



A Review of Studies on School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey

Türkiye’de Okul Deneyimi ve Öğretmenlik Uygulamasına Yönelik Araştırmaların İncelenmesi

Koray KASAPOĞLU*

ABSTRACT: The aim of this study is to review Turkish studies on school experience and practice teaching conducted between 2000 and 2010 to draw a general picture of teacher training practices in Turkey. The review covers 36 studies (19 research articles and 17 master’s theses and dissertations) on school experience and practice teaching that were categorized by method. 13 out of 19 research articles and 10 out of 17 theses and dissertations have a quantitative research design. Using content analysis, five common themes were generated: (1) Variables related to school experience and practice teaching; (2) positive views on school experience and practice teaching; (3) negative views on school experience and practice teaching; (4) roles and expectations related to school experience and practice teaching; and (5) implications for school experience and practice teaching.

Keywords: school experience, practice teaching, teacher training, Turkey.

ÖZET: Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye’de öğretmen yetiştirme uygulamaları ile ilgili genel bir çerçeve çizmek amacıyla 2000-2010 yılları arasında okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine yapılan çalışmalarını incelemektir. Bu inceleme, okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine, yöntemine göre sınıflandırılan 36 çalışmadan (19 araştırma makalesi ve 17 yüksek lisans ve doktora tezi) oluşmaktadır. Sonuçlar, araştırma makalelerinin 13’ünün, tezlerin ise 10’unun nicel araştırma desenine sahip olduğunu göstermiş ve içerik analizi sonucunda beş ortak tema oluşturulmuştur: (1) okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasını etkileyen ve yordayan değişkenler; (2) okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine olumlu görüşler; (3) okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine olumsuz görüşler; (4) okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin rol ve beklentiler; (5) okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması için öneriler.

Anahtar sözcükler: okul deneyimi, öğretmenlik uygulaması, öğretmen yetiştirme, Türkiye.

1. INTRODUCTION

Practical knowledge acquired during undergraduate education has been useful to many teachers, impacting their knowledge-in-action and ability to apply this (Hargreaves, 1996). The acquisition of this knowledge depends on the ability of teachers to self-reflect (Ruohotie-Lyhty & Kaikkonen, 2009), as reflective practitioners, who represent on and explain their practices with one another, especially with more- and less-experienced peers, are more successful. Teacher education, supervision, and development should thus be constructed in ways that make explicit reflection more feasible and thorough (Hargreaves, 1996). Thus, relationships between universities and partner schools that restructure teacher training programs have been of great significance. For example, as discussed by Schwab, DeFranco, and McGivney-Burelle (2004), due to the problems in the American educational system encountered by educators and parents in recent years, and U.S. students’ poor performance on national and international tests, education programs were blamed for failing to adequately prepare teachers. Leaders of the teacher education reform initiatives of the 1980s also identified an urgent need for a reevaluation and redesign of teacher education programs, including the modification of curricula and additional focus on field experience (Webb-Johnson & Artiles, 1998, cited in Burns, Grande, & Marable, 2008). Schwab, Defranco, and McGivney-Burelle (2004) suggested several solutions to these problems: (1) Teacher training programs should be restructured in order for schools of education to survive; (2) teacher training programs should effectively prepare teachers to meet the demands

* Res. Assist., Ph.D, Afyon Kocatepe University, e-mail: kasapoglu@aku.edu.tr

and standards of the 21st century; (3) teacher training programs should give future teachers a strong knowledge of their subject matter, as well as a thorough understanding of teaching and learning; (4) teacher training programs should be based on relationships between universities and K-12 partner schools; (5) teacher training programs and student teachers should be monitored, assessed, and improved at schools of education, which should have a culture of research and practical knowledge.

With respect to relationships between universities and schools, Jeffrey and Polleck (2010) concluded that both must work as partners in teacher education so as to tighten the link between theory and practice (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Patterson, 1999) and to provide professional support for student teachers. Laker, Craig-Laker, and Lea (2008) reported on the support provided to student teachers, which came from both formal (university scholars and mentor teachers) and informal (other student teachers, teachers, and families of students at host schools) sources. Student teachers particularly valued immediate professional feedback and advice from their mentor teachers, and also the social support of other student teachers and teachers. Student teachers shifted from using formal to informal sources of support, supporting the view that learning-to-teach was a constructivist activity in which novices moved from participation in school experience at a surface level into a full community of learners. However, since partnerships are commonly initiated and evaluated by universities rather than schools, there is a gap in terms of how partner schools collaborating with universities benefit from these partnerships (Jeffrey & Polleck, 2010). Prior to establishing a relationship between a university and a school, it is necessary to determine whether both the university and the partner school are ready to collaborate. Clarken (1999) presented some characteristics to determine universities' or schools' readiness for collaboration, such as trust / responsibility, time / commitment, accountability, mutuality / reciprocity, choice / ownership / meaningfulness, shared vision / beliefs, flexibility / adaptability, challenge / openness to growth, respect, and communication / sensitivity. Christensen, McNair, Patterson, and Wade (1998) stressed that partnership was an opportunity for personal and professional growth and emphasized open and honest communication, mutual goal development and shared decision-making. They also underlined that having access to university scholars was an advantage of collaboration that might be hindered by scholars' limited time and attitude.

