting theory into practice and experiencing decision-making under the supervision of experienced practitioners: cooperating teachers (mentors) and university instructors (supervisors). Furthermore, Woods-Mays & Weasmer (2003) state that student teaching plays an important role in shaping pre-service teachers’ values, beliefs, and teaching skills.
Mayer & Goldsberry (1992, cited in McGlinn, 2003) also believe that the professional development of student teachers depends on opportunities to consider their beliefs in the light of experiences they encounter, where they will student teach, and with whom (Lemlech & Kaplan, 1990). Under supervision, student teachers develop skills in classroom management, learning process, planning, selecting teaching materials and strategies, and assessing pupil progress. During student teaching, a new pattern of thinking and knowing emerges with respect to understanding self as a teacher with the help of broadening pedagogical knowledge, applying and sharing new knowledge with cooperating teacher (mentor). Johnston (1994) emphasizes this by asserting that student teachers and supervising teachers require a clear understanding of the learning process in student teaching so they can actively take a role in making most of the often limited time spent in the classroom.

However, as Doreen (2000) states, for many reasons related to contexts and persons, the quality of teaching practice varies greatly in different settings that may not be designed to prepare teachers and may be beyond the control of institutions (McIntyre, 1990 in Sikula, Buttery & Guyton, 1996). For some student teachers, all the time spent in teaching practice will be meaningful and educative, for others that may be true only some of the time; still others may have several difficult or frustrating teaching practice experiences. Although the literature generally emphasizes the importance of teaching practice, its role in initial teacher education (pre-service education), responsibilities of all parties involved in the process and some of the problems encountered during the process, few studies address student teachers’ experiences and expectations in relation to some personal and contextual variables.

**Background of the present study**

In Turkey, it is common practice in teacher training programs for students to follow school experience studies that last two academic semesters and to be engaged in teaching practice for one academic semester—this in addition to following educational theory, subject area and teaching methods courses. The first school experience is scheduled in the second semester of the freshmen year or in the first semester of sophomore, and the second one is in the seventh semester of the four-year undergraduate program. Prospective teachers (students who study at faculties of education) are also supposed to attend a semester of teaching practice in the last semester in the program.

The focus of the present study is on teaching practice—an element of field experience which covers both school experience and teaching practice—of
student teachers in English language teaching departments that takes place in the second semester of the senior (8th semester) year. English Language Teaching is a four-year program in which students are admitted on the basis of a nation-wide university entrance exam. All teacher training colleges (Faculties of Education) follow a similar program for the training of English Language Teachers. Prospective teachers in their senior year are assigned to schools (practice schools/partner school) for teaching practice, after these schools are determined in a district meeting held among faculty coordinators, province director of education, and school coordinators.

Student teachers start teaching practice after successfully completing the courses on teaching profession, teaching methods, planning instruction and evaluation, learning and development, and classroom management. In addition, student teachers are informed about the responsibilities they will take on and the tasks they will fulfill in teaching practice. A teaching practice guide book also covers the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in teaching practice. They have a cooperating teacher at school, and a supervisor (university instructor) at the university, responsible for guiding and leading student teaching. As it is stated in the regulations and rules of the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MONE, 1998), during the field experience, a cooperating teacher can accept up to 6 student teachers for monitoring in school experience or teaching practice. Every student teacher is expected to spend six hours at the partner school each week for 14 weeks (The Council of Higher Education, 1998). Student teachers also meet with their peers every week to share the observations they have noted in different schools during teaching practice under the guidance and supervision of their supervisors.

However, although regulations and rules are clearly stated regarding ‘field experiences’, there are some variables that influence the expectations and experiences of student teachers. Although understanding the expectations and experiences of student teachers is in itself of importance since understanding the relationship between the two would add to our knowledge about practice teaching, there are some other variables that mediate between each of these dimensions. Thus, this study focuses on student teachers’ experiences and expectations in relation to gender, number of teaching sessions (although 14 weeks are proposed, it can vary), type of partner school where teaching practice takes place (such as general public, private, and Anatolian high schools where the opportunities vary in terms of facilities, structures, and school climate in general), as well as an overall portrait of experiences and expectations of student teachers. In order to understand the role of these variables in experiences and expectations of student teachers, the following questions were explored:
– Is there a difference between what student teachers experience and what they expect in teaching practice?
– Do student teachers’ experiences and expectations about teaching practice differ in terms of gender?
– Do student teachers’ experiences and expectations about teaching practice differ in terms of type of practice school attended?
– Do student teachers’ experiences and expectations about teaching practice differ in terms of the number of teaching sessions they realize?

Method

Participants

The participants of this study were 228 (174 female and 54 male) student teachers from six Departments of English Language Teaching at six universities located in five different geographical regions in Turkey (out of seven geographical regions). These universities are among the large size ones in their region and each year admit between 60 and 140 students to the English Language Teaching Department. The participants were in their 4th year in the program and volunteered to participate in the study. Other than 19.1% of missing CGPA scores the rest had satisfactory (CGPA ≥ 2.00) or higher scores. The participants represent 35% of senior English Language students from these six universities attending their teaching practice. The selection of universities was based on a set of criteria that included (a) institutions followed similar teaching practice procedures, (b) they offered an English Language teaching program, and (c) they were willing to cooperate.

Data collection instrument

For the present study a five-point Likert-type questionnaire, ranging from 5 = ‘always’ to 1 = ‘never’, was designed to measure student teachers’ experiences and expectations separately. As a result two scores for each item were obtained: one for the experiences and one for the expectations.

In the development of the questionnaire, first, items were written based on the literature review of conceptual framework on student teaching, clinical experience, learning to teach, field experience as well as the rules and regulations regarding teaching practice in the manuals prepared by MONE (1998) and The Council of Higher Education (HEC) (1998) as guides for student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors. A list of draft items was formed and then
was given to two faculty members from the department of English Language teaching who were involved in student teaching for the revision of these items. Based on the feedback received from the faculty members the number of items was reduced from 38 to 33. Five items were eliminated because they were not clearly stated and there were items that tested the same aspect. Then, the questionnaire was sent to five faculty members including the two faculty in the first step. Two of the new faculty were from education sciences and one from an English Language Teaching Department, from a different institution, who were actively involved in student teaching activities or indirectly interested in field practice. Expert judgment and advice regarding the clarity of items was sought. In addition the questionnaire was administered to a group of 37 student teachers (not included in the group of participants) from a university other than the six included in this study. This was an attempt to ensure the validity of the questionnaire. After the data was collected, a further attempt to ensure validity was made by running a principle component analysis with Kaiser Normalization. Factor analysis carried out with the data obtained from 228 student teachers indicated that for both experience and expectation the instrument was one-dimensional. Most of the loading was on the first factors. The initial eigenvalues for the first factors were 14.64 and 15.39, and explained 26.28 % and 20 % of the total variance respectively. Even though there were other factors with eigenvalues greater than one, the scree plots (Green & Salkind, 2003) for experiences and expectations indicated one-dimension. The total variance explained by the three factors was 62.79 % for experiences and, 42 % for expectations.

The internal consistency coefficient was .96 for both experience and expectation indicating a high degree of reliability in this aspect. On the other hand the correlation between experience and expectation scores was 0.32, indicating that student teachers assessed their experiences and expectations rather independently.

An information sheet was also attached to the questionnaire for collecting data regarding student teachers’ gender, type of practice school attended and, the number of realized teaching sessions.

Data collection procedures

As for the data collection procedures the researcher contacted one faculty member from the English Language Teaching Department of each university selected for the study who then received, administered, and sent back the questionnaires to the researcher. Before the instrument was mailed for implementation, the necessary clearance from the institutions was obtained and the department heads were informed about the purpose and the contact person.
The questionnaire was administered to student teachers in a weekly colloquium session regularly held with student teachers under the supervision and guidance of their university instructors. Completion of the questionnaire by student teachers, as it was reported by the contact individuals, lasted approximately 40 minutes.

Data analysis

One-way analysis of variance and t-test was used for the comparison of subgroup means. As for the overall portrait of experiences and expectations descriptive procedures were utilized. Following one-way analysis of variance the pot-hoc multiple comparison test was used to determine the sources of differences if any. The type of post-hoc multiple comparison tests was decided on the bases of variance equality test. Experiences and expectations were treated as continuous variables; type of partner school attended and the number of teaching sessions were treated as limited category variables, and gender as dichotomous variable. The statistical analysis was carried out by using the SPPS for Windows 10.00 package (Green, Salkind & Akey, 2000; Green & Salkind, 2003).

Results

Findings of the present study are reported in two major parts, the overall descriptive portrait regarding student teachers’ experiences and expectations, and the influence of different variables on student teachers’ experiences and experiences. The sub-titles of the second part are formed by using the key words of the research questions.

Student teachers’ experiences and expectations

Descriptive analysis of the data indicated that student teachers had a higher expectation score than an experience score, indicating a gap between experiences and expectations in teaching practice. Data analysis revealed that student teachers were ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ informed about classroom measurement and evaluation procedures (35.5%, always = 42.1%), guide about lesson planning (31.7%, always = 49.6%), provided with written feedback (64.3%, always = 21.7%), guided about keeping student records (55.8%, always = 25.6%), guided about classroom management activities (26.2%, always = 51.5 %), supplied with copies of lesson observation forms (55.1%, always = 30.8%), guided about classroom activities (57.3%, always = 17.7%), guide about planning personal daily activities (40 %,
always = 40.4%), and informed about how to evaluate teaching practice activities (25.6 %, always = 57.3%) by the supervisors. On the other hand when student teachers’ expectations were examined in relation to the same items it was seen that they had high expectations for the same issues from their supervisors (94.7%, 86.9%, 73.2%, 74.5%, 87.2%, 79.1%, 70%, 77.4%, 84.9% respectively) (see Table 1).

A very similar result was found in student teachers’ experiences and expectations in relation to their work with cooperating teachers. Data analysis revealed that student teachers were ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ informed about how they were going to be evaluated in teaching practice (33%, always = 52.6%), informed about classroom evaluation procedures (28.3%, always = 44.8%), guided about selecting and using teaching materials (33.2%, always = 43.3%), provided with written feedback (68.7%, always = 19.6%), guided about lesson planning (36.3 %, always = 42.1%), guided about evaluation of teaching practice (28.5 %, always = 52.2%), helped to planning individual daily activities (40 %, always = 36.6%), informed about teaching methods and techniques (42.6%, always = 34.3%), guided about out-of-class teaching practice activities (61.3%, always = 22.2%), and provided with a copy of classroom observation form (64.5%, always = 26.8%) by cooperating teachers (see Table 1). In contrast to the low level of student teachers’ experiences they reported a higher level (‘generally’ or ‘always’) of expectation for the activities listed above (88.2%, 88.7%, 86.9%, 64.4%, 83.1%, 81.0%, 79.5%, 84.8%, 69.8%, 78.0% respectively) from the cooperating teachers.

It was interesting to observe that student teachers did not have a high expectation for written feedback from the cooperating teacher. This might be due to an assumption of student teachers that the cooperating teachers were responsible for such feedback. Furthermore, although the responsibilities of cooperating teachers were clearly specified in the partnership guide book (HEC, 1998), cooperating teachers might still not be well aware of the requirements. A parallel argument could be made for the supervisors regarding the provision of written feedback. The discrepancy between experiences and expectations may be related to how clearly supervisor and cooperating teacher roles are defined and fulfilled. As Dagmar (1992) emphasizes, the problem of role clarity could be a barrier to effective supervision.

A paired sample t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of students’ experiences and expectations. The result indicated that there was a significant difference between experience and expectation mean scores of student teachers \( t (229) = 18.11, p = .00 \). The student teachers’ expectation mean score was (\( M = 141.05, SD = 20.05 \)) significantly higher than the mean score for experiences (\( M = 105.41, SD = 29.54 \)). The mean difference between the scores of experiences and expectations was 35.64. This is an expected result because student teachers
**TABLE 1: Student teachers’ experiences and expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Never)</td>
<td>% Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor informed me about behaviors at partner school.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisor informed me about the aim of teaching practice.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor informed about teaching methods and techniques</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor clarified the evaluation procedures for teaching practice</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor informed me about classroom measurement and evaluation procedures</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisor informed me about rules I have to obey at partner school</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor guided me on lesson planning</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervisor has given me written feedback</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervisor has given me oral feedback</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supervisor guided me about keeping students records</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supervisor guided me about classroom management</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervisors supplied the copies of lesson observation forms</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Supervisor guided me about classroom activities</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supervisor guided me about planning my daily activities</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Supervisor informed me about teaching methods and techniques</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Supervised told me how to evaluate teaching practice activities</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The cooperating teacher (CT) informed me about the partner school</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. CT guided me about teaching methods and techniques</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CT clearly explained how I will be evaluated about teaching practice</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. CT informed me about classroom evaluation procedures</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. CT informed me about rules I had to obey at partner school</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. CT guided me about teaching skills</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. CT guided me about selecting and using teaching materials</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. CT guided about relationship and communication with people?</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. CT give me written feedback</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. CT give me oral feedback</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. CT guided me about lesson planning</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. CT guided me about classroom management</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. CT guided me about the evaluation of teaching practice</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. CT helped me in planning my daily teaching learning activities</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. CT informed me about new teaching method and techniques available</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. CT guided me about out of class activities (ceremonies, meetings etc.)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. CT handed me a copy of observation form and the necessary feedback</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this table percentages of 'generally' and 'always' and, the percentages for 'rarely' and 'never' are treated as 'always' and 'never' respectively. 'CT' stands for 'Cooperating teacher'. Percentages for 'sometimes' are not included in the Table.*
generally express high expectations for teaching practice. This difference could be also considered as a desire in student teachers to develop better skills in teaching. Student teachers high expectations could be a good incentive for cooperating teachers and supervising instructors to advance quality of supervision.

Gender differences in experiences and expectations

The second question addressed the difference between female and male student teachers’ experiences and expectations. There were 174 female and 54 male student teachers. The independent samples t-test was run for experiences and expectations separately. The independent samples t-test for experiences was significant, $t (82.18) = -2.09, p = .04$, (when equal variance was and was not assumed). Male student teachers’ experiences mean score was higher ($M = 113.09$, $SD = 31.31$) than female student teachers experiences mean score ($M = 103.1$, $SD = 28.54$), indicating that male students were satisfied with what happened during teaching practice. Though statistically it was not significant a similar difference was observed in expectation scores of male and female student teachers ($M = 144.00$, $M = 140.05$ respectively).

The independent samples t-test for expectation was not significant, $t (80.92) = 1.19, p = .23$ (when equal variance was and was not assumed). Male student teacher’s expectations mean score ($M = 144.00$, $SD = 21.82$) was not significantly different from female student’s expectations mean score ($M = 140.05$, $SD = 19.48$). The mean difference between female and male student teacher’s expectations was -3.94. That is, both female and male students had similar and relatively high expectations from teaching practice. This might be a reflection of the belief that teaching practice prepares students more adequately for the teaching profession. Similarly, Dagmar (1992) reports that 77% of university supervisors and 70% of cooperating teachers support the same notion.

Practice school differences in experiences and expectations

The third question addressed the difference in experiences and expectations of student teachers in terms of the type of practice school where they realized their teaching practice. Since the practice schools included in this study were all secondary level schools, three groups of schools were formed: general high schools, Anatolian high schools, and private high schools. The general high schools are free of charge and open to all students who successfully complete the primary education. Anatolian high schools, also public, admit students on the basis of a nation-wide selection and placement exam. Private high schools also accept students’ through a nation-wide exam, but they also use additional institutional
criteria. In addition they charge students tuition and fees. In this study there were 161 student teachers attending general high schools, 52 attending Anatolian high schools, and 15 attending private high schools. Differences among the three types of practice schools were compared separately for experiences and expectations.

The one-way ANOVA test for experiences was significant, $F(2, 225) = 6.36$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .054$. Because the overall $F$ test and the Levene’s test of equality was significant, Tukey’s test of multiple comparison was used. The follow-up test results indicated that there was a difference between the experiences of student teachers attending private high schools ($M = 126.67, SD = 29.23$) and those attending general high schools ($M = 101.72, SD = 26.45$), the difference was in favor of those attending private schools. There was no difference between the experiences of student teachers realizing their teaching practice at general high schools and Anatolian high schools ($M = 110.93, SD = 35.01$) as well as between Anatolian high schools and private high schools. The difference between private practice schools and general high schools may be attributed to differences in context and in the quality of cooperating teachers. Private schools employ teachers based on a screening process including portfolio, experience and interview. As Guyton & McIntyre (1990, in Sikula, Buttery & Guyton, 1996) suggest, the quality of student teaching can be affected by classroom sites that are not designed to prepare teachers.

As for the differences in expectations of student teachers in terms of the types of practice school attended, the result of ANOVA test was not significant, $F(2, 225) = 1.64$, $p = .19$, $\eta^2 = .014$. Because the overall $F$ test was not significant multiple comparison tests was not applied. That is, regardless of the type of practice school, student teachers had high expectations from teaching practice ($M = 143.96$ for Anatolian high schools, $M = 139.49$ for general high schools, and $M = 146.73$ for private schools). Consistent with what the relevant literature suggests, student teachers perceived teaching practice as an important aspect of initial teacher education, and the mean scores provided in the parenthesis for each subgroup might support this perception.

**Teaching sessions experiences and expectations**

The fourth question addressed the difference in experiences and expectations in terms of the number of sessions student teachers realized in teaching practice. For this purpose data on the number of teaching sessions were grouped first into four categories; one to five sessions constituted category one, six to ten sessions constituted category two, 11 to 15 sessions constituted category three, and 16 or more sessions constituted category four. Number of student teachers in each category was 101, 81, 17 and 6
respectively. Since the number of students in category four was low, it was combined with category three, so there were 23 student teachers in this category involving 11 or more sessions.

In order to examine the differences in terms of the number of teaching sessions one-way ANOVA was run for experiences and expectations separately. The results yielded no significant mean differences either for experiences, $F (2, 203) = 1.48$, $p = .23$, $\eta^2 = .014$ or for expectations, $F (2, 203) = 1.47$, $p = .23$, $\eta^2 = .014$. Since the overall $F$ tests were not significant multiple comparison tests were not conducted. The number of teaching sessions realized by student teachers in teaching practice, for this particular study, does not appear to affect student teachers’ experiences and expectations. This is contrary to the idea of expanding field practice. It is necessary to consider possible barriers to this result. These barriers might be invariability of the teaching practice school and sometime the classroom. In addition, descriptive data on number of teaching sessions indicated that 44% ($n=101$) of student teachers realized one to five sessions in teaching practice and 35% ($n=81$) realized six to ten sessions. In sum 79% ($n=182$) realized up to ten sessions. This might have diluted the real effect of more practice because only 21% of student teachers realized more than ten sessions.

**Discussion**

Overall, the results of the present study suggest that the student teachers who participated in the study rated expectations from teaching practice at a higher level than their experiences. This result pointed to a gap between expectations and experiences indicating that teaching practice does not meet the quality criteria student teachers had in mind.

Male student teachers were more positive about their teaching experiences than female student teachers, whereas both female and male students had similar expectations about teaching practice. Although no significant difference appeared in expectations, the experience mean scores of student teachers attending private high schools for teaching practice were higher than those who attended general high schools. Finally, it was found that neither the expectations nor the experiences differed in terms of the number of teaching sessions realized.

The differences between experiences and expectations seem to suggest the difficulties that the student teachers encounter in exercising theoretical knowledge at practice schools. As Tomlinson (1995) point out, student teachers bring consciously espoused ideas and informal theories about teaching. Student teachers also bring some explicit ideas about how one learns to teach. Such an orientation
might have influenced students’ perceptions regarding teaching experiences. Furthermore, student teachers’ rating of their experiences may imply that cooperating teachers and supervising instructors need to invest more time and energy in their work, particularly in giving written feedback. The gap between experiences and expectations may be a clue. Barriers to effective student teaching like lack of substantive communication among cooperating teachers, supervising instructor and student teachers, incongruent role expectations by both, and lack of collaboration might be hampering the process. However, holding higher expectations also seems to suggest the question of whether we should evaluate these discrepancies in teaching practice activities or the roles of cooperating teachers and supervisors in shaping the attitudes of student teachers toward teaching practice, since ‘the attitudes of student teachers are, perhaps, the variable most strongly shaped by cooperating teachers’ (McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996, p. 177). It is the responsibility of the cooperating teacher, as Doreen (2000) states, to facilitate the development of pre-service teachers through assigning teaching tasks, providing resources and feedback, and making an ongoing evaluation. As Woods-Mays & Weasmer (2003) indicate, this is particularly important in ensuring the acculturation of the student teachers in the field of learning, not only in terms of formal classroom techniques, but also in terms of ‘the myriad of other more subtle awareness reflective of a professional’. As Darling-Hammond (2005) notes, in the classroom setting student teachers want problem solving to be about learning of students not just the implementation of rules and routines, so the quality of cooperating teachers and supervising instructors is an important factor. Another question might be the selection of supervising instructors and cooperating teachers: this might require some time to reach optimum conditions in the context of this study. It could also be suggested that there is a need to train cooperating teachers as teacher educators and instructional supervisors.