Sivakumaran, Holland, Clark, Heyning, Wishart, and Flowers-Gibson (2011) addressed the types of collaborations and partnerships that had been established between universities and K-12 schools, the design and implementation of field experience and practice teaching, and teacher candidate evaluation. The universities they studied had established professional development schools and collaborative partner schools. These partnerships varied in scope, degree of collaboration, and agreement details. The partnerships established by all three universities with schools were mutually beneficial. That is, the universities provided professional development opportunities and resources while the partner schools provided classrooms and mentors to student teachers. With all three universities, practice teaching was designed to orient student teachers in the school learning community, to promote awareness of the socio-cultural context of each learning community, to teach various classroom management and organization techniques, to display various teaching strategies for students from diverse backgrounds, to provide knowledge on how curriculum and diverse learners influence the planning process, and to explain how assessment and evaluation can be used to inform teaching practices. The field experience was implemented at universities whereas practice teaching was implemented at partner schools. The universities used similar methods to evaluate student teachers during practice teaching, such as lesson plans, mid-term and final exams and portfolios. University instructors and mentor teachers acted as a key evaluator of the student teacher during practice teaching.

Turkey also has experience with the establishment of relationships between universities and partner schools (i.e., professional development schools). Turkey's teacher training programs have rapidly developed since the 1998-1999 academic year (Semerci & Taşpınar, 2003), before which a lack of planning and a lack of collaboration between the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), the organization responsible for teacher induction, and the Higher Education Council (HEC), the organization responsible for teacher training, stymied progress (Aydın & Baskan, 2005). Subsequently, a relationship between the MoNE and the HEC was established, resulting in the restructuring of the teacher training programs offered by universities, and an increasing concentration on practice rather than theory, so that student teachers could gain teaching experience in a real classroom with real students (Semerci & Taşpınar, 2003). In the restructured program, student teachers are sent to partner or professional development schools for 14 weeks to practice teaching. Four hours a week are devoted to the courses named as School Experience I and School Experience II, totaling 56 hours in one semester, while six hours a week are devoted to practice teaching, totaling 84 hours in a semester. In total, student teachers are obliged to complete 196 hours of school experience and practice teaching at partner schools (Deniz & Şahin, 2006). All these can be regarded as the attempts to improve the quality of teacher training (Şahin, 2007). However, the restructured teacher training programs in Turkey have been criticized for their restrictive features. Although they are standardized, centralized and implemented all across Turkey, critics claimed that they did not meet the needs of the whole country (Aydın & Baskan, 2005). They also result in that teaching does not become a fully-qualified profession (Şahin, 2010). Rather than a standardized, rigid national program, Aydın and Baskan (2005) suggested that flexible and dynamic programs should be developed so that training and recruitment of teachers is compatible with local, regional, national, and global needs.

With this dichotomy in mind, this study aims to review Turkish studies on school experience and practice teaching. The study's goal is to improve knowledge about the effectiveness of Turkish teacher training programs in a way useful to policy-makers and educators, and to better understand teacher training in the context of the Turkish higher education system.

2. METHOD

A comprehensive search was done to find studies conducted on school experience and practice teaching. The following databases were used in this review: Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, ERIC, Humanities International Complete, Middle East Technical University's Catalog, Professional Development Collection, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, and ULAKBIM Turkish National Databases. "School experience" and "practice teaching" were used as search terms with a Boolean term, "and." The review was limited to studies conducted since 2000. Among the databases searched, only three, ULAKBIM Turkish National Databases, Education Research Complete, and Academic Search Complete yielded studies, 28 in total, conducted between 2002 and 2009. Twenty-three belonged to ULAKBIM Turkish National Databases; four were from Education Research Complete, while only one belonged to Academic Search Complete.

Among these, only nineteen pertained to school experience and practice teaching. These had been published in several academic journals, namely, one from the Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Journal, one from the Journal of National Education, two from the Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, one from the Journal of Educational Sciences and Practice, one from the Anadolu University Graduate School of Social Sciences Journal, one from the Inonu University Faculty of Education Journal, two from the Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, one from the Mersin University Faculty of Education Journal, one from the Ondokuz Mayıs University Faculty of Education Journal, one from the Mehmet Akif Ersoy University

Faculty of Education Journal, two from the Ataturk University Graduate School of Social Sciences Journal, two from the Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal, one from the Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences, one from the Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal, and one from the Selçuk University Graduate School of Social Sciences Journal. In addition to these nineteen studies, a search was also done for theses and dissertations on school experience and practice teaching. For this reason, the author reviewed theses and dissertations provided by the National Theses Center of the HEC. For the phrase “school experience”, the search yielded seven studies, while ten studies found for “practice teaching” were accessible online. Among the seven studies on school experience, six were master theses conducted between 2006 and 2009, and the remaining one was a dissertation conducted in 2006. Four were based on quantitative research, two of them were qualitative, and the remaining one was a mixed-method study. Of the ten studies on teaching experience, eight were master theses done between 1997 and 2010, while two were dissertations completed in 2007 and 2009, respectively. The research articles, theses and dissertations were categorized according to their method. As a result of content analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008), themes were generated and presented in tables. In order to identify common themes, great attention was initially paid to the abstracts of each study. Having looked at the abstracts, the most attention was given to the findings of each study. The findings of each study were conceptualized, listed and grouped by themes to draw a general picture of what current research says about school experience and practice teaching in Turkey. The identified common themes are presented and discussed individually below.

3. FINDINGS

Looking at the research articles, thirteen used quantitative methods; five were qualitative, while the remaining one was descriptive. Among all the theses and dissertations reviewed, ten used quantitative methods; five were qualitative studies, while the remaining two were mixed-method studies. Table 1 summarizes the methods used in research studies, theses, and dissertations reviewed.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Studies Reviewed

Studies Reviewed		Methods Used	<i>f</i>	%
Research Articles	Büyükgöze-Kavas & Bugay (2009); Ceylan & Akkuş (2007); Demircan (2007); Dilmaç & Dilmaç (2008); Gömleksiz, Mercin, Bulut, & Atan (2006); Hergüner, Arslan, & Dündar (2002); Özmen (2008); Şahin, Erdoğan, & Aktürk (2007); Sarıçoban (2008); Şaşmaz-Ören, Sevinç, & Erdoğan (2009); Temizkan (2008); Ünlüöner & Boylu (2007); Yeşil & Çalışkan (2006)	Quantitative	13	68.4
	Baştürk (2008); Becit, Kurt, & Kabakçı (2009); Eraslan (2008); Özgür, Bukova-Güzel, Kula, & Uğurel (2009); Sağ (2008);	Qualitative	5	26.3
	Sağ (2007)	Descriptive	1	5.3
		Subtotal	19	100
Theses and Dissertations	Aytaç (2010); Bağcıoğlu (1997); Davran (2006); Katrancı (2008); Kılıç (2007); Kocatürk (2006); Şallı (2007); Ünal (2008); Yıldız (2006); Yılmaz (2007)	Quantitative	10	58.8
	Caner (2009); Çınar (2010); Doğan (2009); Kazan (2006); Ünlü-Sarahlı (2007)	Qualitative	5	29.4
	Merç (2004); Öztuna-Kaplan (2006)	Mixed	2	11.8
		Subtotal	17	100
		Total	36	100

Five common themes were identified in the articles and theses reviewed: (1) Variables related to school experience and practice teaching in Turkey, (2) positive views on school experience and practice teaching in Turkey, (3) negative views on school experience and practice teaching in Turkey; (4) roles and expectations related to school experience and practice teaching in Turkey, and (5) implications for school experience and practice teaching in Turkey.

3.1. Variables Related to School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey

Many variables can influence school experience and practice teaching. Variables such as age, gender, department of the pre-service teachers, type of instruction (morning or evening), student teachers' high school, and types of problems encountered at partner schools did not have any effect on the attitudes of pre-service teachers toward school experience (Şaşmaz-Ören, Sevinç, & Erdoğan, 2009; Yıldız, 2006). Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward school experience were related to why they wanted to be a teacher and what they thought of their professional growth (Şaşmaz-Ören, Sevinç, & Erdoğan, 2009).