The gender difference regarding the experiences of teaching practice seems to support the notion that gender plays an important role on student teacher perception of the teaching practice. However, the more positive perception of teaching practice by male students appears to be inconsistent with the notion that female teachers are more optimistic about their teaching experiences. The level of criticism placed upon experiences may be influenced as well. However, student teachers, once they choose teaching as a profession, might be more motivated to receive maximum benefit from such an experience. This may lower their satisfaction level about experiences.

In the present study, although no significant difference appeared in expectations regarding the type of practice school, the experience scores of student teachers attending private high schools were found to be higher than those
who attended general high schools. This finding indicates that some factors—such
as school climate, for instance—might have an effect on the teaching experience
of student teachers related to the facilities and infrastructure that private schools
have. Although not specifically evaluated in this study, student teachers might be
attracted by the circumstances that private schools offer to the school personnel.
If this is the case, then it can further be argued that not only for student teachers
but also for teaching professionals, school climate has a profound effect on
teaching experience.

Finally, the lack of evidence regarding the role of the number of sessions in
the expectations and experiences of student teachers could also be attributed not
only to the quantity but also to the quality of teaching practice. Although it is
referred as a traditional approach by Edwards & Protheroe (2003), it appears
that student teachers consistently need to be motivated, instructed, guided,
and provided with continuous oral and written feedback to develop their
professional identity.

The effect of practice schools and the number of sessions realized could have
been diluted by the fact that the placement of student teachers in classroom sites
and schools was mainly based on convenience. Appligate (1985) and Goodlad
(990) (in Sikula, Butterly & Guyton, 1996) suggest that the placement process often
falls outside the control of many faculties of education. As pointed out by Lemlech
& Kaplan (1990), the shaping of future teachers should begin by considering
where they will teach and with whom.

It is important to acknowledge that the present study had certain limitations.
Student teachers’ achievement levels as well as the quality of their relationships
with their supervisors may affect their evaluations. Second, the results are only
applicable to those who participated in this study. Despite these limitations,
however, the present study does nevertheless strongly suggest that there is a
difference between expectations and experiences of student teachers regarding
their teaching practice and some factors mediated in the experiences of student
teachers’ such as gender and types of schools attended.
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AN ASSESSMENT OF 4th AND 7th GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES INSTRUCTION IN TERMS OF HISTORICAL THINKING SKILLS

AYTEN İFLAŽOGLU
ERİNÇ ÇAYDAŞ

Abstract – The latest approach to history education requires that students should be educated not as passive recipients of encyclopedic knowledge but as empowered individuals playing an active role in the knowledge generation process. This can be achieved by teaching students how to generate historical knowledge and by introducing historical thinking skills. The objective of this study is to assess the learning activities used by 4th and 7th Grade teachers in order to improve elementary school pupils’ historical thinking skills. The study was conducted in six public and three private elementary schools in the Seyhan district of Adana in Turkey. The 4th and 7th Grade units entitled ‘History, Our First Homeland and Anatolia in History’ and ‘The Ottoman Empire in the 19th and 20th Centuries’, respectively, were examined. Data were collected through a semi-structured interview and participant observation, and analyzed by means of content analysis. In conclusion, it was found that activities encouraging the development of historical thinking skills were not adequately emphasized by the teachers, and that the teachers utilized only the course book as their material for course presentations.

Introduction

In recent research concerning the organization of learning and teaching, there is an inclination to move away from objective towards constructive understanding. According to the principles of constructive understanding, learning is configured on the advance knowledge of the students. Constructivists propose that we learn through our experiences, and interpretation of these experiences is based on our advance knowledge and on active thinking. They do not believe that knowledge can simply be transferred from the teacher to the student. One cannot know as the other does because people do not normally go through the same process of experience. Even if they did, their interpretations would be different as they would be associating the new with different advance experiences. Teaching is a process of leading the students to construct their own meanings from their experiences by providing such experiences and guiding them.
to be appreciative. The most important issue regarding knowledge and skills is their practice. Constructivism asserts that skills become more meaningful when achieved through contexts enabling logical association (Jonassen, Peck, & Wilson, 1999).

Studies on how learning comes about and how the mind works show that we construct new ideas around our already existing images. Research on teaching history give important clues as to the historical thinking skills of children and adolescents and their previous conceptualization in relation to the past. This research also shows how the previous apprehension of students is conditional upon their socio-economic environment, memory and experiences, as well as how they considerably diverge from each other. Jadallah (2000) claims that, in the course of research, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating the incoming information, the process of learning should allow the students to import the knowledge they would use for understanding and interpreting the new coming knowledge and the knowledge they would construct on their advance knowledge.

In traditional history education, the main textbook is used as the only resource for teaching and learning, thus making the book’s point of view the only truth for students. However, this constitutes a big obstacle in the way of learning history based on one’s own point of view and values. Additionally, it is not possible to understand the interpretative structure of knowledge by reading merely one book (Seixas, 1998). Students can comprehend the interpretative structure of a book or article, and the relativity of the interpretations in it, only if they are exposed to the approaches of different authors in forming the facts.

History education should mostly depend upon the sophisticated commentary skills of students on the conflicting topics where several articles and documents are used (Rouet, Britt, Mason & Perfetti, 1996). For instance, the Greek and Turkish battles during the Turkish War of Independence are narrated differently in Greek and Turkish sources. As it is rather difficult for students to combine different contents in one presentation, they are in a position to select the information carefully and evaluate it from the author’s point of view, the type of historical source, and their relationship with other documents. Instead of building up knowledge from individual texts, students should be able to manage different presentations, tackle the incoherencies among them and evaluate the knowledge presented within the scope of the sources while studying a historical problem.

Providing the students with different viewpoints on specific issues is helpful in helping them build up a more elaborate and enhanced comprehension.

‘Different texts present opportunities for history teachers to help students engage in sourcing (who wrote the texts, where did they appear), contextualizing (in what time period were they written, what was the climate in which they were written) and corroboration (how do they
compare and contrast). In helping students look at these elements they can make the argument that these texts represent the presentation of historical information as arguments rather than as ‘truth’. Students can learn that history is interpreted differently by different groups at different time periods, as a result of socio-cultural and political conditions.’ (Hynd, 1999, p.432)

**History education in Turkey**

The Turkish education system divides into two sub-sections as formal education and mass education. Formal education is offered through pre-school, primary, secondary and high education institutions. Mass education, on the other hand, covers all the educational activities held in addition to formal education. Primary education, which starts as of the end of age 6, is composed of a two-stage system, the first of which covers the 1-5th Grades, and the second of which the 6-8th Grades. Primary education is an eight-year period that lasts until the end of age 14. Secondary education, which lasts a minimum of three years between the ages 15-17, covers public high schools, and vocational and technical high schools (Erden, 1998; Ünal & Ada, 1999; Ergünes, 2002).

Instruction of history courses in Turkey starts with the life studies course in the first three Grades of primary school, continues with the Social Studies course in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th Grades; and with history courses in the secondary school. Through the choice and organization of the basic knowledge, skills, attitudes, thoughts and values introduced in these life studies, history, geography, political and natural sciences courses, children are prepared for life and given a ‘consciousness of living’ (Akınoglu, 2002, p.2). Social Studies is a course which aims at raising active and democratic citizens by combining the knowledge of the social dimension of life with an inter-disciplinary approach. The base for the knowledge of Social Studies is constructed by social and other sciences related with man (Doganay, 2002, p.42). However, the content of Social Studies is composed only of history, geography, political and science which are introduced in different chapters as separate disciplines, without being integrated. This prevents the sciences that form the base for the knowledge of Social Studies from being examined with an inter-disciplinary approach.

The Social Studies course in our country is taught by two different types of teachers. In the 4th and 5th Grades, this course is offered by class teachers whereas in the 6th and 7th Grades, i.e. during the secondary stage of primary education, it is offered by either history or geography teachers. This, however, brings important difficulties alongside. The teachers in the secondary stage, being specialists in their branches, cannot adopt an inter-disciplinary approach. Thus, the students are
observed to lack an overall comprehension of man as a social being (Doganay, 2002, p.43).

Education of teachers has been a continuing problem in Turkey. The system of teacher education has very frequently changed, and often without taking into account the previous experiences (Öztürk, 1996). Considering the difficulties encountered in the education of Social Studies teachers, a reconstruction of faculties of education was initiated in 1998. Thereby, social studies training programs opened under the primary education departments of education faculties, and the first graduates were given in 2002. The graduate teachers offer social studies, human rights and citizenship courses, as well as principles of Atatürk and the history of the revolution at the secondary stage of primary education (Doganay, 2002, p.37).

**Historiography in Turkey**

In order to understand the viewpoints underlying teaching history in Turkey, one should know historiography and its advancement stages. The concept of history in the early years of the Turkish Republic was developed as a reaction towards Islamic-Ottoman history (Neumann, 1998). The main target in this period was to put on a new identity for the new republic. This turned out to be finding a ‘non-Ottoman’ history for the Turkish nation, and rather negative values were attributed to that history. As a result, the Ottoman period was completely ignored. In the alternative history that was created, general and especially Middle Asian Turkishness was highlighted as the tradition of the republican history. Avcioğlu (1995) defines this situation as a historical obligation, stating that in fact the bourgeoisie who made the French Revolution had reprobated feudalism which the king represented, and its institutions. Consequently, ‘the Turkish’ instead of ‘the Ottoman’ was emphasized during this period, and a history concept which would put forth the Turks’ contribution to civilization was adopted. Additionally, a relation was attempted to be drawn between the Turks and the communities who lived in Anatolia in ancient times, such as Sumerians or the Hittites. Likewise, the ‘Sun Language Theory’ which claimed that all the languages had originated from the Turkish language was brought forward for a while.

In the 1940’s, a new concept was adopted in the Turkish historiography, which increased the share of Turks within general history. Later, in the high school textbooks of the 1970’s, Middle Asia had a bigger part. By handling history through a Turkish-Islamic viewpoint, the pre- and post-Islamic periods were associated with each other. For instance, it was stated that ‘only Islam was apt to the Turkish people’s old beliefs and thus was easily adopted and this strengthened them a lot’ (Kafesoglu, 1988).
The understanding of ‘Turkish-Islamic Synthesis’, which has left its mark upon our time, aimed at repairing and protecting the corrupted national culture with the help of the government. In this period, Atatürk Culture, Language, and History High Institution was established under the Prime Ministry for the purpose of researching and spreading the Turkish history, culture and language. Within the framework of official structuring, the Institution was converted into a governmental body and was made the spokesman of the government’s expression of ‘official history’. The principles which the Institution was to implement reflect the understanding of history during this period. These principles disregarded universal values, and evoked nationalist sensations through frequently repeated statements such as ‘gathering the Turkish citizens around national culture and ideals’, ‘protecting national moral values and traditions’, ‘rendering the Turkish nation the proprietor of its history that becomes its glorious past’ (Official Gazette, 1983).

The concept of an alternative history against the official history represented by historians/researchers such as Halil Berktay, Dogan Avcioglu, Taner Akçam had arisen as an outcome of the pressure on various segments of the society caused by the military coup of 12 September 1980. Another significant feature of the 1980’s was that it had a shallow understanding of history, focusing especially on certain archive sources of Ottoman history which has no analytical dimensions (Özel & Çetinsaya, 1986). The historians supposed they were making ‘historiography’ only by publishing the transcriptions of the documentation they could access. The disregarding of the hermeneutic approach best fit to the nature of the social sciences prevented the meaning lying behind the language used in the documentation from being understood. Kılıçbay (cited in Özbaran, 1997) states that historians whose historical research methods lack the process of understanding consider the past merely as a process consisting of the crucial steps of reaching today. In other words, it can be said that these historians make the mistake of ‘historicism’ and thus fail to see the events in history as a chain of multi-dimensional relations.

Ortaylı (1998) states that there are two similarly worthless interpretations of history in Turkey which run counter to each other except for the scientific, historical information and documentation. One of these interpretations exists in the school textbooks and the other in out-of-school publications and the press, as a reaction to the first. In this way, a vain and baseless tension is created; and the real history is reflected neither at schools nor in the popular publications. Neumann (1998) agrees with these views stating that there is a wide gap between the history lessons and the science of history at present. According to him, the loose connection between the history lessons and scientific research should be tightened. This seems quite important in terms of discussing the knowledge and
interpretations of scientific value in history lessons. With the cooperation of the historian and the history teacher, these lessons could be prevented from being treated as ideological means. Moreover, as the use of primary and secondary sources is highly important in teaching history; with the help of this collaboration, studies could be held in terms of compliance of the sources with the level. Additionally, by showing how historical narrations are formed by the historian, the students can be encouraged to make small-scale history research.

The subjects introduced in the history courses in Turkey only cover the period before 1945. The lack of information about our recent history has resulted in a failure to fully understand the present developments that take place in the national and international arenas. Besides, with the transition to the multi-party system, multi-coloration and different viewpoints in the political scene came up. However, this as well as the subsequent period’s not taking part in the content prevents the students from noticing these different viewpoints. Moreover, the students’ ignorance of different outlooks on controversial topics makes them unable to form a synthesis based on their own knowledge.

Though there are many difficulties related with the teaching of history, the issue has been handled thoroughly not by the Institution of Turkish History or the historians but by the Institution of Philosophy. ‘History Education in Turkey’, the meeting organized by this institution in 1975, is considered highly significant as its first example in Turkey. In this meeting, many important historians and social scientists voiced common worries about the content of and methods used in history courses. These worries included, among others, ‘emphasis on memorized knowledge’, ‘lack of relations with other social sciences’, ‘lack of a philosophical view of history’, ‘needless chronological knowledge’, and ‘avoidance of contemporary history’ (Institution of Philosophy Seminars III, 1977, 35).

Tekeli (1998) has divided the criticisms against teaching history in two groups: in the first group are the criticisms of the content of the written history, which can be entitled ‘official history’. The second group of criticisms is related to the process of teaching and learning. The tedium and stagnation of teaching, its being far from attracting the attention of the students, and consequently driving them away from history can be included in this group. Tekeli claims that the solution would be a scientific history, written free from all ideologies and based only on objective facts. Yet, there is a basic logical fallacy in this very optimistic thought. We learn history not only within the framework of facts but through the works of the historians as well, which inevitably include their own viewpoints and comments while combining the evidence from the past within the framework of cause and effect relations.

When history books are examined, two main characteristics are noticed. First, there are deviations and distortions in these books caused by the nationalist views which have reached their climax with the Turkish History Thesis, which aims at
creating a distinction between ‘us’ and ‘the others’. Upon even a minor victory of the Turks, the comment is: ‘The glorious Turkish army has inflicted a giant defeat on the enemies who wish to raid us on all occasions’; whereas upon a defeat: ‘The treacherous enemy has murdered our defenseless soldiers in their sleep’. Humiliating the contrary communities and creating a sense of national superiority are considered much more important than the factual defects. This can be due to the mission attributed to the history courses. Emphasizing social aims and disregarding the aims of inner-discipline in the goals of teaching history is a sign of this (Dilek, 1999, p.42).

It can be said that, due to the traditions from the past, one of the most serious problems of today’s history teaching in Turkey is a steady understanding in the education policy produced and executed by the Ministry of National Education. Additionally, handling the subject problems with short-term solutions and implementing different models of education with each changing government have made up another dimension of the problem.

In shaping history training, the National Education Council, which is the highest advisory board for the Ministry of National Education, has played an important role. Having examined the agenda of the Council meetings, the issues related with history training can be dated back to the agenda of the 2nd National Education Council held as early as 1943. Suggestions on the textbooks, problems of teachers and teaching, auxiliary information and equipment necessary for history teaching were discussed in the meetings of this Council. The emphasis in the textbooks was our national history; and the information on other nations was given in rate of their relations with our nation (Ministry of Education—The Second Council of the Ministry of Education, 1991, pp.199-205).

Development plans are another determining factor in history teaching policies. The principles to be implemented in the realization of the education services which take place in the 8th Five-Year Development Plan which covers the years 2001-2005 is deemed to solve the existing problems and meet the requirements. With this plan, an education policy was foreseen which aims ‘to raise productive and creative individuals of the age of knowledge, devoted to Atatürk’s principles and revolutions; having improved thinking, perception and problem solving skills; democratic, libertarian and devoted to moral values; open to new ideas; having personal responsibility; imbibe national culture; capable of interpreting different cultures and contributing to contemporary civilization; predisposed to science and technology production, with high level of skills’ (State Planning Organization, 2000). In addition to this, education programs, teaching techniques, tools and materials were planned to be reorganized within universal measures, taking into consideration development aims and technological progress. However, these principles largely remained on paper, concrete steps not having been taken.
The mission attributed to history courses in the Turkish education system appears to be more in the direction of developing consciousness of citizenship and socialization. In other words, this course is handled within the framework of social aims, with little consideration of its inner disciplinary aims. Besides, the general aims of the history course on classroom level and the content prepared accordingly are beyond being coherent or meeting specific aims. No target was specified particularly for perceiving differences, questioning ideas, and achieving the skill of criticism.

**Historical thinking**

According to Korbin & Abbot (1993), to make history education authentic means to give students authority in definition and interpretation, a skill often possessed by sophisticated historians. In order to think and work like historians, students should be able to accept and manipulate a range of sophisticated skills and attitudes. In other words, they should acquire historical thinking skills. These skills require that students (Nash, 1996):

- generate questions
- arrange reliable evidence to support their questions
- search historical records beyond those offered in their books
- consider documentation, periodicals, diaries, historical places, work of arts, historical findings and other evidences belonging to the past
- search these records taking the conditions of the relevant era into consideration, and compare events through multiple viewpoints.

Seixas (1993) presents three elements regarding historical thinking. The first element consists of the ability of students to define facts of historical significance which requires contemplation about attributing importance to historical events. Therefore, one should be aware of how the thinker’s epistemological viewpoint affects his document examination and interpretation style. Within this structure, thinking is a knowledge level attributing a meaning to the past. At this stage, the students are supposed to respond to the following questions: ‘What are the important things belonging to the past?’ and ‘Why are they so important?’ To exhibit such a skill, students need factual knowledge and criteria differentiating the important from the unimportant.

The second element according to Seixas (1993) concerns historical epistemology. This is the capability of refining, revising and enlarging historical knowledge through evidence and relying on the authorities. It is what students
know and how they learn about the past. How much do they believe in the possibility of knowing about the past? Their evidence might be more or less complicated, or might be clearly bound to each other or not. Students mostly depend on the authorities. However, their selections of authorities are not always secure. They might also have several criteria for internal and external consistency. Besides, in order to be able to separate the right from the wrong, students might exhibit different reliability levels in accordance with their skills.

The third element covers three interrelated points: agency, empathy and moral judgment. Historical agency expresses the consequences of man’s choices, decisions, and actions in the past. The design of the historical agency is important for people to comprehend their interaction with the socio-cultural situation surrounding them. Without this tool, students cannot find themselves in the same world with the historical figures they study. Consequently, they cannot attribute meaning to history. Students working on historical empathy see historical figures as people facing decisions, conflicts, restrictions, and problems but thinking in a completely different way than they do. It is not possible to draw a meaning from a past story without moral judgment either directly or indirectly in any case.

These three elements involve using the required tools for the historical inquiry process as well as the skill of contextualizing the past. Contextualizing the past requires the use of imagination, empathy, and moral judgment in order to avoid evaluating the past within present points of view because the only way to understand what happened in the past is to take the circumstances of that era into consideration. Two main aspects of contextualizing the past include (a) progress and regression (b) continuity and change.

VanSledright (1998) indicates that, for the development of the process of historical thinking, history teachers are required to:

1. interrogate the students
2. ask students to support their historical claims by evidence
3. understand how socio-cultural, local, ethnic and family background influence the way of thinking of their students
4. teach their students how to ask questions to each other
5. emphasize the importance of doing research with rich historical contents, and
6. give their students the tools of inquiry to encourage a thorough investigation.

The most important and implementation-based stage of historical thinking is its inquiry aspect. According to Van Sledright (1998), to enhance the historical content by multiple and varied interpretations is the starting point of inquiry.
Instructions are quite important when teachers lead their students to fill the gaps within these interpretations by emphatic and imaginary skills. To ensure this, they should set up a platform surrounded by the reading of secondary sources, corroborating accounts, and engaging sourcing techniques. They should also make their students direct these tools towards their historical assumptions and viewpoints which construct their own historical positionalities.

To sum up, a successful history teacher asks questions to the students and uses enhanced contents integrated into the inquiry tools. The teacher becomes a model within the process, showing the presentation of the inquiry, and leading the students to ask questions about their historical position.

Underneath the problems regarding teaching history lies the undefined aim of teaching history in a precise way. In other words, answers to the questions ‘What should be the aim of history lessons?’, ‘Why should the determined content be learned?’ and ‘How should the learning-teaching processes be organized in order to maintain more permanent, meaningful and efficient learning?’ are ambiguous. However, one of the basic aims of teaching history is to develop historical thinking skills in the students. The concept of teaching history in Turkey is, however, rather distant from this aim. Consequently, the number of students who read, understand what they read, establish a relation of causality between historical realities, and develop their own comments and views after having evaluated different viewpoints is quite small. Therefore, it is considered that most of the problems about the teaching of history can be solved with the in-class acquisition of historical thinking skills.