However, pre-service teachers' success in acquiring teacher qualifications differed with gender, department, and when the practice teaching occurred (Davran, 2006): (1) Male pre-service teachers were more successful in acquiring teacher qualifications than female pre-service teachers. There were some problems related to gender: Male pre-service teachers received more assistance from mentor teachers and instructors than female ones. (2) A significant difference was found between pre-service teachers taught at the Department of Science Teaching and those taught in other departments. Pre-service teachers at the Department of Science Teaching reported different problems during practice teaching. (3) Their successful acquisition of teacher qualifications differed depending on when the practice teaching occurred.

Pre-service teachers' views on the amount of work done by partner school coordinators and mentor teachers differed by gender, department, and mentor teachers' gender (Katrancı, 2008): Pre-service teachers viewed the amount of work done by partner school coordinators higher than the amount of work done by mentor teachers. Views on the amount of work done during practice teaching differed significantly among partner school coordinators, mentor teachers, and pre-service teachers (Katrancı, 2008). Aytaç (2010) underlined that the amount of work done by instructors differed significantly with gender and whether they taught pedagogy or not: Male instructors were more likely to mentor pre-service teachers than female ones. Also, instructors who taught pedagogy were more likely to mentor pre-service teachers than those who did not teach pedagogy.

According to Kocatürk (2006), who assesses school experience was also a significant factor: Assessment of school experience differed between mentor teachers and instructors, as instructors assessed school experience less generously than mentor teachers. However, assessment of practice teaching did not differ between mentor teachers and instructors. Assessment itself differed by what was being assessed and when the practice teaching occurred (Kocatürk, 2006): Practice teaching was assessed more favorably than school experience and the views and classroom management techniques / beliefs of mentor teachers and pre-service teachers were found to be different before, during, and after practice teaching. For instance, Yılmaz (2007) highlighted that the classroom management approaches of pre-service teachers shifted from interventionist to interactionist.

Ceylan and Akkuş (2007) also highlighted that pre-service teachers' behavior changed after school experience, as they improved giving directions and explanations, asking questions, managing lessons and the classroom, assessing and recording, and planning lessons, planning and organizing activities. The problems encountered by pre-service teachers decreased after practice teaching (Merç, 2004). Doğan (2009) stated that the way pre-service teachers perceived teaching, assessment, and classroom management was different after school experience. Pre-

service teachers perceived teaching with a more student-centered perspective, assessment less traditionally and classroom management more positively after school experience.

The reviewed correlational studies on school experience and practice teaching indicated that there were statistically significant relationships between the partner school environment, the partner school administrators, mentor teachers, instructors, pre-service teachers, pre-service teacher satisfaction and the use of technology. Pre-service teachers' satisfaction with school experience was significantly predicted by mentor teacher, instructor, partner school administrator, and the use of technology (Şahin, Erdoğan, & Aktürk, 2007). Yeşil and Çalışkan (2006) found a significant relationship between the expectations for the people responsible for school experience and practice teaching and what expectations were met. Öztuna-Kaplan (2006) also found a significant relationship between pre-service teachers' practice teaching and their epistemological beliefs – they practiced teaching in accordance with their epistemological beliefs. Another significant relationship was found among the views of instructors and pre-service teachers at the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Vocational Education, and the Faculty of Technical Education on practice teaching. Bağcıoğlu (1997) also detected strong relationships among the steps of practice teaching (i.e., learning special methods of teaching, placing pre-service teachers at partner schools, observing, planning lessons and preparing materials, teaching for a limited time, assessing, and giving seminars). Caner (2009) conducted a qualitative study on a blended learning model for practice teaching in a pre-service English Language Teaching training program and concluded that there was no significant relationship between pre-service teachers' involvement in online discussions and their satisfaction with practice teaching.

3.2. Positive Views on School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey

The studies reviewed reported that pre-service teachers' views on school experience and practice teaching were usually positive and that pre-service teachers were satisfied with how school experience and practice teaching courses were taught (Becit, Kurt, & Kabakçı, 2009). Pre-service teachers were reported to view sharing experiences in class positively, allowing them to be aware of different teaching experiences (Özgür, Bukova-Güzel, Kula, & Uğurel, 2009). Pre-service teachers also said that school experience contributed to their professional growth (Özmen, 2008). Demirçan (2007) found that pre-service teachers viewed school experience as a reference point in teacher training programs. School experience was highlighted as having an influence on pre-service teachers' professional attitudes and behaviors (Ceylan & Akkuş, 2007). Şaşmaz-Ören, Sevinç, and Erdoğan (2009) concluded that pre-service teachers had positive attitudes toward school experience. Pre-service teachers also reported liking teaching as a profession (Temizkan, 2008). As a result of her study on designing e-portfolios for educational purposes, and its implementation in a practice teaching class, Kazan (2006) concluded that the use of e-portfolios was viewed as positive. Caner (2009) also underlined that pre-service teachers were positive about computer-assisted instruction and satisfied with the model of blended learning used in practice teaching.