In brief, one can conclude that the examination of historical thinking skills plays an important role in seeking a synthesis of different viewpoints, and in analyzing and investigating the historical knowledge of the students. However, no other study done in the country has yet looked into ways of improving historical thinking skills through easily accessible sources. This study will contribute to determining the activities in 4th and 7th Grade courses which are in accordance with the improvement of historical thinking skills.

The objective of the study

The main objective of this study is to determine how 4th and 7th Grade elementary school teachers improve the historical thinking skills of their students. In line with this main objective, answers to the following questions have been sought for:

1. What do teachers do towards improving historical thinking skills and how do they manage this?
2. Is there any coherence between the activities that teachers use in their classrooms to improve students’ historical thinking skills, as recorded during observations, and the answers they have given to the interview questions?

Method

This research study aims to determine the activities used by primary school teachers in order to develop students’ historical thinking skills. It is a descriptive case statement designed on the basis of qualitative research techniques.

The data collection techniques employed in the study, namely interviews and observations, are among the most widely used data collection techniques in qualitative studies. As the researcher observed the classes from one of the rear desks and as there was no interaction with the teacher or students, the researcher has taken the role of a ‘non-participative observer’. The reason why the interview technique was also used as a data collection tool is to present different viewpoints in the interpretation and description of the observation data. The observation findings have been evaluated together with the interview findings in order to eliminate any bias on the part of the researchers.

At the first stage of the research, information was obtained from the teachers through observations and interviews. At the second stage, data came from both the teachers and students, again through observations and interviews, and thus, ‘data triangulation’ was achieved (Cohen & Manion, 1994).

The study was conducted in six public and three private schools in the Seyhan District of Adana in Turkey. The sample consisted of 4th Grade classroom teachers and 7th Grade social studies teachers. In the Turkish elementary school system, history is first introduced in the 4th Grade as part of the social studies curriculum. The content of the course covers the concept of history, time, place and so on. Students are also expected to discuss the question, ‘Why do we learn history?’ This course is completed in the 7th Grade, and is substituted by ‘History of Turkish Revolution’ in later Grades.

With this curriculum, one expects historical thinking skills to develop within the period of 4th to 7th Grades. These years mark the beginning and ending of history education in elementary schools and this explains the reason why the 4th and 7th Grades were selected for the purposes of this study.

The sample

The teachers who participated in the research were chosen from among those who work at the elementary education institutions of the Seyhan District of Adana,
and possibility based sampling technique was used. First of all, a list of the elementary education institutions in the Seyhan District of Adana was made. Among the teachers working at the contacted schools, 18 teachers who agreed to take part in the research were chosen. Twelve of these work at public schools and six in private schools.

Most teachers who participated in the study had between 21 and 30 years of work experience. However, among the private school group, there were teachers with 31-plus years of experience. Whereas the degrees of the representative group teachers from the 7th Grade differed, the 4th Grade teachers mostly had ‘Open University / Two-year college’ degrees.

Data collection

Data were collected by ‘participant observation’ and ‘semi-structured interviews’. The observations were carried out in the social studies courses during a 3-hour period of teaching on different days. During these observation sessions, all of the teacher activities concerning teaching history were recorded by taking descriptive notes. Thus, data were collected in the class environment during regular class hours. The researchers sat at one of the back seats and had no communication with the students or the teacher.

‘Semi-structured interview forms’ were also used in the study. In the preparation stage of the form, relevant literature was reviewed and the general objectives of the social studies courses as well as the specific class level objectives were examined. In accordance with the data obtained from the literature, the essence of historical thinking skill development was taken into account and a semi-structured interview form was prepared. Certain corrections to the form were made in accordance with the comments made by several experts. Similarly, upon the conclusion of a pilot implementation, several questions which proved problematic were excluded from the form. The final version consisted of 13 questions and also several others aimed at collecting personal information. Recordings lasted 30 minutes. Data were noted by hand.

Data analysis

Qualitative evaluative measures were used to analyze the data collected from the assignment tools. Analytic coding based on the Strauss and Corbin Grounded Theory Procedure was used to classify and categorize the collected information (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The data obtained from the observation was first transcribed to a word processing program and a raw data text was obtained. Following this, the text was evaluated several times and coded using line-by-line
reading techniques. While coding, the ‘repetitive reading’ and ‘drilling through literature’ procedures were affirmed. After creating the codes, the following categories were built: materials, techniques, explaining the importance of the content, activities to improve thinking, different viewpoints, and giving inquiry assignments.

As for the interviews, the data obtained from interviewees were transcribed to a word processing program. At the second stage, the answers obtained from each teacher for each question were collected in columns. Thirdly, after reading the texts several times, the researchers evaluated them using a line-by-line reading technique and generated a coding strategy. ‘Drilling through literature’ and ‘repetitive reading’ procedures were repeated where necessary during the reading process. Afterwards, proper categories were set up in accordance with the literature and coding. The results obtained from interview analysis were represented according to ‘the approach of categorized data expression,’ which was recommended by Miles & Huberman (1994). Categories were ranked as follows: history education, teaching of history content, and the improvement of historical thinking skills.

In order to support the comments of researchers and reflect the viewpoints of the participants, some quotations from the interview are given.

Abbreviations that were used reflected school type and class level as in the following: (PU7): PU for Public school, 7 for 7th Grade, and (PR4): PR for Private School, 4 for 4th Grade.

**Findings**

The aim of this study was to determine the activities used by 4th and 7th Grade teachers in order to improve students’ historical thinking skills during the course process. In this part of the study, ‘the findings from the interview analysis’ are slotted.

**Findings obtained from the observation analysis**

The activities employed by the classroom teachers are classified in the following categories: materials, techniques, explaining the importance of the content, activities to improve thinking, different viewpoints, and inquiry assignments.

The main tool was the textbook for all teachers in both Grades. It was found that most of the 4th Grade teachers utilized the board, maps and historical scales. The 7th Grade teachers, on the other hand, utilized only maps.
The question-answer technique was used by all the teachers during their courses in the 4th and 7th Grade classes. It was also observed that most of them referred to student and teacher narration techniques. More than half of the 4th and 7th Grade teachers made the students write in their notebooks, underline the articles or use analogy and similar techniques, as well as traditional group activities.

Three of the 4th and five of the 7th Grade teachers mentioned the importance of the content. To give an example:

‘Çanakkale War is noteworthy because it caused the death of many intellectual people. For instance, entire classes from Galatasaray High School vanished because students went to war and died.’ (PU7)

It was seen that most of the teachers used cause-effect relationship activities in order to improve students’ thinking. They made the students correlate to the present and thus influenced their thinking. It was also observed that they related occurrences from different eras, got the students to interpret, matched those different occurrences and thus the disciplines were interrelated. These activities were mostly done by 7th Grade teachers. One of the 4th and one of the 7th Grade teachers asked hypothetical questions, and two of the 4th Grade teachers emphasized that the activity of evaluating events should be in accordance with present circumstances.

Respective examples related to activities in the classroom are as follows:

To begin with, few teachers attempted to introduce different viewpoints, and it was observed that four of the 4th Grade teachers approached facts from a one-sided viewpoint. There was only one teacher from the 4th Grade and one from the 7th Grade who used multiple-viewpoints.

‘The teacher said ‘we are always proud of having founded 16 different states and of our past. We never mention those states we demolished’. The teacher also indicated that history is a science, and that we should react realistically and learn lessons from history because there is no way to be successful by excess pride. He said we are always proud of being the grandchildren of Mehmed the Conqueror and Suleyman the Magnificent who were among the sultans of the Ottoman Empire, but nobody wants to be the grandchild of Crazy Ibrahim.’ (PU4)

Only one of the 7th Grade teachers and six of the 4th Grade teachers gave inquiry assignments. The topics of the homework were: ‘Collecting encyclopedic data about the Orhun Monuments’, ‘Answering preparation questions’ and ‘Searching the meaning of Asakiri Mansure-i Muhammediye.’
### TABLE 1: Teachers’ Qualification on the Observed Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVED CRITERIA</th>
<th>4th Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th>7th Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical atlas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical scale</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (laser pen, draw cards, calendar, source book)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher narration</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student narration,</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question – answer</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional group study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatization or picture study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (taking notes in a notebook, reading from the book, underlining, analogy)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2: Teachers’ Qualification on the Observed Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVED CRITERIA</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>4th Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>7th Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining the importance of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td></td>
<td>- ✓ - - - ✓ -</td>
<td>- ✓ - - - ✓ -</td>
<td>✓ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- ✓ - - - ✓ -</td>
<td>- ✓ -</td>
<td>✓ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing cause-effect relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>- ✓ - ✓ - - ✓ -</td>
<td>- ✓ - ✓ - - ✓ -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- ✓ - ✓ - - ✓ -</td>
<td>- ✓ -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking hypothetical questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to the present</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - ✓ - -</td>
<td>- - - - ✓ - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - ✓ - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlating with other events of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>era</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlating with the events of</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different eras</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the events in accordance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the era’s circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different viewpoints</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>- - - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>view points</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>- - - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>✓ ✓ - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ - ✓ - - -</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ - ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(✓): Teachers who executed the criteria
(−): Teachers who didn’t execute the criteria
Findings obtained from the interview analysis

General information about history education

In relation to history education, findings are concentrated on the general purposes of history education and whether history teachers like to teach history.

When asked about the objective of teaching history, both the 4th and the 7th Grade teachers indicated that teaching history meant making a correlation between the past and the future, as well as learning lessons from the past. In addition to these, two of the teachers described it as teaching one’s own history, and one teacher as presenting multiple viewpoints. Only one teacher emphasized that the aim of teaching history was to improve students’ thinking, to satisfy the expectations of the society and to develop consciousness about history:

‘From my viewpoint, the first objective is to satisfy the expectations of the society. Grandfathers tell their grandchildren ‘you should have learned this better’. Things like these are told about history and expected to be taught at school. I aim to give a spirit. My real target is to develop historical thinking.’ (PU7)

When asked about whether they liked giving history courses, both the 4th and 7th Grade teachers made explanations on different grounds. The teachers expressed their pleasure in teaching history courses through the following statements: ‘I teach our own history’, ‘I have the opportunity to mention different viewpoints’, ‘I can build cause-effect relationships’, ‘I can talk more when working on history topics and I can impersonate these topics’. On the other hand, those teachers who did not like teaching history courses said: ‘the curriculum is not well-organized’, ‘the subjects do not arouse interest’, or ‘I do not like it because of the many details and the fact that students learn by memorizing the information presented’.

Information about the contents of teaching history

The preparations that teachers make before lessons, their lecturing techniques and materials, and the ways they make students participate in the courses are recorded in this section.

Answering the question about their preparation stage for the courses, all of the 7th Grade teachers both in public and private schools indicated that they make their daily lecture plans, read from the textbook and utilize private publications. Two of the teachers emphasized that they come to class ready to answer questions from students, and six of them said that they themselves prepared the materials required for the lesson.
When they were asked what kind of tools and materials they used during the lessons, the 7th Grade teachers answered that they made use of textbooks, maps, history atlases, CDs, overhead projectors, and encyclopedias while the 4th Grade teachers stated that they also made use of unit supplementary materials in addition to these sources. Besides one of the 7th Grade teachers indicated that she used the board efficiently and another one said that she made use of cartoons and primary sources. Similarly, one 4th Grade teacher stated that she used the photos she took, another said she used videos and yet another said she used pictures.

While nine of the teachers who participated in the research made no comments on whether their schools were satisfactory in terms of tools and materials; five said that they were short of tools and materials at school while four stated that they found the tools and materials sufficient.

When they were asked about the techniques they used when giving history courses, both the 4th and 7th Grade teachers stated that they used the techniques of narration, question-answer, discussion, demonstration, and dramatization, in general. One of the teachers added that she preferred narration by the student, which she described as an active method; and the other indicated that she used the technique of making the student read and write down the content (she uses the term ‘method’ for ‘technique’).

‘What we mean by ‘active method’ is a student-oriented and teacher-led method. I never ask who will answer a question or who is prepared for class. There is no rule for it. Students are always in a position to prepare for class. At the end of the term, I give marks taking their in-class activities into consideration.’ (PR7)

As for question type, 7th Grade teachers in private schools stated that they ask questions which enable the students to make interpretations and form cause-effect correlations. One of the teachers added that he asks questions based on memorization. The public school teachers gave various responses: ‘I ask questions with short answers’, ‘I ask cause-effect type questions’, ‘I ask questions depending on thinking and interpretative skills, generating, bearing cause-effect relationships’.

4th Grade teachers, on the other hand, indicated that they emphasize interpretative questions as well as examination-oriented test type questions, thought-provoking and both interpretative and memory-based questions, trying to lead them to correlate to the present. When we wanted them to give examples of these types of questions though, no one could give an answer. Only one of them replied:

‘I try to get them to think with questions like: How would it affect our daily life, if the electric bulb hadn't been invented?’ (PU4)
When asked about the ways they encourage student participation, they generally stated that they refer to question-answer techniques and give marks for participation. In addition to this, showing pictures depicting certain different eras and asking the students to interpret them, organizing museum visits, or creating a discussion forum using empathy questions were also used.

4th Grade teachers indicated that to ensure participation in the lectures they use discussions, student narrations, group work, test solving, interrelation activities with previous topics or actual occurrences, as well as question-answer techniques.

Information about the improvement of historical thinking skills

Regarding historical thinking skills, the following type of questions were evaluated: How do the teachers underline the importance of the content to be lectured? What do they think about the importance of chronological order? How do they lead the students to think? How do they find correlations with the present time? What are their viewpoints about the events of different eras and circumstances? Do they mention different viewpoints in their courses? Do they give inquiry assignments or not?

When asked about how they emphasize the importance of the content to be lectured, most 7th Grade teachers and only one 4th Grade teacher expressed that they make correlations to the present. The rest of the 4th Grade teachers said that they explicitly state the reason for studying each unit at the beginning of class. In addition, one private school teacher stated that he explains the importance of content through class discussions, and one public school teacher said that he emphasizes the importance of the events in accordance with the world and humanity history.

When answering the question about the importance of chronological order, all of the 7th Grade teachers who participated in the study stressed that it is vital in building up correlations between events, integrity, and a comprehensive study base. All of the teachers indicated, however, that the books have been prepared without taking the chronological order of events into consideration and that this prevented students from making correlations and comprehending the cause-effect relationships:

‘Topics should be presented within a chronological order. It was so in our prior social studies books. But in the new boo, the events are given in a mixed order, which poses problems for students. Selim I dies in one unit and then we run into him again 2 units later.’ (PR7)

Teachers explained that their students have an understanding of chronology, but since the events were not given in chronological order in the course book, their
knowledge becomes insufficient. Moreover, because of this problem, they have difficulty in telling the order of events.

More than one-half of the 4th Grade teachers indicated that chronological order is important to see the interrelationship among events and two of them indicated that it is important to make cause-effect relationships. One of them rejected memorizing as a method, but stated the necessity of teaching chronological order.

Answering the question regarding the lecture contents and how they were orienting their students to think, both 7th and 4th Grade teachers indicated that they encourage the students to discuss issues within a cause-effect frame and to interrelate past incidents to the present. Besides, three teachers stressed the importance of question-answer technique as a thinking-based activity, with one of them adding answer-finding as well:

'I try to show and get them to notice the details which they may miss, generating some question marks in their minds. I always refrain from imposing my view. I lead them to find their own.' (PU4)

'Lecturing about the Hun State, I ask questions such as ‘What would you do to ensure economic improvement in your country if you were the ruler?’' (PU4)

As a response to whether they build up relations between the past incidents and the present time, all participating teachers gave affirmative answers. Some of them, however, did not give explanatory examples.

As a response to whether they present different viewpoints, most 7th Grade teachers gave affirmative answers but had difficulties giving concrete examples. The answers of three public school teachers were in the negative. They claimed that information obtained anywhere other than the textbooks confuse students.

‘In fact, history books exaggerate our success and always find excuses for our failures. We pretend as if the incidents happened free from our will, or we were unjustly treated. However the students should also be shown other dimensions of the event.’ (PU7)

Most 4th Grade teachers expressed that they do not point out different viewpoints. Only two of the teachers spoke in the affirmative:

‘Yes, I asked a question about Adam and Eve. Some students claimed that we are their offspring. Some others argued in favor of Darwin’s theory and the rest said that they were cloned by aliens. I never voice my opinion in such cases; I only point to the issues to be considered.’ (PU4)

‘I haven’t recognized different comments. Since the students are too young, they are unable to interpret.’ (PU4)
When asked about the evaluation of different eras and conditions, all but one stated that these events should be evaluated in accordance with past circumstances:

‘The problem of today’s children is that they see historical incidents as today’s events. We should adapt them. When you mention the army, they think of today’s tanks. When I say Timur’s tanks were his elephants, they strain to comprehend. In fact, we should evaluate some of the events in accordance with present conditions. For instance, what happened on 12 September was a huge mistake’ (PU7).

‘The Independence Courts of the Turkish War of Independence were not democratic. But those days’ circumstances required that. It was a fairly reasonable decision.’ (PU7)

When asked whether they give inquiry assignments before class, all of the 7th and 4th Grade teachers gave affirmative answers. They explained that they ask students to read the content of the next class from the book and to collect encyclopedic data about the content. They also assign term papers, topics of which are identified during previous class meetings. For the willing students, teachers assign projects encouraging them to carry out a more in-depth examination of the subjects. With the exception of one teacher, all the others stated that they recommend different sources for the students to read, but none of them further explain how the students should make use of them. Only one teacher stated that he gives the students a bibliography list and spends a class hour explaining how to reach these sources.

‘We don’t give long term assignments. I ask my students to prepare a paper and bring it to class the next day. We applaud those who do the assignment. Those who haven’t yet read the source go and do so after that.’ (PU4)

‘I give homework asking ‘What would have happened, if this hadn’t been so?’ Students write their answers and I ask them to read it aloud in the classroom.’ (PU4)

While 4th Grade teachers did not give any explanation about the use of different sources, they stated that they help students do an inquiry assignment by recommending encyclopedias and other primary school level sources.

Discussion and conclusion

In conclusion it was found that the teachers expressed the main objective of history education as helping the students to build up a past-future interrelationship and learn lessons from the past. In order to reach this goal, the teachers use
textbooks and some similar publications (general-content books, encyclopedias, etc.) as their main sources. Other than these, it was observed that teachers mostly make the students memorize the content rather than comprehend it. We conclude that this is a result of referring to one source only. It is believed that using a single textbook in the lessons as the only source book plays an important role in preventing the students from developing multiple viewpoints, which they would be able to achieve through analyzing the interpretations in different source books.

Seixas (1998) underlined that historical thinking skills cannot be improved by the use of the textbook as the main source. This will prevent the students from seeing the interpretative nature of historical knowledge. Hynd (1999) states that only one book could not exhibit the contradicting information, hence the students should examine sources reflecting different viewpoints.

At the end of the study, no difference has been found between the classroom activities used by 4th and 7th Grade teachers. We can state, therefore, that students are not equipped with historical thinking skills during the 4th Grade courses where they face historical information for the first time. Likewise, these skills are still not utilized effectively in the 7th Grade courses either.

The techniques used by the teachers in lecturing history contents are: question-answer, teacher narration, student narration, taking notes, book reading, and underlining the books. However, the above-mentioned techniques do not improve the historical thinking skills of students. It is observed that these are used as a means of getting the students to memorize the information in the textbook. It can be gathered from the observations that the techniques, tools and materials the teachers use are quite limited and this is insufficient in developing students’ thinking. Similar results were reached in an earlier nationwide research carried out in order to determine the techniques, tools and materials used in history lessons (Bozkurt, 2000; Dumludag, 2000). It would make a big contribution to the development of students’ historical thinking skills, and enhance their knowledge as well, if historical places and museums could be used for history lessons where materializing words in the mind of the students may be difficult. In addition, the techniques of verbal history, group studies, discussions, and drama may be employed rather than narration and question-answers.

Regarding the skill of describing historically important events (Seixas, 1993) which is one of the three issues of historical thinking, most of the 7th Grade teachers stated that they emphasize these events by building a relation with the present, whereas the 4th Grade teachers said that they explained the importance of the event at the beginning of the lesson. However, the observations did not record any of the teachers exhibiting such activity. In such cases, students may have difficulty in comprehending the relevance of the subject to their own lives and the present day.
Teachers indicated that the history topics are not presented in a chronological order in the 7th Grade social studies book and that this confuses the students. Association of historical events with each other asserts the advanced stages of chronological thinking (Stow & Haydn, 2000). At the same time, the comparison of historical persons and cultures requires thinking about change, continuity, and progress. In order to perceive the historical process as a whole, the improvement stages of the civilizations should be considered comparatively and within the framework of their interrelations. However, it was seen during the observations that the teachers were not closely associating historical events with each other, which may be hindering students’ chronological thinking.

The teachers also stressed that chronological order is especially important in helping the students to form cause-effect relationships as they perceive chronological order as a set of linear occurrences. In other words, they see the end of an event as the beginning of another. However, cause-effect relationships differ from chronological order. Liu (2000) states that, if B comes after A in an event, this will mean they may have a causality relationship between each other, but it will be wrong to think that A affected B only because B comes after A. Therefore, it can be deduced that these teachers have a linear understanding of history. In other words, it can be said that these teachers and their students think that the order of occurrence of the events form a cause-effect relationship and the cause of an event is the outcome of a previous one.

It was also determined that the teachers mostly use cause-effect relationship activities to improve students’ thinking. What is important is that this relationship is built by the question-answer technique and the students get the answers from the book. Consequently, this activity also fails to surpass factual knowledge.

Although much research asserts that students develop different viewpoints and construct their own opinions by examining the often different—even conflicting—opinions in different sources (Doppen, 2000; Foster & Yeager, 1999; Voss, 1998; Stahl, Hynd & Britton, 1996; Wiley & Voss, 1996; Rouet, Britt, Mason & Perfetti, 1996; Cooper, 1992; Wineburg, 1991), the teachers in this study did not seem to be making a conscious effort to help students form different viewpoints. It was seen during the observations that the main source used in the classroom was the textbook, and the few other sources used in the classroom contained similar information. It can be said that the teachers’ not emphasizing different viewpoints in the classroom is due to a lack of using additional sources written by historians with different viewpoints.

During the interviews, most of the teachers indicated that the events which occurred in different periods and under different conditions should be evaluated according to the circumstances of that period. When the acts of the people who lived in the past are examined as a whole with their thoughts, beliefs, and
viewpoints forming the basis of these acts, a certain change can be observed. In order to understand this change and analyze the historical events in a healthy manner, these acts should be evaluated within the framework of the circumstances of that specific period. However, it will not be enough to express this verbally in a class environment. While interpreting the past, historical empathy should be established. Dulberg (1998), in his experimental research on historical empathy, has discovered that the perception of the students about the people who lived in the past reflect qualitative variation through different ways. However, no activity towards establishing historical empathy was witnessed during the observations. It can be argued that this will prevent the students from making healthy evaluations of the significant acts that took place in the examined period as well as the prevailing structures of thinking.

When the teacher interviews and the classroom observations are taken into account, the research assignments given by the teachers cannot be regarded within the dimensions of historical thinking. The most important issue in developing the skill of historical research, which is the fourth historical thinking standard set by the NCHS (1996) writers, is that the students should act like historians and examine the primary and secondary sources, thus composing their own interpretations through questioning the different approaches presented in these sources. They should also form historical approaches by supporting their interpretations with different sources. However, in our situation, a compilation of the collected information is made using only the limited sources at hand.

All these results show that teachers do not execute an adequate number of activities for the improvement of historical thinking skills, neither in the 4th nor in the 7th Grade.

More research is needed into the development of students’ historical thinking skills. The elementary education stage is of utmost importance as it is the starting point for developing these skills. Implementation programs aimed at these skills should be prepared and improved with the help of experimental research. Moreover, it was pointed out in this study that social studies programs were not structured in proper chronological order. For the purpose of developing historical thinking skills in students, history units should be revised taking these into consideration.
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‘WHAT IS ART?’ FOR CHILDREN AROUND THE WORLD: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

VICTORIA PAVLOU

Abstract – Art as a concept often operates within a particular culture. Through social interaction with adults, children build up a fund of social knowledge, which influences their own interpretations of art. This paper compares the findings of different studies examining children’s perceptions of art, which took place in different geographical (Los Angeles, New York, Nicosia/Cyprus), ethnic/cultural (Whites, Latino, African-American, English speakers, Greek speakers), socio-economic and curriculum contexts. Despite the significant disparities observed in the contexts under review, striking similarities are noted in children’s perceptions of art. These results have implications for the way we seek to understand what art is for children. More importantly, though, they highlight that art has a universal meaning for children and as such it can be used as a means for understanding, appreciating and accepting diverse cultures.

Introduction

There is no easy way to define art and this issue is often hotly debated:

‘Walking through a gallery I stop to view a work of art that has caught my eye. The work consists of a simple box with an interesting formal quality about it. It contains a delicate arm that moves methodically across a rotating paper scroll tracing a meandering path. I look for the plate to identify the artist and I am disappointed to find that it is missing and that the work, therefore, remains the creation of an anonymous artist. As I leave the hall I discover an identical work in the next room, causing me to blush as I realize that the object of my interest is a device for monitoring the humidity and temperature levels in the museum. How was I to know if this exhibit was, or was not, art?’ (Elliot, 1997).

Defining art is a challenging task. Both philosophers and art educators (Weitz, 1970; Goodman, 1977; Dissanayake, 1988; Davies, 1991; Anderson, 1995; Elliot, 1997) have raised arguments about the very nature of art, which are inextricably meshed with ontological, interpretive, and evaluative issues. Decisive answers cannot be expected given the complex and fundamental situation. Defining art is very important for art education—art and art education are inexorably interrelated—because its precise nature will define the content of what should be
taught (May, 1993). This paper does not advocate in favour of any given
definition; that is not its purpose. Rather it is concerned with what children as
recipients of art lessons in primary schools make of art. While there is much debate
among art educators and philosophers of what is art, there is limited research of
what children believe art is. Understanding children’s perceptions will benefit
practising primary teachers in their art teaching. Existing literature (Johnson,
1982, Stokrocki, 1986) suggests that children may have limited perceptions of art
and that the role of teachers is to understand these and move pupils forward by
introducing activities that aim to expand their horizons.

At the same time, researchers and art educators support the view that the terms
used by pupils to define art reflect their teachers’ attitudes and subsequently those
of the social context that they are located (Johnson, 1982). In a sense it is argued
that children develop structures of meanings for interpreting art and art activities
based on what is socially acceptable (Hamblen, 1984). Thus, one may hypothesise
that children coming from different social contexts may have different perceptions
of what is acceptable for art. This paper compares the findings of four studies
(Johnson, 1982; Stokrocki, 1986; Jeffers, 1998, and Pavlou, forthcoming) that
deal with pupils’ perceptions of art. Johnson’s (1982) study develops a socially/
culturally grounded position on what children know about art. Johnson examines
‘the meanings that children used to define the nature of art, and to reflect upon the
social knowledge and cultural assumptions that they share about the visual arts’
artworlds is founded on the belief children’s perceptions of art ‘are based on their
knowledge of art history and aesthetics and conditioned by their parents’, teachers’
and subcultural influences’. Jeffers (1998) shares Hamblen’s views that children’s
perceptions of art are predisposed and based on ‘socially relative learned
expectations’ (Hamblen 1984, p. 21). Pavlou (forthcoming), too, believes that
teachers condition, to a great extent, children’s perceptions of art and that by
examining these perceptions teachers can reflect on their practice and on the kinds
of art meanings that they transmit to their pupils. Bearing in mind the cultural
context in which the author has worked (Pavlou, forthcoming) and the cultural
contexts of the other studies (Johnson, 1982; Stokrocki, 1986; Jeffers, 1998) it was
hypothesised that pupils would provide significantly different definitions of art.

Comparing studies of children’s perceptions of art

The studies mentioned in this paper—and specifically those by Johnson
(1982), Stokrocki (1986), Jeffers (1998) and Pavlou (forthcoming)—deal with
children of different ages and/or at developmental stages. Johnson’s study (1982)
included children in Grades K-12; Stokrocki’s study (1986) included second graders; Jeffers’ (1998) study involved fourth graders; and Pavlou’s study (forthcoming) included sixth graders. To make meaningful comparisons, children of similar ages are presented together starting with the second graders of Johnson and Stokrocki, moving on to the fourth graders of Johnson and Jeffers, and ending up with the sixth graders of Johnson and Pavlou. Before comparing children’s perceptions of art, each study’s methodological framework is briefly presented.

Johnson (1982) asked 251 children the question: ‘in your opinion, what is art?’ or ‘what do you think art is?’. The children attended art classes in 17 schools in four districts located in south-eastern New York and of them 21 were second graders. The question was asked during tape-recorded interviews conducted in the art room while classes were taking place. Stokrocki (1986) gave 25 second graders a questionnaire that asked in part: ‘what is art?’ The children attended an art class of an elementary school of average size in a working class, industrial community of a mid-western city of USA. The second graders in Johnson’s and Stokrocki’s studies most often defined art in terms of making and doing (activity-based perceptions), e.g., ‘chalking and creating’ and ‘it’s like making stuff and learning about art’. Some defined art as object(s), e.g., ‘pictures’, ‘paintings’ and ‘stuff’. Other children defined art as a place where things were made. One difference between these two studies is that Stokrocki mentions that some children considered art as a hedonistic activity (‘I like art’, ‘art is fun’, and ‘art is nice’).

Jeffers (1998) conducted a study with 22 fourth graders. Children were asked: ‘what is art to you?’. The participants attended school in and reflected the ethnic diversity of Los Angeles County. Latino, Asians, African-Americans and Whites were well represented. Most participants were working class and lower-middle to middle class. Also, 23 additional definitions of art were obtained from case studies conducted by pre- and in-service teachers. These teacher-researchers interviewed children, usually in their home settings and asked them to define art. Johnson (1982) included 31 fourth graders in her study. Fourth graders overwhelmingly defined art in terms of doing and making, e.g. ‘paint, painting and drawing’ and ‘making designs and shapes’. Most children referred to paintings and drawings. Some children in Johnson’s study used the word ‘stuff’. Few children described art in terms of time and place while children in both studies referred to art as ‘fun’ and ‘enjoyable’. Also, there were some children in Johnson’s study who did not offer any definitions of art.

In Pavlou’s (forthcoming) study 24 sixth graders were asked the question: ‘in your opinion, what is art?’, or: ‘can you tell me, what do you think art is?’. The children attended art classes in six schools at the Nicosia district, Cyprus. The question was asked during tape-recorded interviews conducted in a quiet room while the rest of the class was having their art lesson. Interviews were conducted
in groups of four after pupils completed an attitude scale for art experienced in school. All children were of Greek-Cypriot origin coming from lower-middle to middle socio-economic background. All sixth graders in Pavlou’s study defined art in terms of doing, making or expressing, as did sixth graders in Johnson’s study (Johnson included 27 sixth graders in her study), e.g., ‘draw things on paper’, ‘make things by using your imagination’, ‘show your emotions’, ‘express your ideas’ and ‘express your feelings’. Sixth graders in both studies refer to different art forms such as painting, collage, sculptures and pottery. When referring to the content of art, they referred to ‘things’, ‘stuff’, ‘pictures’, ‘ideas’ and ‘feelings’. Several children noted that art was ‘nice’, ‘fun’ and ‘enjoyable’. Very few children in both studies referred to art as something that happened in a particular time and place, e.g., ‘it’s a subject we do in school’. In addition, few children in Pavlou’s study referred to art as something that could prove to be useful as a hobby or profession when they would have grown up. Few others talked about the kind of thinking art required, which was more pleasurable than the kind of thinking needed for other subjects: ‘you have to think in art, but it’s not the kind of thinking that you do in Maths’, ‘you do not think so hard, like you do in mathematics, e.g., in equations, or in Greek when you write a text’, ‘you don’t have to tire yourself thinking’.

Explaining the differences in content and context

Overall there are few differences in the types of meanings that children used in these studies to describe what art was for them. Therefore the hypothesis that children living in different cultural contexts would provide different definitions of art (when asked ‘what is art?’) was not supported. This is made explicit next by presenting all the differences and giving possible explanations that account for them.

One difference involves the use of the word ‘stuff’, which appeared quite frequently in all but one studies (in Jeffers’ study there is only one reference), e.g., ‘art is doing or making stuff’. Johnson notes a declination in the frequency of the use of ‘stuff’ as children get older (Kindergarten to grade 10). Jeffers asserts (1999, p.42) that the absence of ‘stuff’ in her study tended to indicate that the use of ‘stuff’ ‘could be considered as an idiosyncratic, rather than a developmental issue’ as suggested by Johnson. Jeffers’ argument is supported by Pavlou’s study where children used quite frequently the Greek word of ‘pragmata’, which can be translated as either ‘stuff’ or ‘things’.

Another difference is the perception of art as something that happens in a specific time and place. According to Johnson as children get older they seem to refer less frequently to art in terms of ‘when’ or ‘where’. Stokrocki and Pavlou also
reported that there were children who defined art in those terms. Again this does not appear to be a developmental issue but rather an issue connected with children’s art experiences and the conditions under which these have taken place. In particular in Stokrocki’s research, second graders had their art lessons in an art room and in Pavlou’s study children who referred to art in terms of specific time and place had art lessons with an art teacher in an art room. Fourth graders in Jeffers’ research did not receive art lessons in an art room from an art specialist and thus they were not to be expected to conceive art as happening in a special place and time.

One more difference is that few second and fourth graders who participated in Johnson’s study did not provide any definition of art. In fact, Johnson reported that a few participants at each grade level responded that they did not know. Jeffers also mentions that even though a couple of children initially responded that they did not know, after some though they were able to offer a definition when asked ‘What is art to you?’. Jeffers posited that this could not have been an indicator of lack any knowledge of what art was but rather that participants did not know how to formulate his/her definition, or did not know what was expected of him/her. There are some data in Pavlou’s study that support Jeffers’ position; that participants wanted to reply according to what they perceived it was expected of them to say. For example, after a sixth grader responded to the question ‘in your opinion, what is art?’, she quickly added: ‘is that what you wanted us to say?’. This indicated that she wanted a confirmation of what was expected of her to say. In addition, a couple of teachers in Pavlou’s study also replied ‘I don’t know’, when they were asked to define art. Certainly this was the case of people who were unsure of what was expected of them to say rather than people who lacked any knowledge of what art was. After giving them more time to think, they did provide definitions of art. In fact, in few cases the researcher found herself reassuring participants that there was no right or wrong answer to help them relax and provide their definitions of art. In both Jeffers and Pavlou’s studies participants were interviewed on a number of relative issues whereas Johnson asked a single question, which might have made it hard for participants to offer alternative answers.

Few children in Pavlou’s study referred to art as being something useful for them either as a hobby or a profession. This type of meaning was not reported in any other study. One explanation of this is that before the interview, children were asked to complete an attitude scale (Pavlou, 2003). The scale aimed to examine children’s attitudes towards art experienced in school and included four key dimensions (sub-scales). One of them dealt with how ‘useful/important’ children considered art to be and reasons for that. Children who made references to the usefulness of art were in line with the statements in the scale.
Finally, a more important difference is the perception of art as an intellectual activity. Few children in Pavlou’s study referred to the kind of thinking art entailed, which was characterised as being different from the one needed for subjects such as Maths and Language and more enjoyable. This type of meaning highlighted the fact that children conceived art as an intellectually demanding activity, an activity that did not deal only with feelings but also with thinking. There is not a readily explanation of why few children in Pavlou’s study had this particular perception of art while children in the other studies did not. This is the most recent study and perhaps it reflects a more current wide spread assumption of art as an intellectual activity. However, it is worth pointing out that children were interviewed in groups of four and this group dynamic helped children to elaborate their ideas further because they were able to respond to what their classmates were saying by either agreeing or disagreeing or elaborating further. This perception was mentioned by one member of the group and the rest of them agreed and added a few comments of their own.

It is apparent that most differences in children’s perceptions of art can be attributed in the methodological contexts under which the studies were undertaken. Some children were asked to give written definitions whereas others were interviewed. Written definitions tended to be shorter than the oral ones. In some cases children were interviewed by teacher-researchers in the comfort of their homes whereas in others they were interviewed in schools by the researcher. Definitions given by case study participants in Jeffers’ study were more expansive, inclusive and richer, than those given by Johnson’s participants. Moreover, some children were interviewed individually and others in groups of fours, something that made them feel more relaxed with the researcher as they were in the company of their classmates and thus they gave more colourful definitions of art than those mentioned by Johnson.

Common perceptions of art

Children’s perceptions of art as a creative activity (e.g., ‘draw’, ‘paint’), which is intrinsically rewarding (e.g., ‘fun’, ‘enjoyable’, ‘interesting’) was strongly evident in all the studies mentioned in this paper. Older children (fourth and mainly sixth graders) also referred to the expressive role of art (e.g., ‘expression of feelings/ideas). These perceptions emphasise that (a) the process is equally important as the end-product, and (b) art is intrinsically motivating—an argument that is lately often forgotten in art educators’ effort to argue in favour of art’s role in the school curriculum. Although one has to acknowledge that art education is not only about children’s own making and ability to create, but it also involves
critical studies, awareness of the making of others, and culture (Discipline Based Art Education), children in all studies refer mostly to art-making when asked to define art. One may argue that this is due to the limited vocabulary and knowledge that young children have. However, older children (fourth and sixth graders) are not expected to lack the vocabulary to express themselves about art and can improve in reasoning tasks, which involve judging if a definition of art is adequate by employing criteria of logic and relevant examples (Russell, 1988). Another explanation is that children were not engaged frequently enough in other activities—apart art-making—such as art history, art criticism and aesthetics (Greer, 1987) to consider these activities as part of what constituted ‘art’ for them. Children’s emphasis on art making (within the school context) may also suggest that children rarely had opportunities to view art in other places, such as galleries and museums (this was certainly the case for the sixth graders in Pavlou’s study).

While it seems reasonable to find differences in children’s perceptions of art, which can be attributable to differences in the research procedures and methods of each study, it was surprising to find so many similarities. In particular, participants received art instructions in different cultural and educational contexts (e.g., art curriculum, the existence of an art room or not, teacher’s qualifications, etc.). One reason for examining children’s perceptions of art is to help teachers better understand them and plan activities that aim to expand them further. But these similarities tend to support the view that a teacher (or a curriculum) has little impact on pupils’ definitions of art. Is this really the case?

Hamblen (1986, p.21) supports the thesis that ‘artistic perception is a function of learned expectations’, which are socially specific learned. All the studies were carried out in an attempt to understand children’s perceptions of art and at the same time the influences of the socialisation process. Therefore, we need to interpret children’s definitions of art in light of these expectations. That is, Jeffers (1999, p.43) argues that the question ‘what is art?’ should not be considered as ‘an open-ended question about an abstract mental concept; rather, it is laced with expectations and can be perceived as a test question having an acceptable answer’. Evidence of this was apparent when participants wanted a reassurance of their answer, e.g., in Jeffers’ and Pavlou’s study. In particular a teacher who participated in Pavlou’s study found it utterly ridiculous that the researcher (a teacher with post graduates studies in art education) was asking him, ‘what is art?’. In amazement and failing to grasp what lay behind the question, he replied: ‘you are an expert, don’t you know? Why would you want to hear to what I have to say?’ This response suggests that the teacher probably saw the question as inauthentic. Perhaps if he was asked ‘what is art about?’ or ‘how do you feel when dealing with art?’, he would have provided a more genuine response. So, one explanation of the similarities found in these four studies is that participants tried to formulate free-
risk responses according to what they believed it was expected of them to say. That is, when children were being asked to define art, the real question was what others had taught them art was. If this was the case a rephrasing of the question might have been necessary, or even a series of questions would have been more helpful in understanding better children’s perceptions of art.

Still this explanation does not fully explain the significant thematic similarities in children’s definitions of art living in different times and places. If pupils responded to the question according to what their teachers or others have already taught them, does this suggest that they have been taught the same things? Based on the importance of socialisation and wide spread assumptions/ideas about art, one could answer ‘yes’, that is primary school teachers appeared to have conditioned art to have a similar meaning to the children included in the studies under investigation in this paper (although it is highly questionable that teachers in different parts of the world were using very similar approaches to the teaching of the art subject). Another possible explanation is that in defining art children did not try to distinguish it from non-art, but they tried to highlight its value for them and how they were ‘using’ art. And this value and ‘use’ of art had to do with being able to create paintings, drawings, things, etc, and thus express themselves (the latest was emphasised mainly by sixth graders and older children). These ‘activities’ were not influenced by their gender, age or cultural background.

Children’s responses to the question ‘what is art?’ illustrate vividly—and not just theoretically—that art is a common language to all children around the world because art appears to have the same meaning for children coming from different ethnic, cultural, social backgrounds. These common perceptions of art can serve as a starting point for teachers operating in diverse cultural contexts to introduce artefacts from different cultures. And when talking about ‘introducing’ art, I am not simply referring to accepting information about cultures but using these perceptions of art as a means to promote mutual understanding between cultures and people who might otherwise feel there are few things that they can share. However, often things are more complex. It is often the case that when art education is concerned with the formal (e.g., colour, shape, texture, space) rather with the cultural aspects of art (e.g., traditional artefacts), it becomes easier for the common perceptions to emerge. Building on these common perceptions, however, provides the best possible basis for promoting understanding, appreciation and thus acceptance of different cultures and people. The theoretical framework is there: the need to learn ‘in art’, ‘about art’ and ‘through art’ is constantly emphasised by different art curricula around the world. Not all three roles of art education are reflected in pupils’ understandings of art, and the expressive rationale (learning ‘in art’)}
teaching art seems to be stronger than the reconstructive (learning ‘through art’) or scientific rationale (learning ‘about art’) (Siegesmund, 1998). This implies that in order to expand children’s perceptions of art, teachers will have to incorporate cultural experiences in their lessons and not just offer activities that represent the productive nature of art.

Conclusion and directions for future research

This paper raises issues on, at least, two levels. At the first level, it aims to interpret the implications of the similarities identified among studies that asked children to respond to the question ‘what is art?’. At the second level, it acknowledges the limitations of the question asked and suggests ways to overcome them. So, the paper emphasises that based on research findings, it may be proposed that children from different parts of the world share similar perceptions of art, which can help teachers plan activities that would aim to introduce various cultures to them. As teachers we need to understand these perceptions and our role in shaping/expanding them. And this brings us to the second point of the paper, that, it may be necessary to change the form of the question and replace it with more genuinely evocative questions. Questions referring to the way pupils use art, what is art about, the way they value art and the way they feel when making art or responding to art are crucial for revealing clearly pupils’ perceptions of art. Changes in the form of the question(s) may empower a deeper understanding of pupils’ perceptions of the nature of art.

Further research is needed to examine how one can build on children’s perceptions of art in order to help them understand, appreciate and accept different cultures. Moreover, any attempts to compare children’s perceptions of art from different parts of the world need to based—at least—on having the same questions asked and—at best—the same methodology used, too. At the moment the only common question asked is the question under investigation in this paper. Discussions around specific artworks would be valuable in understanding further children’s perceptions of art, but these should not be confused with aesthetic attitudes (for example, kinds of art that children prefer most, e.g., realistic vs. abstract art). Jeffers (1998) showed reproductions of artworks to children to choose their least and most appealing artwork and Pavlou (2003) asked children to bring their own artworks and talk about them. However, these findings were not useful for comparison purposes. An agreed set of reproductions of artworks—among researchers/art educators—will promote a better understanding of children’s perceptions of art in any future research.
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Notes

1. In Pavlou (forthcoming) I refer to pupils’ perceptions of art as these were revealed through their response to a specific question (in your opinion, what is art?) but also through their overall responses to an entire interview and an attitude scale designed to measure children’s attitude towards art. For comparison purposes, in this paper I refer only to pupils’ responses to the specific question, ‘in your opinion, what is art?’.

2. A very simple example of this can be the teaching of the visual concept of pattern. For example, one may introduce this concept through direct observation of the natural or man-made environment of the children and then move on to the observation of traditional patterns first within children’s own culture and then within the culture of other (e.g., traditional artefacts, folk clothes, decorations of mosques or churches). These pieces of information can be the beginning of an understanding of other cultures.
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Abstract – The aim of the present comparative study is to find out whether there are any differences in self-esteem between Pontian and Greek students at the 6th Grade level. Pontians are a particular type of immigrant in the sense that they are in fact ‘re-patriated’: they are Greeks whose ancestors lived around Pontos in the Black Sea area during the seventh century before Christ. They moved to the interior of the ex-Soviet Union in 1916, and then returned to Greece in 1986. Although Pontians share a common history, religion, and several cultural elements with the Greeks, ‘natives’ regard them as ‘foreigners’ and as a result they are a marginalized population in Greece. This study set out to analyse the self-concept of a total sample of 1558 students attending 6th Grade. 552 of these students were Pontian immigrants, 864 were native Greeks while 172 were Pontian natives. The results of the present research lead us to conclude that there is a statistically significant difference in the self-concept between the Pontian and Greek population. It also seems that the marginalized immigrant family, whether belonging to the same ethnic group or not, comprises a population at risk as far as the self-concept of the children is concerned.

Introduction: repatriation and self-esteem

According to research worldwide, immigration presents itself as a complex and multifaceted social phenomenon. The condition of immigration imposes primordial changes on an individual’s and a family’s life-cycle. The immigrant family has to mobilize numerous skills (language, ability to make decisions, to socialize, to cope with frustration and so on) as well as mechanisms of adaptation in order to survive and embed itself successfully in the new social environment of the host country.

According to comparative research findings the children of immigrant families, compared to native children, do not present more generalized or higher levels of emotional disturbances or difficulties in their social adaptation (Aronowitz, 1992; Touliatos & Lindholm, 1980). Nevertheless, it is generally...
considered that the immigrant population represents a social group at risk as far as the psychological welfare of its members and particularly the formation of the self-concept of their children is concerned (Eyoud et al., 2000; Sam, 2000; Vered & Sheraga, 1997).

The main factors that contribute to the development of self-esteem as well as the development of the psychological welfare of immigrant children are on one hand the successful adaptation of their families to the new social environment (Sam, 2000) and on the other, the degree of ‘social support’ they receive. The term ‘social support’ refers to the chances offered to an individual by his/her network of interpersonal relationships, to develop further his personality and personal skills (McCombs, 1991). The main sources of social support during school age (which represents the age of the population of the focus of the present research) are parents, educators and their peers (Harter, 1986; Messer & Harter, 1986; Printz et al., 1999).

According to research findings (Rutter et al., 1975), when immigrant children are successfully adapted to the social environment of the host country, then they do not present either a higher degree of pathology or other problems in any other dimension of their behaviour compared to the native population (Touliatos & Lindholm, 1980). According to other findings of research related to differences in relation to sex and school performance, immigrant children do not present differences compared to those of the native population (Osborne, 1971).


According to other findings of comparative studies, the immigrant population seems to exhibit higher levels of impulsive behaviour, emotional vulnerability, lower self-esteem and higher levels of pathology than native children. On the other hand, they exhibit higher levels of motivation towards success and goals (Siefen et al., 1996).

Research on immigrants and repatriates in Greece reveals that the majority of the immigrant population was found to experience higher levels of major depression and anxiety disorders compared to the native population (Georgas et al., 1999). Research on self-esteem has shown that this is particularly low in the immigrant children and adolescents (Baral, 1977; Sam, 2000; Hatzichristou, 2003).

Moreover, other research carried out in Greece concerning the relationship between emigration and pathology show that those immigrants with a high level
of acculturation in the country where they emigrated from developed higher levels of pathology—when compared to those with lower level of acculturation during their stay in the host country—when they repatriated themselves in their homeland (Bilanakis et al., 1995/1996).

According to other research findings (Leze, 2003; Hatzichristou et al., 2001) immigrants as well as foreign students face difficulties in specific domains, including: difficulties in understanding and speaking the Greek language, learning difficulties and poor school performance. The above-mentioned characteristics constitute the main factors which hinder the process of social adaptation of immigrant students to their new social environment in the host country.

Further findings on repatriated as well as foreign students in Greece confirm that they have higher psychosocial needs compared to those of their native peers (Hatzichristou, 2003). Also, immigrant students seem to experience higher levels of anxiety (Georgas et al., 1999).

The history of Pontians

Pontians are a particular type of immigrants. They can most certainly be regarded as repatriated because they are Greeks whose ancestors left in the Black Sea area during 700 B.C. After 1916 they immigrated to the interior of the ex-Soviet Union and returned to Greece in 1986. It should be mentioned that during the 90’s Greece received a great number of Greek repatriates from many countries namely: Western Europe (mainly Germany), Albania and the ex-Soviet Union. The Pontians from the ex-Soviet Union have managed to keep their Greek identity regardless of being uprooted and the sufferings they endured. When they came back to what they considered their ‘mother country’ they were regarded by Greek society as ‘immigrants’, and therefore not Greeks. Natives refer to them as ‘Russian-Pontians.’ This name stigmatizes them and excludes them socially because they are not considered Greeks by the rest of the native population who seem to consider them as having the same status as any other immigrant population (Albans, Romans, and so on) (Anthogalidou et al., 1998).

The Pontian population is faced with many difficulties in accomplishing their social and economic insertion in Greece. These difficulties are mainly due to the following:

(a) Pontians cannot access a number of professions in the Greek labour market either because such jobs are prohibited to non-natives—as in the case of teachers and doctors, for instance—or because they do not have formal, certified training in vocations that Pontians learned informally, in
such trades and crafts as jewellery, car mechanics, electrical installation, and so on.

(b) Pontians (mainly those belonging to the first generation) lack language skills.
(c) They have a low financial status.
(d) They have less chance than natives to climb up the social ladder.

Due to the above-mentioned difficulties, Pontian families face high levels of anxiety, insecurity and uncertainty due to their struggle to survive financially and also due to the effects of social exclusion (Kotsionis, 1993).

Research also indicates that their relationship with state authorities is often negative. They feel they have been ‘deserted’ by the state, that the policy of the Greek state is inadequate, and that the so-called ‘good practices’ are practically inexistent. Consequently, they feel very angry and suspicious towards any Greek authority and its representatives (Kotsionis, 1993).

During their stay in the Black Sea and the countries of the ex-Soviet Union the cultural characteristics of the Pontians have been altered as a result of the phenomenon of acculturation. At the same time, during this period the cultural givens of the native Greek population have also changed. Nevertheless, the expectations of Pontians were, on return to their homeland to find a culture identical to theirs. When they returned and came into contact with the native population they discovered a culture markedly different to theirs. They felt ‘different’, ‘strangers’ and gradually ‘excluded’ (Anthogalidou et al., 1998).

The purpose of the present study is to find out whether there is a positive or a negative correlation between self-esteem and immigration. The specific research goal is on the one hand to evaluate the level of self-esteem of 6th Grade Pontian students of primary school and on the other to compare it to that of native students.

Social exclusion is a stressful condition by definition and it can be considered as one of the stressors the immigrant family is faced with. In the case of Pontians there seems to be a particular problem, i.e. they are faced with a specific identity problem which is due to (a) the fact they feel and have always felt Greeks, and (b) that they have always longed to return to what they considered their country, so that when they did return, they did so expecting to be welcomed as ‘brothers’ and ‘equals’, by the rest of the Greeks. However, what they faced upon their arrival in the ‘mother country’ was the same ‘traumatic’ experience of having to live with the identity of the ‘immigrant ‘the stranger’ and the ‘excluded’ (Kotsionis, 1993; Anthogalidou et al., 1998; Fotiadis, 2000). As the history of the Pontians shows, they can be regarded as immigrants and emigrants, refugees and repatriated at the same time (Kotsionis, 1993).
The present research worked with the hypothesis that the primary school age Pontian students would present lower self-esteem than children from native Greek families would. This hypothesis is based on the following rationale: Pontians consist of a social group who suffer the effects of social exclusion in the Greek society. The condition of social exclusion has negative effects on the development of children’s self-esteem because:

- The excluded family is faced with high levels of anxiety due to the condition of social exclusion and to their struggle for survival because of their low financial and social status. The family has more difficulties in maintaining a stable context of security for their children (Haritou-Fatourou, 1994).
- These families often react by overprotecting their children (Haritou-Fatourou, 1994) and therefore giving them less chance to develop autonomy and self-esteem.
- During their stay in the countries of the ex-Soviet Union as well as during their present stay in Greece, Pontian families are faced with a negative prototype of identification. The representation of the immigrant is, therefore, pejorative compared to that of the native Greek. The edification of the self-esteem of the Pontian students is hindered because they come up against a negative representation of themselves, as Pontians.

It should be noted that there is very little if any research concerning the self-esteem of the Pontian population. Most research in Greece and other countries is related to the economic and social effects of immigration. Also there is very little research on the psychological status of Greek immigrants or repatriated populations, and especially so of Pontians.

Method

Participants

One of the main concerns of the researchers of the present study was to define the ‘Pontian student’. The necessity of such a distinction comes from the fact that Pontian students can be considered to fall in the following categories: (a) those students whose parents (and in many cases the children themselves) were born in the ex-Soviet Union. For the purpose of this study, such students are considered as ‘Pontians’; (b) those students whose parents as well as themselves were
born in Greece and are considered as ‘native Pontians’: that is Greeks whose grandparents were Pontians. The focus of this research therefore includes both ‘Pontians’ and ‘native-Pontians’.

Research participants were students of the 6th Grade. This Grade was chosen because by then students have acquired sufficient language competence to answer the questions of the tests used in the research.

Selection of participants

According to the data of the General Secretariat of National Statistical Service of Greece and those of the Department of Primary education of the Ministry of education, 71% of Pontian students study in the schools of the educational regions of Athens (an urban area and the country’s capital), Thessalonica (also an urban area and the second biggest city in Greece), and Thrace (which is a semi–urban area in northern Greece). The present research took place in the above-mentioned regions. The method of random sampling was used. The number of participants in the research was 1,558. The average age of the students was twelve years. Out of the 1,558 students who answered the questionnaires, 522 were Pontians, 864 were natives and 172 were native-Pontians.

Instruments

The instruments used in the present study were the following:

1. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Scale, which is based on a mono-dimensional approach to self-esteem, i.e. it refers to one dimension of self-esteem, which is that of general self-esteem. The scale consists of 58 questions out of which 8 refer to the lying scale. If the subject answers positively in 5 of those questions then it can be regarded that he consciously tries to describe himself in an unjustifiably positive fashion. In that case the scale we did consider valid neither the Coopersmith scale, nor the correspondent Scale of Susan Harter that the participant has answered.

In the present research the validity of the Scale was checked and was found to have satisfactory stability in time and to be satisfactorily free of time sampling error. In a sample consisting of 177 students (Pontians, Natives and Native Pontians) and for a period of four weeks, the validity of the repetitive measurements was found to be equal to $r = 0.89$. The internal consistency of the questionnaire administered to a sample of 1478 students (Pontians, Natives and Native-Pontians) was equal to alpha Cronbach $= 0.85$. 
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2. The Susan Harter (Self-Perception Profile for Children, 1985) Scale. The theoretical approach to self-esteem in this scale is more holistic compared to Coopersmith’s Scale. Susan’s Harter Scale refers to many dimensions of the self-esteem and emphasizes the multidimensional nature of the term as well as the feeling the person has about his overall self-worth. The scale consists of thirty-six questions and is divided in six sub-scales (Global Self-Worth, Scholastic Competence, Social Acceptance, Athletic Competence, Physical Appearance and Behavioural Conduct). Each sub-scale consists of six questions. The reliability analysis of repetitive measurements, considering that each sub-scale consists of only six questions, showed that the sub-scales had satisfactory stability in time (r = from 0.65 to 0.77) as well as satisfactory internal consistency (alpha Cronbach = from 0.65 to 0.76).

The criteria that led us to choose Susan Harter’s Self-Perception Profile for Children scale were the following: It presents high validity, it is easy to use and it emphasizes the multidimensional nature of the meaning of the term of self-worth. The Coopersmith questionnaire was also administered for the following reasons: (a) in order to have a better assessment of the overall self-esteem of the students; (b) it gave us the possibility to identify the false answers; (c) finally both scales have been used by a great number of researches in Greece and elsewhere.

Procedure

The data of the present study were collected from October to May 2002. A total of seventy schools were contacted for the purposes of the study. Out of these, 40 were located in Athens, 25 in Thessalonica, and 15 in the area of Thrace.

The questionnaires were not administered during periods of national or religious celebrations. The rationale that informed that decision was that during festivities children are usually in a very positive and celebratory mood, which could affect their answers to the questionnaires.

The questionnaires were administered in the classroom, during the first two didactic hours. The time required for the completion of each questionnaire was approximately 40 to 45 minutes. It was explained to the students that they were participating in a project. They reacted very positively and often showed excitement at being involved.

Results

A major finding was that while students of the 6th Grade were naturally expected to have been born in 1990, a large number of Pontians (145) was in fact born before that date and were consequently older than their native peers. This
difference is due to the fact that upon their arrival in Greece, they were placed in lower grades than those corresponding to their age, on account of the fact that they did not speak the Greek language. We therefore set as a primary task the finding out of the correlation between self-esteem and the age of the students.

**Correlations between self-esteem and age**

By placing individuals randomly in each group we constructed the following three equal groups: Pontians, Natives and Native-Pontians (_=145). One-way ANOVA analysis showed that statistically significant differences between means existed in the following scales-sub scales:

- Self-Esteem (Coopersmith): \[F (2,432) = 5,7, p<0,05\]
- Scholastic Competence (Harter): \[F (2,432) = 6,87 p<0,001\]
- Social Acceptance (Harter): \[F (2,432) = 3,89 p<0,05\]
- Behavioural Conduct (Harter): \[F (2,432) = 4,76 p<0,05\]

Students born before 1990 present lower self-esteem compared to those born in 1990. Therefore, since age is an important factor affecting self-esteem, we focused the rest of the analysis only on students who were born in 1990.

**Correlations between self-esteem and origin: Pontians, Natives, Native-Pontians**

We continued our analysis by examining the correlation between self-esteem/self-perception and each group according to the place of birth of the students (Pontians, Native, and Native-Pontians). The analysis of the One-way ANOVA analysis showed the existence of statistically significant differences between means in the following scales-sub scales:

- Self-Esteem (Coopersmith): \[F (2,1408) = 39,85 p<0,001\]
- Global Self-Worth (Harter): \[F (2,1408) = 15,14 p<0,001\]
- Scholastic Competence (Harter): \[F (2,1408) = 45,1 p<0,001\]
- Social Acceptance (Harter): \[F (2,1408) = 14,43 p<0,05\]
- Athletic Competence (Harter): \[F (2,1408) = 12,38 p<0,001\]
- Physical Appearance (Harter): \[F (2,1408) = 4,45 p<0,05\]
- Behavioural Conduct (Harter): \[F (2,1408) = 19,49 p<0,001\]

We applied the Post Hoc Tests (Student-Newman-Keuls) in order to locate differences among the groups. The analysis showed that the general self-esteem
and self-perception scores on all sub-scales were lower in the Pontian students in comparison to the other two groups. On the contrary, there was no difference between Native Pontians and Greeks.

A questionnaire was administered in order to find out the structure of the Pontian family (we administered the same questionnaire to the native students of sample). By the term structure we refer to whether the families under study were nuclear or extended. We added extra questions in the section referring to the demographic data. The kind of questions we asked were the following:

– How many persons live in your home?
– How often do you communicate or meet with your relatives?
– Where do your grandparents and uncles/antes live?

What we found out was that a significant percentage (52%) of Pontian families lives with their grandparents or other members of the extended family. In other words, they either live within walking distance of each other or share the same house or apartment. An equally significant percentage (35%) of Pontian families live away from their relatives who are left behind in Russia. They can therefore be regarded as nuclear families. The target of the following analysis is to depict any differences in the self-esteem / self-perception between the students whose families are in close contact with their relatives (and therefore their functioning can be regarded as that of the extended family) and those whose families are in no contact with the extended family (and their functioning is closer to that of the nuclear family). We have proceeded to separate analysis concerning contact of the students of the sample with grandparents and other relatives.

Correlations between self-esteem / self-perception and bi-generational structure of the Pontian family (grandparents)

One-way ANOVA showed statistically significant differences between means of the following scales and subscales:

– Scholastic Competence (Harter) [F (2,381) = 6,60, p<0,05]
– Social Acceptance (Harter) [F (2,381) = 3,35, p<0,05]
– Behavioural Conduct (Harter) [F (2,381) = 3,40, p<0,05]

H Post Hoc Tests (Student-Newman-Keuls), p=0,05 showed:

Scholastic Competence (Harter): the students who are scarcely (once every two months) or never in personal contact with their grandfathers and
grandmothers present lower (scores) of scholastic self-perception compared to the students who are in a daily, personal contract. Furthermore the scholastic self-esteem of the students who have daily contact with grandparents presents the same scores with those who contact their grandparents twice or three times a month.

Social Acceptance (Harter): The students who have very scarce personal contact (a period of more than two to three months elapses between meetings) with their grandparents or other close relatives present lower Social Acceptance from students who are in daily personal contact.

Behavioural Conduct (Harter): The students who have very scarce personal contact (a period of more than two to three months elapses between meetings) with their grandparents or other close relatives present lower Behavioural Conduct from students who are in daily personal contact.

Correlations between self-esteem / self-perception and structure of the Pontian family (cousins, uncles and aunts)

One-way ANOVA showed the existence of statistically significant differences between means in the following scales- subscales:

- Self-Esteem (Coopersmith) [F (2,387) = 7,59, p<0,001]
- Global Self-Worth (Harter) [F (2,387) = 7,95, p<0,001]
- Scholastic Competence (Harter) [F (2,387) = 6,66, p<0,05]
- Behavioral Conduct (Harter) [F (2,387) = 3,402, p<0,05]
- Physical Appearance (Harter) [F (2,387) = 3,66, p<0,05]

The Post Hoc Tests (Student-Newman-Keuls), p=0,05 analysis showed the following in the domains of self esteem (Coopersmith) / Global self-worth (Harter), Scholastic Competence, Social Acceptance, Physical Appearance. Students who are in daily contact with grandparents, uncles and aunts present higher general self-esteem and self perception compared to the other two groups. On the other hand those students who contact their relatives once or twice a month do not present any difference in their self-esteem compared to those who very seldom or ever contact them.

Discussion

According to the findings of the present research, the self-esteem of the sixth Grade Pontian students from the ex-Soviet Union is lower than that of the native students. This difference in the self-esteem is present in all subscales of the Harter
test. These findings are consistent with those of other research findings (Siefen et al., 1996; Bilanakis et al., 1995; Sam, 2000).

Given the above results we may come to the conclusion that Pontian students of the sixth Grade are a social group whose insertion in the host country is not satisfactory. The fact that the families of those students are not sufficiently embedded in Greek society affects negatively the development of the self-esteem of its young members. We may also assume that the low self-esteem of the young Pontian students may, in its turn, be at the origin of anxiety, marginalization from the group of peers, difficulties in the psychosocial development of the students and low school performance (Botsari, 2001; Eyouat et al., 2000; Hatzichristou, 2003; Siefen & Kirkcaldy, 1998; Madianos, 2000; Sam, 2000).

The findings of the research validate further the hypothesis according to which the healthy development of self-esteem presupposes a social context, which provides emotional security and social acceptance (Botsari, 2001; Burns, 1986; Hatzichristou & Hopf, 1992; Hatzichristou, 2003; Matsagouras, 1999; Mason et al., 1996).

Pontian students who are placed in classes which do not correspond (are lower) to their age (e.g. a twelve year-old student is placed in a third Grade class) present lower self-esteem / self-perception than their native peers. This difference is found to be statistically significant in the domains of: Self-Esteem Coopersmith, Scholastic Competence Harter, Social Acceptance Harter and Behavioural Conduct Harter. The students were placed in lower classes on the assumption that they would have fewer difficulties in learning the Greek language and that by learning faster and in an easier way the Greek language they would have more possibilities to insert themselves successfully in the Greek educational system. However the fact that these students study in lower grades than those who correspond to their age and therefore their classmates are younger than themselves seems to have a negative affect on their self-esteem.

Another major finding is that students of the sixth Grade who are in close personal contact with the extended family (grandparents, cousins, uncles) present higher self-esteem than those who are in very scarce or no contact at all in the domains of Global Self-Worth, Scholastic, Social and Behavioural self-perception. These findings may lead us to the conclusion that the contact of the students with the extended family and especially with their family peers affects positively the development of the self-esteem. We may conclude that the peers of the family as well as the adults function as a network of support. Further research could reveal the mechanism behind this finding with peers. One could put forward the hypothesis that there is a mechanism of identification taking place apart from the hypothesis that the extended family functions as a network of emotional security and support.
Applications

The findings of the present research show us that the Pontian students from the ex-Soviet is a group at risk as far as the development of their self-esteem is concerned. We therefore propose a number of measures that could be taken in order to face and also this prevent the effects of their exclusion.

a. *The establishment of a positive context (emotional climate) in the classroom:* Pontian students should be encouraged to participate actively and equally to the other students and experience a climate of acceptance and equality with their peer natives. All students (native or not) should be introduced to the principles of equality and the respect of human rights. Students should also be sensitized to accept differences and multiculturalism.

b. *Activities organized by the school:* The school should organize lectures and other activities common to students of all origins (festivities, expositions) inside and outside the school premises. The purpose of these activities would be to sensitize the students, the parents of all nationalities (whether Pontian or natives) and the community on issues of equality, and difference of every kind (sexes, nationality, social status, and so on).

c. *The existence of a transitional period before class placement:* Repatriated students should be given the possibility to go through a transitional stage before they are taught the whole syllabus in the native language (Greek). This can be achieved by the creation of remedial language and enculturation classes in schools and with Pontians teachers, from USSR, who will teach their native language in a few lessons at the first year of school.

d. *Placement of the repatriated students to the class that corresponds to their age:* Repatriated students should follow classes that correspond to their age and they should be able to follow at the same time the secondary lessons in their mother language.

e. *Teaching of the Russian language:* Russian should be taught as a second language in schools where there is a great number of Pontian students.

f. *Seminars addressed to teachers:* Seminars should be offered to teachers in order to disseminate information on subjects concerning the teaching of foreign and repatriated students. Emphasis should be given on the recent developments of the methods of teaching a language to foreign students.
Activities that contribute to empowerment: The establishment of activities the target of which will be to reinforce the acceptance of repatriated students by their native peers. In the case of Pontians who speak the same language with natives, museum-based instruction in shared cultural heritage can be used as a tool that will contribute to mark out common cultural features and will lead to the further strengthening of their relationship and the acceptance of their differences. Teacher training programmes should include sessions on the psychology of repatriated students and their families. Universities should also encourage and support research on issues related to repatriation and on transcultural education, so that teachers become more sensitised to the problems and particularities of repatriated students.
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THE PERCEPTIONS OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS ABOUT EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

MELEK ÇAKMAK
MEHMET BULUT

Abstract – This study aims at investigating the perceptions of pre-service teachers regarding effective teaching and effective teachers. The following research questions were addressed for this purpose: What are the dimensions of effective teaching? What are the characteristics of an effective teacher? The study is composed of two parts: a literature review, and empirical research. A questionnaire consisting of four open-ended questions was administered to 153 pre-service teachers. Some findings are briefly discussed, including the key fact that pre-service teachers believe that the pedagogical skills of professional teachers should take precedence over the improvement of their theoretical knowledge of their subject matter.

Introducing the context

The structure of the present formal Turkish education system consists of preschool education, elementary education, secondary education, and higher education. Except for higher education, formal education is provided free of charge in the public schools even though private schools exist at all levels of education. Until recently, primary education had been the only compulsory education. In 1997, the period of compulsory education was increased from five to eight years, combining primary and middle schools. Secondary education encompasses general and vocational or technical high schools where, depending on the type of high school, additional three or four years of training take place after elementary education (Saban, 2003). Admission to higher education is centralized and based on a single-stage examination, named the Student Selection Examination, administered by the Student Selection and Placement Centre every year (Tekkaya et al., 2004).

Since 1982, the responsibility for teacher education in Turkey lies with the universities that are governed by the higher education council (Sefereoglu, 2004). The Council of Higher Education is responsible for the planning, coordination and supervision of higher education. Teacher education programs were restructured bringing uniform curricula to replace the varied curricula of teacher education.
program in all subjects which brought standardization to teacher education programs all over the country in terms of their curricula in 1990’s (Seferoglu, 2004).

The reform of teacher education created the conditions for the government to launch of a new strategy in the training of teachers. Thanks to these reforms, it became imperative for teacher training institutions to change the curriculum by adding pedagogical courses, increasing the length of methodology courses, and devoting far more time to teaching the skills that are related to effective instruction (Simsek & Yıldırım, 2001).

Pre-service teachers are trained through four-year undergraduate programs at the faculties of education. Pre-service teacher training is carried out by the faculties of education at university level. Preschool teachers, classroom teachers, upper primary (previously middle school), subject area teachers (mathematics, science, social sciences and Turkish) are trained through four-year undergraduate programs that offer subject area and pedagogical courses concurrently (Yıldırım & Ok, 2002, p.262).

Extension of basic education to 8 years through the Basic Education Reform of 1997 has created a shift in emphasis in teacher education, which had previously given priority to training subject area teachers for secondary schools. In 1998, teacher education programs were restructured to give more emphasis to training subject areas, which presented the greatest number of teacher shortages in the 1990’s. Today, teacher education program or a certification program is offered by Faculties of Education (Yıldırım & Ok, 2002, p.262).

Effective teaching

Educators have discussed the teaching profession and agreed that teaching is a complex and difficult task. Teachers have ultimately important roles in order to make teaching effective and useful for learners in this context. Inevitably, the quality of teaching and teacher are an important factor for students’ learning and their success in the learning process. There is a relationship between effective teaching and effective learning, since effective learning is the result of effective teaching. If teachers have effective strategies, they can enable children to learn and understand what is taught effectively. Effective teaching is also closely related to children’s learning outcomes and their success. These outcomes could be in cognitive, affective and social domains.

Kyriacou (1997), for example, defined effective teaching as teaching which successfully achieves pupils’ learning intended by the teacher. There are two things which should be considered with respect to effective teaching according to
Kyriacou: (1) the teacher must have a clear idea of what learning is to be fostered (2) the teacher sets up and provides a learning experience which achieves this. On the other hand, Berliner (1983) stated that effective teaching requires a set of executive skills and these skills are about planning, communicating goals, regulating the activities of the workplace, creating a pleasant environment for work, educating new members of the work group, supervising and working with other people, motivating those being supervised, and evaluating the performance of those being supervised.

In contrast to Kyriacou (1997) and Berliner (1983), Slavin (2003) described key elements of effective teaching in four categories: quality of instruction, appropriate levels of instruction, incentive and time. Quality of instruction is about a product of the quality, organization and comprehensiveness of the curriculum and lesson presentation. In the second category, by appropriate levels of instruction, students are ready to learn a new lesson, having the necessary skills, background knowledge and material that are neither too easy nor too difficult. In the incentive category, students are motivated to work and learn. In the last category, classroom time is well used with adequate time for learning. All four elements must be attended to effectively if learning is to accelerate.

On the other hand, Giovannelli (2003) demonstrated that a reflective disposition toward teaching was related to effective teaching, especially in the domains of instructional behaviour, classroom organization and teacher expectation. Reflective disposition consisted of six components: the composite of effective teaching, reflection on what teachers should know and able to do, reflection on teaching, reflection on learning, reflection on what it would be like to be a teacher in the classroom. According to Giovannelli, effective teaching consists of five components: the composite of effective teaching, classroom management, instructional behaviour, and classroom organization and teacher expectations.

A perusal of the relevant literature also provides research findings which investigated effective teaching according to the considerations of teachers, student teachers, principals, and so on. Wilson & Cameron (1996), for instance, investigated student teacher perceptions about effective teaching. They examined whether student teachers’ perceptions change or not during their pre-service programs and the results revealed the main points such as: (1) student teachers develop from a ‘teacher centered’ to a ‘pupil centered’ view of effective instruction (2) student teachers develop from a ‘control’ view to a holistic view of classroom management (3) student teachers develop from a personal to a professional/outcomes view of relationships with pupils.

On the other hand, Stanovich & Jordan (1998) investigated the performance of teacher behaviours associated with effective teaching. Teachers’ and principals’
beliefs were taken into account in their study and data was collected in 33 classrooms from 12 schools by applying questionnaire to the participants. Teachers were also interviewed and observed regarding effective teaching behaviours. The results mainly showed that the strongest predictor of effective teaching behaviour was the subject school norm as operationalized by the principal’s attitudes and beliefs about heterogeneous classrooms.

Effective teachers

What does research on an ‘effective’ and a ‘good’ teacher highlight? Researchers who study effective teaching indicate that one of the essential factors that determine effective teaching is an effective teacher. However, when the related research was reviewed, it was seen that some researchers describe the characteristics of ‘effective’ teachers whereas others describe characteristics of ‘good’ teachers. For instance, Clemson & Craft (1981) described the ‘good’ or the ‘effective’ teacher and attempted to clarify their meanings. According to them, most people regard ‘good’ and ‘effective’ as being synonymous whereas these concepts are not the same. To differentiate these concepts, two factors are important: teaching method and content. The content which includes knowledge, skills and attitudes will vary according to some factors such as pupil age, ability, and the perceived needs of society and so on whereas the basic criterion for the selection of method must be related to pupils’ ability to learn more, to make them happy in the learning situation. As a result, the good teacher is always effective but the effective teacher is not necessarily ‘good’ according to their study.

Guskey (1985) investigated whether or not teachers who received training actually applied what they learnt to their instructional practice more effectively. The subjects were 96 intermediate and high school teachers. According to the results, after implementing mastery learning techniques in their classroom, teachers do attach significantly greater importance to behaviour factors in explaining teaching effectiveness and also attach less importance to personality factors.

Stanton (1985) also stated what makes a good teacher and explained that good teachers were often in the past simply accepted as those who knew their subject well and had strong academic qualifications. According to Stanton there are two approaches about what defines an effective teacher. One of the approaches suggests anyone with an interest in a subject and a desire to communicate with students will be able to teach effectively, another approach emphasizes that the subject matter expert is usually a poor teacher. Stanton claims that it is possible that the truth lies somewhere between these two viewpoints and both of them are necessary to be an effective teacher.
On the other hand, Perrot (1986) claimed that observational studies of teaching suggest that the effective teacher is one who is able to demonstrate the ability to bring about intended learning goals. Here are the two critical dimensions of effective teaching: intent and achievement. Similarly, Richardson & Stop (1987) indicated that good teachers have some of the qualities of a good teacher as having different backgrounds shared characteristics among them even though they come from many different backgrounds, with various interests and experiences and they represent a wide range of personality types.

On his part, Broadhead (1987) classified ‘good teacher’ characteristics as follows: (1) **professional behaviour**, which suggests that the ‘good teacher’ is reliable, punctual, co-operative and willing and committed to further professional training. (2) **personal characteristics** which suggests that the ‘good teacher’ is enthusiastic, hardworking, has common sense, is firm, intelligent, adaptable, tenacious, intuitive, sensitive, friendly, energetic, conscientious, imaginative, resourceful and able to command the respect of pupils and maintain excellent relations (3) **organizational attributes**, which suggests that the ‘good teacher’ is able to engage in long and short term lesson planning and able to gain access to teaching aids/resources for both self and pupils (4) **perceptive qualities** which suggests that the ‘good teacher’ is able to undertake the role of guide and mentor to pupils when required and is able to perceive and respond to individual pupil differences (5) **have good information gathering skills**, which suggest that the ‘good teacher’ is proficient at gathering information pertaining to individual pupils’ progress and proficient at identifying reasons for failure.

Stephens & Crawley (1994) also pointed out the characteristics on how to become an effective teacher. According to them, becoming an effective teacher involves looking at what is good and what works. It is emphasized in their study that good teaching is related to style rather than content.

Further research was conducted by Kyriacou (1982). The PGCE (Post Graduate Certificate Education) students’ perceptions were investigated by Kyriacou related to effective teachers of mathematics. The questionnaire was used to collect the students’ perceptions and ninety-seven students responded to the questionnaire which included 38 teacher characteristics in the study. The highest mean ratings were the items: (1) explain points clearly and at pupils’ level (2) pay attention to revision and examination technique (3) confident and at ease when teaching.

In their investigation, Kutnick & Jules (1993) made a large-scale survey of pupils’ perceptions of a good teacher. According to them, knowledge of pupils’ perceptions of a good teacher is important in order to highlight to following two points. Firstly, this knowledge helps teachers in their practice; secondly perceptions are the individual’s private interpretation of interaction. An essay-
based, interpretative mode of research was used to identify these characteristics and 1633 students were asked to write a general essay on a ‘good teacher’. 166 items were identified as a result of the content analysis and items were grouped under five sets: (1) physical and personal characteristics of the teacher (2) quality of relationships between teacher and pupil (3) control of behaviour by teacher (4) description of the teaching process (5) expected educational and other outcomes obtained by pupils due to teacher efforts. The findings also showed a variety of relationships between class level and main attributes acknowledged in children’s perception of a good teacher. These results indicated that pupils desire a sensitive and supportive relationship with their teachers. In addition, Minor et al., (2002) investigated the pre-service teachers’ perceptions of the characteristics of effective teachers. They took 134 pre-service teachers perceptions by using questionnaire. One of the interesting results of the study showed that more men than women endorsed teacher characteristics that were associated with effective classroom and behaviour management.

On the other hand, Beishuizen et al., (2001) investigated the issue from a different perspective and they studied students’ and teachers’ cognitions about good teachers. They mainly aimed to deepen their understanding of what students think about good teachers in the study. Primary and secondary school teachers and students from different age groups (7, 10, 13 and 16 years of age) participated in the study and all of them were asked to write an essay about good teachers. Analyses of the essays indicated some important points that are as follows: (1) Primary school students described good teachers primarily as competent instructors, focusing on transfer of knowledge (2) Secondary school students emphasized relational aspects of good teachers (3) The type of the teacher that participants considered ‘good’ were the one who establishes personal relationships with their students.

Rudduck & Flutter (2004, p.76) also investigated students’ perspectives relating to what makes a ‘good teacher’. They interviewed secondary school pupils in three schools and the following points were revealed. Good teachers are: (1) human, accessible and reliable/consistent; (they are fair, they are people you can talk to, they don’t give up on you, they don’t just remember the bad things you have done, they are consistent in their mood etc) (2) respectful of students and sensitive to their difficulties in learning; (they don’t go on about things, they don’t shout, they don’t make fun of you or humiliate you in front of others, they are not sarcastic or vindictive, etc.) (3) enthusiastic and positive (they enjoy being a teacher, they enjoy teaching the subject, they enjoy teaching us, they give praise more than punishment etc.) (4) professionally skilled and expert in their subject (they make the lesson interesting and link it to life outside the school, they are knowledgeable in their subject but know how to explain, they find out who needs
help etc.) Rudduck & Flutter (2004) believe that the findings of their study reveal that the qualities most important to pupils is as much about how they are treated as how they are taught.

An interesting study has also been conducted by Moreira (2002). The researcher realized that high school students’ (n=369) perceptions do not change largely when it is comprised with other research findings. In order to collect data, the researcher firstly asked students to complete an essay and found that students highlighted some characteristics of an effective teacher as follows: explains assignments, gives example and materials; does not take personal problems out on students; grades fairly; is honest and friendly; maintains control of the classroom; listens to students; helps students, does not ridicule students. In Moreira’s study the following points might also be considered as interesting:

‘Instructionally, students want classes to be more interesting and fun. This suggestion should come as no surprise to educators. What student doesn’t want to have more fun in the classroom? Granted, it’s not always easy to make learning fun, but according to students, the ‘good teachers’ do.’

Recently, Korthagen (2004) investigated what the essential qualities of a good teacher are and concluded that this question can not be answered in a simple way. On the other hand, the researcher also indicated that a ‘good teacher’ will not always show ‘good teaching’.

In summary, some of the studies mentioned so far emphasize that some students want their teachers to help them and want learning to be fun, while others want their teachers to make the lesson easy for students to understand what is being taught. They also expect their teachers to be honest, smart, patient, and so on. However, it is obvious that these expectations may vary according to the students’ level. For instance, the view of children at primary level might be different from the views of other students such as secondary or university level. Hayes (1993), for instance, indicates that at primary level teachers’ role in particular is even more important than at other levels because they have a pivotal role to play as a central figure in the classroom and teachers’ attitude and their reactions will help to shape each pupil’s life.

It is essential to note that teachers should be aware of what their students expect from them in order to become more effective in their classes. This understanding enables teachers to know how students think about their educational experiences. As Tucker (1979) indicated teachers could learn a lot from students; therefore, they consider students’ needs in the teaching context.

Teachers may have particular skills related to teaching and learning but it is suggested that teachers should also know how and when to use them. Being an effective teacher is not an easy task; however, teachers should consider different
points in teaching and learning such as motivating students, using time effectively, and students’ characteristics. Brophy (1982) indicates this as follows:

‘Teachers must take into account students’ learning needs, time constraints, administrative mandates, and other considerations in making decisions about what to teach. Thus, to teach this content successfully, they must not only understand the material clearly themselves but also present it clearly and be prepared to recognize and correct their students’ misconceptions.’

On the other hand, it can be asserted that being reflective is also one of the important points in being an effective teacher. McCollum (2002), for instance, states that reflective teachers develop the habit of thinking about their teaching. Giovannelli (2003) also noted that a reflective disposition toward teaching was related to effective teaching, especially in the domains of instructional behaviour, classroom organization and teacher expectation. Reflective disposition consisted of six components and one of them is effective teaching. According to the study, effective teaching consisted of five components: the composite of effective teaching, classroom management, instructional behaviour, classroom organization and teacher expectations.

Briefly, then, teaching is not a simple matter of transferring information (Lougheed, 1992). As Cooper & McIntyre (1998, p.3) note, people who work in classrooms already do not know everything regarding effective teaching and learning. However, effective teaching is a huge area and there are many issues to be considered which had been discussed earlier in this article.

In Turkey, there are also some studies that investigate effective teacher (cf. inter alia, Çakmak, 2001; Küçükahmet, 2002; Bulut, 2003). Çakmak (2001) analysed the research on effective, good, ideal teacher concepts and noted that there is a broad terminology used by researchers. Küçükahmet (2002) looked for the answer of ‘how ideal teachers behave’. Student teachers were asked to write an essay about this. The results showed that student teachers pointed out physical, intellectual, social characteristics of teachers, competence on subject matter, classroom management, having a good communication with students, and so on. This result is also similar to other research findings. Slightly different from other researchers, Bulut (2003) investigated pre-service teachers’ views on effective teaching and effective teacher of mathematics. The research indicated similar points to other research findings such as the importance of personal characteristics. However there were also some interesting points raised in this research, for example the usage of educational materials and resources, preparing a challenging, enjoyable and supportive classroom atmosphere were the most popular factors for effective teaching according to them. However there is still a need for more research in terms of innovations in the education system in Turkey,
investigate effective teaching which suggests that more details on this broad area can be studied.

In the light of the discussion presented above, it can be stated that researchers use two different terms to define teachers, i.e. being ‘good’ and being ‘effective’—a point that was also stressed at the outset in this present article. One could even claim that there is a conflict relating to the use of the terms ‘good teacher’ and ‘effective teacher’.

From all the above, we can say that characteristics of good teachers include reliability, enthusiasm, sensitivity, friendliness, respectfulness, an easy-going nature (cf. inter alia: Richardson & Stopp, 1987; Broadhead, 1987; Stanton, 1985; Rudduck & Flutter, 2004). On the other hand, effective teachers can be described as people who have effective classroom management skills and who emphasize not only what is good and what works, but also what is effective in instructional practice (e.g. Guskey, 1985; Kyriacou, 1997; Minor et al., 2002).

The literature reviewed thus far shows that there have been numerous research findings on what makes teaching strategies effective and an effective teacher. This extensive literature review implies that:

- There is a variety of terminology in order to identify the characteristics of an ‘effective teacher’. The concept of ‘good teacher’ was also often used in the research studied on effective teaching and teacher.
- There are many studies on effective teaching—in particular, on what it means to be an effective teacher. It should be noted that it is not so easy to put forward a definition of an effective teacher since there are different views presented by researchers.
- Different types of research methods were used to define who an effective teacher is. Different methodologies such as surveys, essays, and literature-based methods were used in the studies of understanding effective teaching and a teacher being successful which suggest that both qualitative and quantitative research methods are available to study this subject.

From a historical view, researchers generated a list of competencies that are part of the make up of a ‘good teacher’ or an ‘effective teacher’, as viewed from different perspectives, including, in particular, from the point of view of students. Although many researchers have investigated this topic, it seems that there is a need to study this issue from the view point of pre-service teachers. Pre-service teachers’ beliefs, their knowledge and their ideas on this issue should also be considered by teacher education programs. There are some studies which indicate that teaching can be affected by the factor of experience. For instance, some studies (e.g. Veenman, 1984; Reed, 1989) highlight that in particular; at the beginning of their career, teachers encounter many serious classroom discipline problems.
The study

The present study sets out to provide further insights into effective teaching characteristics and characteristics of teachers who are perceived as ‘effective’ by pre-service teachers. The relevant literature suggests that ‘effective teaching’ means more than teacher behaviour (cf. inter alia, Harris, 1998), and that perceptions are critical in the construction of professional identity. This study therefore aimed to focus on the perceptions of pre-service teachers, in order to see what their views are, and how such views impact on teacher training and professional development. The study therefore concerned itself with the following key questions, addressed to pre-service teachers:

1. Which are the three most important characteristics of effective teaching?
2. Which are the five most important characteristics of an effective teacher?
3. What were the three most positive points you have observed in teachers during your teaching experience?
4. What were the three most negative points you have observed in teachers during your teaching experience?

Methodology

Data collection was carried out using a survey, which was considered to be the most appropriate one given the goals of the study, i.e. to collect pre-service teachers’ perceptions on what constitutes ‘effective teaching’ and what makes an ‘effective teacher’.

153 pre-service teachers participated in the study, all of whom were taking their final year education course at the Educational Faculty of Gazi University, in Ankara. The questionnaire was conducted among pre-service teachers from the following departments: mathematics, philosophy, chemistry, and science teaching.

The questionnaire, which was devised by the authors of the paper, included open-ended largely derived from the related literature. A pilot study was carried out with a different group of students. Content analysis was used in analysing responses to open-ended questions. All responses for each question were typed, and then categorized for data reduction purposes, following the strategies proposed by such researchers as Strauss & Corbin (1990) and Miles & Huberman (1994).
Results and discussion

In response to research question one—i.e. ‘Which are the three most important characteristics of effective teaching?’—pre-service teachers referred to several different characteristics. The most commonly referred to can be seen in the Table 1.

TABLE 1: The factors pre-service teachers (n=153) thought most important for effective teaching

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good communication skills with students (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Classroom atmosphere (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers’ subject knowledge (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Classroom management skills (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motivation (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teaching techniques and strategies used by teacher (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teachers’ pedagogical-content knowledge (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students’ enthusiasm towards to teaching (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other important factors that are not presented in Table 1, but which also featured in the responses to the open-ended questions; include: ‘materials’ (14); ‘students’ knowledge as a background’ (11); ‘content’ (9); ‘class size’ (8); ‘teachers’ enthusiasm towards teaching’ (7); ‘school’ (7); ‘curriculum’ (7); ‘teachers’ attitudes’ (7); ‘financial factors’ (6); ‘socio-economic environment’ (6); ‘teachers’ personal characteristics’ (5); ‘connection with real life’ (4); ‘teaching experience’ (5); ‘teacher-parent relationships’ (4); ‘teaching students according to their cognitive level’ (3); ‘sincerity’ (2); ‘being careful’ (2); ‘teachers’ status’ (2); ‘student centered education’ (1); ‘authority’ (2); ‘openness to new developments and technology’ (2); ‘students’ active engagement to lesson’ (2); ‘time management’ (2); ‘planning’ (2); ‘being lovely to students’ (1); ‘consistency’ (2); ‘student interaction with each other’ (1); ‘patience’ (1); ‘practical’ (1); ‘being fair’ (1); ‘grouping students according to their abilities’ (1).

If we had to consider the items most often stressed by pre-service teachers, and compare them to the literature on the subject as referred to in earlier sections of this paper, and as represented by the work of such researchers as Rudduck & Flutter (2004) and Kutnick & Jules (1993), then we can note a match. On the other hand, there are some researchers (inter alia, Kyriacou, 1997) who emphasize that
children’s learning outcomes is one of the important indicators of effective teaching—a view which is different from that which comes across in the responses to our survey.

The second question directed to pre-service teachers was ‘Which are the five most important characteristics of an effective teacher?’ The responses to this question are presented schematically in Table 2:

**TABLE 2: The five key factors pre-service teachers (n=153) thought most important to define an effective teacher.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Having a competent knowledge of the subject (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Having friendly and good relationships with pupils (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Personal characteristics such as being creative, honest, positive (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Using various teaching methods and techniques (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Using classroom management skills effectively (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Having enthusiasm for teaching (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Developing students’ interests towards the lesson (motivating students) (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Continuous self-improvement(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Being fair (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Being systematic and good at planning (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors that student teachers referred to in their responses included: ‘is capable of connecting with where the student is at, and understandable’ (7); ‘uses various evaluation and assessment techniques’ (6); ‘applies pedagogical knowledge to teaching’ (5); ‘is patient when dealing with students’ (5); ‘is consistent’ (5); ‘uses time effectively’ (4); ‘makes use of various teaching materials’ (3); ‘is experienced’ (2); ‘uses his or her voice effectively’ (2); ‘is flexible and natural’ (1); ‘has natural skills for teaching’ (1); ‘uses questions to develop students’ understanding’ (1) ‘is understanding’ (1).

From pre-service teacher’s responses, it is possible to see that ‘having a competent knowledge of the subject’ is considered by them to be a very important quality defining an effective teacher. This finding is also consistent with the related literature. For instance, some researchers (inter alia Clemson & Craft, 1981; Stanton, 1985) emphasized that having a strong knowledge of the subject is important for teachers whereas recently some researchers (such as Beishuizen et al., 2001) stress that personal relationships between teachers and their students is important. Others (such as Minor et al., 2002) claim that effective classroom management skills are crucial for teachers.
The third question directed to pre-service teachers was ‘What were the three most positive points you have observed in teachers during your teaching experience?’ The pattern of responses can be seen in Table 3:

**TABLE 3: The most positive points observed in teachers by pre-service teachers**

*(n=153)*

1. Having competent subject knowledge (71)
2. Effective communication skills (44)
3. Using effective classroom management strategies (30)
4. Making efforts to recognise the needs of the students (18)
5. Making the subject understandable by using a variety of examples (13)
6. Making students active in the classroom (12)
7. Motivating students (11)
8. Being experienced (10)
9. Being an effective planner (11)
10. Effective use of time in the classroom (8)

The importance accorded by pre-service teachers to strong subject knowledge and effective communication skills is very clear in the responses presented in Table 3. It is significant that research in effective teaching in fact emphasises different factors to these ones, and that in this regard it is important to highlight the fact that perceptions held by pre-service teachers are likely to have a strong impact on their teaching practice in the future.

The fourth question directed to pre-service teachers was ‘What were the three most negative points you have observed in teachers during your teaching experience?’ Table 4 shows the responses to this question:

**TABLE 4: The most negative points observed in teachers by pre-service teachers**

*(n=153)*

1. Lack of classroom management skills (70)
2. Lack of competence in using various teaching methods (25)
3. Lack of competence in motivating students (20)
4. Poor communication skills (17)
5. Lack of ability in the effective use of voice (16)
6. Lack of competence in using time effectively (15)
7. Lack of motivation towards teaching (13)
8. Unfair behaviour (10)
9. Lack of competence in the use of materials and technology (9)
10. Lack of subject knowledge (8)
Other negative characteristics that pre-service teachers identified in teachers included ‘being authoritarian’, ‘not being ready for lessons’, ‘always doing routine things’, ‘not giving homework to the students’, and so on. It is clear, though, that ‘lack of classroom management skills’ is ranked very highly as a negative trait by pre-service teachers.

Conclusion

This study, while limited in scope given that it focused on a sample of pre-service teachers from the same university in Turkey, does provide us with some insights into how such a group constructs an understanding of effective teaching. It is clear, for instance, that the respondents to the survey value such characteristics as good communication skills, the ability to create a positive classroom atmosphere, relating well to students, and personal qualities in the make-up of a teacher’s personality. Such findings reinforce those of other researchers, such as Broadhead (1987), Kutnick & Jules (1993) and Moreira (2002).

Pre-service teachers also put a great deal of emphasis on competence in subject matter, as well as on effective classroom management strategies. They are especially critical of teachers who are not skilled in maintaining order, in using a range of teaching methods, and in motivating learners. In many ways, they seem to give more importance to competence in teaching than in mastery of subject matter, though clearly both are considered to be valuable—a point that has also been discussed by other researchers, such as Veenman (1984) and Reed (1989). Such student teacher perceptions of what constitutes effective teaching are important, because ‘prior beliefs’ condition the reception that pre-service teachers give to what they are exposed to during teacher training courses. Awareness of—and systematic engagement with—pre-service teacher values can facilitate professional development in ways that are more enduring, and that are more supportive of the management of change (Smittle, 2003). Effective teacher education is a key to promoting transformed learning environments for the younger generations (Tekkaya et al., 2004), and therefore deserves to be developed in ways that address—and respond to—the images and constructs that novices bring with them into the profession.

Melek Çakmak is Assistant Professor at Gazi University, Gazi Egitim Fakültesi, Egitim Bilimleri Bölümü, K-Blok, No: 124, Teknikokullar-Ankara, Türkiye. Areas of specialization include curriculum development, effective teaching and teacher characteristics, teaching methods, qualitative research on teaching. E-mail address: melek@gazi.edu.tr
Mehmet Bulut is Research Assistant in the Education Faculty at Gazi University
Area(s) of specialization: Effective teaching and teacher characteristics, Teacher education, Mathematics education. E-mail address: mbulut@gazi.edu.tr

References


RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SELF-REGULATED LEARNING COMPONENTS, MOTIVATIONAL BELIEFS AND COMPUTER PROGRAMMING ACHIEVEMENT IN AN ONLINE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

ERMAN YUKSELTURK
SAFURE BULUT

Abstract – This study analyzed relationships among motivational beliefs (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, and test anxiety), self-regulated learning components (cognitive strategy use, self-regulation) and computer programming achievement in an online learning environment. The study consisted of 38 participants from an online Information Technologies Certificate Program which is based on synchronous and asynchronous communication methods over the Internet. Data are gathered from two consecutive online computer programming courses in this online certificate program, where the second course followed the first one in content as well. Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) was used to collect relevant data. The results of the study indicated that the effect of self-efficacy variable on students’ programming achievement was statistically significant in the first course and the effect of self-regulation variable on students’ programming achievement was statistically significant in the second course.

Introduction

With the improvements in technology, information and communication technologies (ICT) have been transforming our society in the last century. New human communications media, such as mobile phones, computers, and the internet, have emerged, and these are used by millions of people as an indispensable part of their daily life. With the help of these media, the old barriers of distance and time have been being broken down. In other words, the most advanced technologies have been used for disseminating information to members in our society (Jonassen, Davidson, Collins, Campbell & Haag, 1995; Rogers, 1995). These developments have led to major changes in the structure, management and organization of many fields. For these reasons, people need to learn how to cope with changes in different aspects of their lives and success depends on keeping up with technology through advanced training and lifelong learning. One of the effective ways to educate people, especially adults, is through
distance education. Adults need flexible and diverse educational delivery systems, and this is greatly facilitated by the information and communication technologies (Huang, 1997). Furthermore, as Sherritt (1996) notes, distance education overcomes many barriers—such as those of place and time—and helps even the odds for those learners who are negatively affected by them. Indeed, distance education helps open up access to learners in remote areas, eliminates the need for learners to be away from home, provide access and equity for learners outside the mainstream, and provides opportunities for higher education and technician level training to those incapable of pursuing traditional programs.

In the literature, distance education is simply defined as that form of education where the learner is in some way separated from the instructor and instruction is delivered through print or electronic communications media to the learners. Also, distance students are often placed in a situation in which neither teachers nor fellow students are physically present. Therefore, they take control over the time, place and pace of education. In other words, they have a more active role in their learning process. Bandura (1993) states that the rapid pace of technological change and accelerated growth of knowledge help to create environments for self-directed learning. On the other hand, these opportunities bring more responsibilities and difficulties to distance students in contrast to traditional ones (Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, & Zvacek, 2003). Therefore, one of the factors that determine the efficacy of distance education is distance students’ characteristics. Many researchers agree that the dearth of research on distance education still leaves many unanswered questions about what type of students will have success in online education since much of the initial research completed in this field is related to the selection of media, the effectiveness of media or performance results of a given methodology (McIsaac & Gunawardena, 1996).

Recent research on students’ learning and achievement has progressively included emphasis on student characteristics, especially on motivation, and on cognitive and metacognitive strategies. According to this research, motivation is known as a driving force that makes the student successful, and also self-regulated learning has emerged as a construct that provides more holistic views of motivation, use of cognitive strategy and metacognitive process. There is a great deal of research conducted to investigate the nature of these factors and the contribution of these factors to students’ academic performance. For example, some predictor variables in online studies are self-efficacy (Multon, Brown & Lent, 1991); learning strategies—i.e. monitoring, elaboration, and rehearsal strategies—(Davidson-Shivers, Rasmussen, & Bratton-Jeffery, 1997), self-regulation (King, Harner & Brown, 2000); motivation or lack of motivation (Zalenski, 2001); and mastery goals (Chi-hung, 2002). However, few research
studies analyse these factors simultaneously to understand their relationships and their influence on student success, especially in online learning. This study therefore attempts to extend the empirical research on both motivational beliefs (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety) and self-regulated learning components (cognitive strategy use, self-regulation) by documenting their relationships to computer programming achievements in an online environment.

Additionally, earlier studies generally measured these factors only one time at the beginning or at the end of course. However, these factors (i.e. self-efficacy) may fluctuate during a period of time (Lee & Witta, 2001). This study analyzed two consecutive online computer programming courses, where the second course followed the first one in content as well in order to avoid the pitfall of a one-shot measure of these factors and to provide a better understanding of relationships among these factors in the long period of time. At this stage in the research, the literature about self-regulated learning and motivation is given with discussing their theoretical framework used in this study.

Self-regulated learning

Research on self-regulated learning has increased exponentially in recent years and there are a number of definitions depending on theoretical perspective of the researcher from behaviorist to constructivist. Actually, examination of the literature reveals considerable overlaps in definitions. To summarize, the key feature in most definitions of self-regulated learning is the systematic use of metacognitive, motivational and/or behavioral strategies. The common conceptualization of self-regulated learners is that they are active participants in their own learning (Zimmerman, 1990).

In this study, following the work of Pintrich & DeGroot (1990), self-regulated learning conjoins three major constructs:

(1) Cognitive strategies that students use, remember, and understand the material. The cognitive strategies include:

   – Rehearsal: Rehearsal strategies involve reciting or naming items from a list to be learned. These strategies are best used for simple tasks and activation of information in the working memory rather than acquisition of new information in the long-term memory.

   – Elaboration: Elaboration strategies help students store information into the long-term memory by building internal connections between items to
be learned. Elaboration strategies include paraphrasing, summarizing, creating analogies, and generative note-taking.

- **Organization**: Organization strategies help the learner select appropriate information and also construct connections among the information to be learned.

- **Critical thinking**: Critical thinking refers to the degree to which students report applying previous knowledge to new situations in order to solve problems, reach decisions, or make critical evaluations with respect to standards of excellence.

(2) Students’ metacognitive strategies for planning, monitoring, and regulating their cognition. Metacognitive strategies include:

- **Planning**: Planning activities such as goal setting and task analysis help to activate, or prime, relevant aspects of prior knowledge that make organizing and comprehending the material easier.

- **Monitoring**: Monitoring activities include tracking of one’s attention as one reads, and self-testing and questioning: these assist the learner in understanding the material and integrating it with prior knowledge.

- **Regulating strategies**: Regulating refers to the fine-tuning and continuous adjustment of one’s cognitive activities. Regulating activities are assumed to improve performance by assisting learners in checking and correcting their behavior as they proceed on a task.

In addition, metacognition is defined as the conscious awareness and frequent self-checking to determine if one’s learning goal has been achieved and, if necessary, selecting a more appropriate strategy to achieve that goal (O’Neail & Abedi, 1996). In other words, it is essentially thinking about thinking and is an important countenance of academic performance, problem-solving, and student learning (Corno & Mandinach, 1983). Furthermore, metacognition is not merely an individual process; as Jost, Kruglanski & Nelson (1988) have noted, it is part of the social world as well. These authors argue stated that metacognition has much to do with one’s own personal and family experiences, the social groups to which we belong, ongoing social situations, and cultural backgrounds.

(3) Students’ management and control of their effort on classroom academic tasks. Management strategies include managing time and study environment, effort management, peer learning, and help seeking.
In addition to self-regulated learning, being a self-regulated learner is another important issue. Zimmerman (1986) explains that self-regulated learners are students who are ‘...metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active participants in their own learning process.’ And also he states that ‘self-regulated learners perceive themselves as competent, self-efficacious, and autonomous’ and ‘self-regulated learners select, structure, and create environments that optimize learning.’ (p. 309).

The importance of self-regulated learning is supported by previous studies (Zimmerman, 1986, 1990; Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990). For example, Pintrich & De Groot (1990) examined the relationship of seventh-graders’ self-efficacy, intrinsic value, test anxiety, cognitive strategy use, self-regulation tendency and academic performance, and they found that the best predictors are self-regulation tendency, self-efficacy, and test anxiety. Another study claimed a causal model that showed a combined influence of self-efficacy and goals on academic achievement among ninth and tenth graders (Zimmerman, Bandura & Martinez-Pons, 1992).

In addition to traditional environment, research about self-regulated learning in computer and internet based environments has begun to feature in the literature in the last years. For example, Young (1996) investigated students’ application of self-regulatory strategies in a learner-controlled computer-based instructional (CBI) environment. He found that students with a high level of self-regulatory learning strategies performed better in a learner-control CBI environment than in a program-controlled CBI environment. However, students with low self-regulatory learning strategies were at a notable disadvantage in the learner-controlled CBI environment than the program-controlled CBI environment. According to another study in a hypermedia concept lesson by Davidson-Shivers, Rasmussen & Bratton-Jeffery (1997), high performance learners showed higher numbers of learning strategies—such as monitoring, elaboration, and rehearsal strategies—than the average and low performance learners. Hill & Hannafin (1997) have also pointed out that self-regulatory skills, such as metacognitive knowledge, perceived orientation, and perceived self-efficacy, are key factors for learning with computer-networked hypertext/hypermedia learning environment, such as the WWW.

Researchers have identified the importance of self-regulation as a predictor of academic success in traditional classrooms. However, the effects of self-regulated learning on students’ achievement in online courses have not yet been completely examined. In addition, Miltiadou & Savenye (2003) stated that more researches are needed in the context of the online environment to predict student success and lower attrition rates.
Motivation

One of the most important components of learning in any educational environment is motivation. Pintrich & Schunk (1996) expressed that motivation influences how and why people learn and also it influences how people perform. In other words, motivation and motivational beliefs are among the best predictors of student achievement. The motivational beliefs include several different constructs that have been generated by different theoretical models, such as attribution theory, goal theory, and intrinsic motivation theory. In this research, the theoretical framework for conceptualizing student motivation is an adaptation of general expectancy-value model of motivation (Pintrich, 1990). The model proposes that there are three motivational components that may be linked to the three different components of self-regulated learning: (a) expectancy component, which includes students’ beliefs about their ability to perform a task (self-efficacy and control beliefs), (b) a value component which includes students’ goals and beliefs about the importance and their interest in the task (goal orientation and task value beliefs) and (c) an affective component, which includes students’ emotional reactions to the task (test anxiety). This study is one of the few studies that include such a large number of cognitive and motivational variables in the same study and moreover which investigates the joint effect of those variables on computer programming achievement in two consecutive courses in an online environment.

In the literature, there are many studies related to motivation and distance education students, especially related to their perception, achievement, dropout, and attitudes. For example, a study analyzed high achieving and low achieving open university students in regard to their study habits, purpose for learning, approaches to study, use of support systems, other commitments and self-perceptions. The study showed that motivation is a factor affecting achievement (Jegede, Fan, Chan, Yum & Taplin, 1999). Another study with 1200 distance learners investigated the complex relationships between the motivation and cognition of university students in a distance learning mode. Results showed that mastery goals and efficacy beliefs were the most important predictors in the use of different forms of self-regulated and learning strategies over time (Chi-hung, 2002). Shih & Gamon (2001) studied 99 students enrolled in two courses delivered via the web. In this study, learning style, motivation and attitudes were examined for their effects on achievement. An adapted version of the Motivation Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) was used to assess student motivation. The researchers reported that student motivation explained over one-fourth of student achievement as measured by course grades. In another study, Riddle (1994) studied factors that contributed to student satisfaction in courses.
delivered by interactive video networks. Riddle included learning style, self-efficacy, and a host of demographic variables in the study. It was concluded that self-efficacy contributed to explaining the variance in student satisfaction in a distance education course. Similarly, Zalenski (2001) studied a different measure of success in a distance delivered course, attrition. The sample of this included 815 undergraduate students in liberal studies program. The researcher reported that motivation, or lack of motivation, can also affect graduation and attrition rates in distance education.

To sum up, students’ motivation beliefs and self-regulated learning components in distance education is important for people or institutions who work in this area to give students support and counseling. In other words, such studies will assist educators and teachers to recognize the importance of motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning components on students’ academic achievement and find suitable ways to get better these wanted characteristics. For these aims, participants and online computer programming courses are analyzed from an online Information Technologies Certificate Program in this study.

An Online Information Technologies Certificate Program

An Online Information Technologies Certificate Program (ITCP) is one of the first Internet Based Education Projects of the Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara, Turkey. It was based on synchronous and asynchronous communication methods over the Internet offered by the Computer Engineering Department in cooperation with the Continuing Education Center at METU. The online certificate program was started in May 1998, and it is still active. It includes eight fundamental courses of the Computer Engineering Department and comprises four semesters lasting nine months in all. The courses in the program are given by the instructors from Computer Engineering Department. The main aim of the online ITCP is to train the participants in the IT field to meet the demands in the field of computer technologies in Turkey. Furthermore, the online ITCP provides opportunities for the people who could not get education in information technologies or computer engineering, but interested and willing to improve themselves in this area and enthusiastic about making progress in their existing career. University students and people who graduated from 2 or 4 year university courses have been accepted on the programs. In addition, the participants are expected to be computer literate and to have an intermediate level of English.

The program provides online lecture notes, learning activities and visual aids, and each course has a textbook to follow. An instructor and an assistant are
assigned to each course. In order to promote interaction between instructors and participants, each course has an e-mail address, discussion list as well as chat sessions. At the end of each term, there are face-to-face sessions for each course on the METU campus. For each course at least three or four assignments are given to the participants during the semesters. At the end of each semester, there are traditional final examinations within the campus of the University. The participants’ final grades are based on the final examinations, assignments, attendance to chat sessions and discussion lists. At the end of the program, graduates receive an official certificate approved by the president of the METU, the chair of the Computer Engineering Department and the president of the Continuing Education Center. The courses given in this program are as follows:

**First Semester (lasting two months)**
- Computer Systems and Structures
- Introduction to Computer Programming with C (stated as course-1 in this study)

**Second Semester (lasting two months)**
- Data Structure and Algorithms with C (stated course-2 in this study)
- Operating Systems with Unix

**Third Semester (lasting two months)**
- Software Engineering
- Database Management Systems

**Fourth Semester (lasting two months)**
- Computer Networks
- Software Development Project

There are two programming courses given in this program. Introduction to Computer Programming with C (course-1) given in the first semester, and Data Structure and Algorithms with C (course-2) given in the second semester were chosen for this study. The aim of the first course is to teach students who have no knowledge about computer programming by using C programming language. The basic programming concepts and applications are given to students with the help of examples. At the end of the course, students will be able to write variant basic C programs. Some topics of the course are as follows: variables, operations, conditionals, loops, arrays. The main aim of the second
course is to teach basic data structures and algorithms concepts to use in preparing many different programs. The aim of giving these basic concepts is not only using them in solving some problems during course but also teaching them how to use them while finding solutions when they encounter problems. The course content is given from C programming strategies to pointers, data structures, lists, trees, searching, sorting and algorithms. These two similar and consecutive courses were selected to decrease the content effect on the results of this study.

Research design

The problems of the study are the following:

- How well can computer programming achievement be explained in terms of motivational beliefs (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety) and self-regulated learning components (cognitive strategy use, self-regulation) in online programming course-1 (Introduction to Computer Programming with C Course)?

- How well can computer programming achievement be explained in terms of motivational beliefs (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety) and self-regulated learning components (cognitive strategy use, self-regulation) in online programming course-2 (Data Structure and Algorithms with C)?

In order to examine the problems, two hypotheses are formulated. These hypotheses are stated in the null form and tested at a significance level of 0.05.

- **H1**: The eight variables together (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety, cognitive strategy use, and self-regulation) do not explain a significant amount of variance in students’ computer programming achievement in course-1 given online.

- **H2**: The eight variables together (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety, cognitive strategy use, and self-regulation) do not explain a significant amount of variance in students’ computer programming achievement in course-2 given online.

Subject of the study
The subject of this study was from the 7th programs’ participants of online certificate program (October 2003 - June 2004). The number of participants who registered in the 7th online ITCP was 70. All participants who registered to the programs are computer literate and have an intermediate level of English. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants. The number of male participants was greater than the number of female participants, and the participants’ age ranged from 20 to 40 and above. The majority of the participants aged between 20 to 29. In addition, the majority of the participants attended the online ITCP from Ankara and Istanbul (the biggest cities in Turkey), and were university graduates and undergraduate students in universities.

The subjects of study were chosen from volunteer participants who attended 7th online certificate program and also the subjects that attended both online programming courses. However, all participants did not complete all the courses in the program due to problems related to dropouts. Therefore, 38 participants attended this study. Their demographic characteristics and percentages were similar to the participants who registered to the program.

**Instrumentation**

Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) was used to collect relevant data. It is an adapted version of the relevant sections from the MSLQ developed by Pintrich, Smith, Garcia & McKeachie’s (1991). MSLQ, a self-report, Likert-scaled instrument was designed to assess motivation and use of learning strategies. The motivation scales tap into three broad areas (1) value (intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation, task value), (2) expectancy (control of learning beliefs, self-efficacy), and (3) effect (test anxiety). The learning strategy section is comprised of ten scales, which can be distinguished as cognitive, metacognitive, and research management strategies. The cognitive strategy scale includes (a) rehearsal, (b) elaboration, (c) organization, and (d) critical thinking. Metacognitive strategies are assessed by one large scale that includes planning, monitoring, and regulating strategies. Resource management strategies include (a) managing time and study environment, (b) effort management, (c) peer learning, and (d) help-seeking.

The MSLQ was translated into Turkish and some minor adjustments were made to a few items to ensure applicability to all students. The pilot study was administrated to students enrolled in Department of Foreign Languages Education.
at METU, Turkey (Hendricks, Ekici & Bulut, 2000). Also, it was used in the study of investigating mathematics achievement and self-regulated learning in the city of Denizli, Turkey with 752 ninth-grade students from high schools (Ozturk, 2003).

**TABLE 1: The demographic characteristics of the participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>P2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 and below</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities the participants from</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduates</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N1: Number of participants who register to the program, P1: Percentage of participants who register to the program, N2: Number of participants who attend the study, P2: Percentage of participants who attend the study.
Data collection and analysis

The online certificate program starts the first semester with giving two courses. One of them is a programming course, Introduction to Computer Programming with C (course-1). It lasts two months online and at end of the two months, participants come to the university campus for two days. On the first day, a face-to-face session to explain and discuss course topics is given by course instructors to the participants in two hours and on the second day, participants take a paper-based final examination. The second semester, like the first one, starts by giving two courses. One of them is a programming course, Data Structure and Algorithms with C (course-2) and it lasts two months online and at end of the two months, participants come to the university campus for two days, and a face-to-face session and a paper-based final examination are given. Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) was distributed by the researcher to the participants that attended both of the two courses when they come to the university campus. The structures of online certificate program or courses given in this program were not changed for this study and researchers did not affect the participants or instructors of courses during study.

In this study, the participants’ achievement scores are based on assignments (six assignments given in course-1 and three assignments given in course-2) and the traditional final examinations (paper based test) at the end of the course.

In this study, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations of subjects were calculated for the scale scores and Linear Stepwise Regression analysis was used to assess how well programming achievement can be explained in terms of motivational beliefs (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety) and self-regulated learning components (cognitive strategy use, self-regulation) in programming course-1 and course-2 online. Then, the data were displayed into tables so that the conclusions could be reasonably drawn and verified.

Findings

Descriptive statistics

Table 2 and Table 3 show the descriptive statistics (range, min, max, mean, standard deviation) of variables, such as, intrinsic goal orientation (Intr), extrinsic goal orientation (Extr), task value (Tskv), control beliefs (Cont), self-efficacy (Slef), test anxiety (Tanx), cognitive strategy use (Stru) (Stru provides a measure
of the use of rehearsal, the use of elaboration strategies, organization strategies and use of the critical thinking strategies), self-regulation (Slrg) (Slrg was constructed from metacognitive self-regulation and effort regulation) and programming achievement (Achive). In other words, tables show the descriptive statistics of MSLQ subscale scores and programming achievement converted into 7-point Likert-type scale, just like in the original scale.

**TABLE 2: Descriptive statistics of MSLQ subscale scores and programming achievement for course 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intr</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extr</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tskv</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slef</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanx</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stru</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slrg</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achive</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76.63</td>
<td>17.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 demonstrates that mean scores of the motivational subscales range from 3.19 to 5.86 for the course-1. Participants tend to reflect an ‘agree’ perspective toward their motivational beliefs about programming with regard to intrinsic goal orientation, task value, control beliefs, and self-efficacy. However, they tend to reflect a ‘disagree’ perspective toward their motivational beliefs about programming with regard to extrinsic goal orientation and test anxiety. In addition, they tend to reflect an ‘undecided’ perspective on self-regulated learning components in computer programming with mean scores ranging from 4.43 to 4.78.

Furthermore, Table 3 demonstrates that mean scores of the motivational subscales range from 3.39 to 5.29 for the course-2. Participants tend to reflect an ‘agree’ perspective toward their motivational beliefs with regard to task value, control beliefs and ‘disagree’ perspective about extrinsic goal orientation and test anxiety like course-1. However, they are ‘undecided’ about intrinsic goal orientation and self-efficacy. In addition, they tend to reflect an ‘undecided’ perspective on self-regulated learning components in computer programming with mean scores ranging from 4.16 to 4.42.
Results of testing hypotheses

Two problems of this study are examined by means of their associated hypotheses and the hypotheses are in the null form and tested at a significance level of 0.05. For each course, the interrelationships among variables before testing hypotheses are examined due to the concern about the issue multicollinearity. Therefore, pearson product moment correlations to examine the interrelationships among measures are conducted. The correlation matrixes are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

TABLE 3: Descriptive statistics of MSLQ subscale scores and programming achievement for course 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intr</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extr</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tskv</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slef</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanx</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stru</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srlg</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acheive</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>27.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4: Pearson product moment correlations among measures for all subjects of the study for course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intr</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extr</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tskv</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cont</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Slef</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tanx</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Srlg</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stru</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Acheive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Table 4 shows that predictor variables do not have high correlations among themselves. Therefore we deduced that multicollinearity was not a problem for course 1.

**TABLE 5: Pearson product moment correlations among measures for all subjects of the study for course 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intr</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extr</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.39*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tskv</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cont</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Slef</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tanx</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Slrg</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stru</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Acheve</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

Table 5 also shows that predictor variables do not have high correlations among themselves. Therefore we deduced that multicollinearity was not a problem for the course 2.

In addition, the stated hypotheses (H1 and H2) were examined by using Linear Stepwise Regression at a significance level of 0.05.

**The results of Course-1:**

As Table 6 indicates, a variable (self-efficacy) explained a significant amount of variance in students’ computer programming achievement, $R^2=0.289$, adjusted $R^2=0.262$, $F(1,27)=10.568$, $p=0.003$. 28.9 percent of the variances are explained by this variable. The value of Standardized Coefficients is 0.538 and Standard Error is 14.4 for this variable.

Intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, test anxiety, cognitive strategy use, and self-regulation are excluded from the equation because they do not have significant contributions to variance in computer programming for course-1 ($p>0.05$). Table 7 shows the results of linear stepwise regression analysis of seven excluded variables.
TABLE 6: Linear Stepwise Regression Analysis Results for one significant predictor variables on programming achievement in course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2198.647</td>
<td>2198.647</td>
<td>10.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5409.067</td>
<td>208.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7607.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

TABLE 7: Results of linear stepwise regression analysis of seven excluded variables in course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intr</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extr</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tskv</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-1.073</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.623</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanx</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slrg</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stru</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Course-2:

As Table 8 indicates, a variable (self-regulation) explained a significant amount of variance in students’ computer programming achievement, $R^2=0.277$, adjusted $R^2=0.249$, $F(1,27)=9.957$, $p=0.04$. 27.7 percent of the variances are explained by this variable. The value of Standardized Coefficients is 0.526 and Standard Error is 22.99 for this variable.

Intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, control beliefs, task value, self-efficacy, test anxiety, and cognitive strategy use are excluded from the
equation because they do not have a significant contributions to variance in computer programming for course-2 (p>0.05). Table 9 shows the results of linear stepwise regression analysis of seven excluded variables.

**Conclusion**

The main purpose of this study was to further understand the relationships among self-regulated learning components, motivational beliefs and programming achievements in an online environment. In order to fulfill this
purpose we conducted some analyses with data gathered from the online certificate program participants and programming courses.

In the result of the study, Table 4 and Table 5 display correlations among the motivational, cognitive, and achievement variables. In the first course (course-1), intrinsic goal orientation, task value, control beliefs, self-efficacy, cognitive strategy use and self-regulation were positively correlated with programming achievement. However, test anxiety and extrinsic goal orientations were only variables that negatively correlated with programming achievement in course-1. In addition, in the second course (course-2), all variables except control beliefs were positively correlated with programming achievement in self-regulation.

According to the regression analyses of this study, self-efficacy beliefs in course-1 and self-regulation in course-2 have a significant effect on student programming achievement in online courses. The fact that self-efficacy beliefs related to computer programming was the only variable to enter regression equation, accounting for 28.9 % of the variance in students’ programming achievement, indicates that programming achievement can partly be explained by the students’ judgments of their own capabilities to accomplish specific programming tasks in an online environment. Self-efficacy beliefs can determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and act. Bandura (1977) pointed out that, in the basis of self-efficacy there lies a mechanism of changing, continuing and generalizing of behavior. Result is also consistent with the findings of the previous studies stating the effects of self-efficacy beliefs on academic achievement (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990, Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990). They demonstrated the central role of self-efficacy beliefs in students’ academic achievement with empirical support from correlational studies. Multon, Brown & Lent (1991) reviewed a comprehensive list of studies that examined self-efficacy in achievement situations. Findings suggested that self-efficacy beliefs were positively related to academic performance. Also, Lim (2001) has indicated that, self-efficacy in computer knowledge was the only statistically significant variable that can help predict achievement. Therefore, it can be deduced from the literature that self-efficacy beliefs are a strong predictor of academic achievement and this study results state that programming achievement in online environment is influenced by students’ self-efficiency beliefs as well.

In addition, self-regulation related to computer programming was the only variable to enter regression equation in the course-2 regression analyses and that was accounted for 27.7 % of the variance in students’ programming achievement. Self-regulation refers to students’ ability to understand and control their learning (Zimmerman, 1994). According to Zimmerman (1994), learners who self-regulate possess three important characteristics. First, they actively control their own learning by employing a range of cognitive strategies that assist in the construction
of meaning and retention of information. Second, learners mindfully use metacognitive strategies such as planning and monitoring to control their own progress towards their educational goals. Finally, they are intrinsically motivated, focused upon the task at hand, and thoughtfully control emotional difficulties. In academic contexts, self-regulation refers to processes that involve the activation and maintenance of cognitions, behaviors and effects which are systematically oriented toward the attainment of goals (Zimmerman, 1989). In summary, research states that self-regulation and its strategies are crucial to be successful in distance education (King, Harner & Brown, 2000). However, empirical research relating these abilities to distance learners’ motivation and learning outcomes is not seen much in the literature.

In conclusion, distance education students take more responsibility in their learning in comparison to traditional ones. Their motivation beliefs and self-regulated learning strategies are among important variables that may affect their achievement in distance education. In this study, students’ self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulation have strong and positive influence on their academic achievement in online programming courses. According to this study, although self-efficacy beliefs were enough to affect students’ academic achievement for the introductory programming course, students’ academic achievement for advanced programming course were affected by self-regulation. According to the results, it can be concluded that instructors and instructional designers of distance education can benefit from self-efficacy beliefs of students at the beginning and alter the students’ inaccurate judgments about online tasks gradually. Also, they can design their courses and online environments for students to be self-regulated learners in further and detailed courses.

In addition, this study indicates that motivation and self-regulated learning components may change in the period of time during online education. This change may be affected by some other factors. For example, participants may be more competent in the use of a given online environment and computer technology. Furthermore, there may be a maturation effect and content effect in this study even though course-2 was given after course-1 immediately and courses had similar aims and topics.

**Recommendations for further studies**

In this study, motivation and self-regulated learning components were analyzed in online computer programming courses. Much more study is needed on these variables and their effects on student achievements. In other words, these components should be analyzed in various online courses and programs with
larger samples to generalize the results of these types of study. In addition, other variables (i.e. attitude, satisfaction, learning style) can be examined with these selected components together. The experimental approach can be used to identify causal relationships between self-regulated learning and achievement.

Another study can be conducted about relationships of interaction types, collaborative activities that are more prepared in online learning environments, and student characteristics (motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning strategies) together.

Erman Yukselturk works as an online learning coordinator at the Internet Based Education Project (http://idea.metu.edu.tr) of Middle East Technical University. His main areas of interest are distance education, designing online learning environments, online collaboration, and instructional technology. He can be contacted by email: ermany@metu.edu.tr
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BOOK REVIEW


This publication constitutes an edited collection of papers arising from the ‘Lifelong Learning in the Mediterranean Conference’ that was held in Malta in September 2003. The idea of lifelong learning has long been a central catchword in educational studies. Although its definition is often fluid and its usage diverse, lifelong learning is generally used to refer to our efforts in creating a society where everybody is learning all the time.

Lifelong education is thus understood as an institutional movement, a politico-institutional project and even as a discourse on social change but never, of course, as a pedagogy. Consequently, it is not surprising that the last decade witnessed a consistent stream of publications focusing on the concept of éducation permanente. This set of proceedings is interesting in that it situates the concept of lifelong learning within a Mediterranean context with its unique set of identities, problems, and interests; in this respect, it recalls another volume, Lifelong Learning and Participation (University of Malta Press, 1985), edited by Kenneth Wain, which consisted of the proceedings of a 1984 conference, also held in Malta, entitled ‘Lifelong Learning Initiatives in the Mediterranean’. The 2004 proceedings focus on a locus of interest in which data and information are highly sparse largely due to substantial amounts of ideological and propagandistic biases that serve to limit the possibility of a Mediterranean social movement.

Hopefully, this set of proceedings together with the series of conferences on lifelong education in the Mediterranean (the latest meeting took place in Larnaca, Cyprus, last December) will serve as a catalyst for the overturning of such a scenario. The contents of this volume of proceedings can be divided into four major parts.

The first part starts with a reproduction of the opening speech by the Hon. Minister of Education in Malta followed by that of the Deputy Head of Mission at the German Embassy in Malta before finishing with Carmel Borg’s address as Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Malta. The second part includes the conference plenaries where Michael Samlowski’s and Peter Mayo’s contributions serve as critical introductions to the unique aspects concerning a Mediterranean approach to lifelong learning. Focusing on multi-ethnic relations,
Mayo’s piece asks how Mediterranean society can face the acceleration of development and growing change while at the same time ensuring cultural continuity. A Freirean approach to lifelong education, he contends, provides a promising resolution.

In the third part of the proceedings, one finds participant country reports that provide some indication of the issues being faced by adult educators in twelve countries of the Mediterranean ranging from Bosnia and Herzegovina to Egypt to Spain to Lebanon. One must acknowledge here the fact that the Palestinian representative was prevented from participating at the last moment, despite having all travel documents in order (including a visa), because of a curfew imposed by Israeli military forces on her home city of Ramallah. The fourth part contains three papers on various issues that intend to convey a sense of the larger picture concerning lifelong learning and adult education in the region.

Kenneth Wain’s paper, providing critical reflections on lifelong education, is clearly the highlight of the whole proceedings. Questioning lifelong learning as the ‘great unquestioned nostrum of our times’, Wain goes on to present a short analysis of the genealogy of the concept of lifelong learning to conclude that ‘it is important to keep a close critical eye on what’s happening, on the game of power and on the agendas that shape the political discourse within which current lifelong learning thinking is framed’ (p. 84, 87). The final part of the proceedings includes workshop and concluding reports and, most importantly, a final conference declaration.

Overall, this volume of proceedings is a challenging read. Most papers are thought engaging, and, taken as a whole, it promotes a new path for lifelong education. The volume acknowledges learners not as merely objects, but as subjects situated in social, economic, cultural, and political contexts. This volume of conference proceedings exhorts adult educators to use their skills to struggle for social and economic development, justice, equality, respect for traditional cultures, and recognition of the dignity of every human being through individual and social transformations. Most importantly, however, this publication places an emphasis on the unique challenges facing lifelong educators in Mediterranean countries. In this respect, it is a crucial read for anybody interested in local aspects of adult education and lifelong learning.

Marvin Formosa
University of Malta
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