Other studies put emphasis on the advantages of school experience and practice teaching. For instance, school experience helped pre-service teachers shape their further experiences of teaching and better understand teaching as a profession (Hergüner, Arslan, & Dünder, 2002), gain professional knowledge and skills (Caner, 2009; Dilmaç & Dilmaç, 2008), get ready for teaching as a profession, prepare lesson plans (Caner, 2009) and materials, use their subject knowledge while teaching, learn about the rights and responsibilities of teaching as a profession, and view teaching positively (Becit, Kurt, & Kabakçı, 2009). It also helped them by providing a real-life experience of an actual school environment while limiting interactions to on-task, motivated, and experienced mentor teachers and instructors (Eraslan, 2008). This experience

gave pre-service teachers a professional standpoint from which they could fully understand the education system (Sarıçoban, 2008) and put theory into practice (Ünal, 2008).

3.3. Negative Views on School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey

The studies on school experience and practice teaching found that pre-service teachers who worked with off-task, unmotivated and uninterested mentor teachers (Ünlüönen & Boylu, 2007) and instructors felt alienated from teaching as a profession (Eraslan, 2008; Gömleksiz, Mercin, Bulut, & Atan, 2006). School experience with off-task, unmotivated, and uninterested mentor teachers and instructors was reported to be ineffective, making the integration of knowledge and skills with practice challenging for pre-service teachers (Özgür, Bukova-Güzel, Kula ve Uğurel, 2009). Yeşil and Çalışkan (2006) stated that the people responsible for school experience and practice teaching were not aware of their rights and responsibilities, and were not accountable for their actions.

Pre-service teachers stressed that they were not mentored enough by mentor teachers and instructors (Kocatürk, 2006; Ünlü-Saratlı, 2007). Pre-service teachers were also not given feedback at a satisfactory level. Some reasons for lack of mentoring were (Ünlü-Saratlı, 2007): (1) no collaboration between mentor teachers and pre-service teachers, (2) mentor teachers' lack of experience with the courses named as School Experience I-II and their lack of knowledge of the purpose of school experience, (3) lack of interaction between mentor teachers and pre-service teachers, resulting in an unawareness of their reciprocal expectations, (4) limited time due to a great number of pre-service teachers and excessive class hours, (5) unserious behaviors of pre-service teachers due to mentor teachers' uninterest. According to Kocatürk (2006), pre-service teachers were not mentored by instructors or mentor teachers, and strongly disagreed with mentor teachers who claimed that they did mentoring. They also mentioned problems due to different types of implementation by different instructors and unclear expectations for school experience and practice teaching (Özmen, 2008).

Pre-service teachers also stated that instructors were not good at implementing and evaluating practice teaching and had negative views about the implementation and evaluation of practice teaching (Gömleksiz, Mercin, Bulut, & Atan, 2006). Pre-service teachers had also negative views on partner schools, mentor teachers, and instructors in terms of the implementation of practice teaching (Demircan, 2007). Şallı (2007) mentioned that school experience was often not implemented. Sağ (2007) underlined that Turkish faculties of education were not effective in terms of practice teaching and did not focus on the process in the expected way.

Büyükgöze-Kavas and Bugay (2009) found that pre-service teachers viewed the provided materials as inadequate, school experience and practice teaching hours as limited, and the amount of practice teaching as unsatisfactory.

Baştürk (2008) highlighted that mentor teachers perceived practice teaching traditionally, as pre-service teachers only observed and conducted a lesson for a few hours, and viewed the attendance of pre-service teachers as the most important criterion in assessment. The level of interaction between mentor teachers and pre-service teachers was found to be low and limited, operating at a surface level (Baştürk, 2008).

Ünal (2008) highlighted that school experience was hindered by troubles, resulting from the partner schools and the education system. A great number of pre-service teachers and limited physical space in schools prevented mentor teachers from helping pre-service teachers adapt to schools, providing opportunities for practice, and viewing them as colleagues. Instructors also neglected to fulfill their responsibilities in the university-partner school collaboration, assuming that mentor teachers were responsible for the entirety of the collaboration (Ünal, 2008). Due to

crowded and unusual classrooms, many mentor teachers were not able to assess practice teaching in a valid and reliable fashion (Dilmaç & Dilmaç, 2008).

Ünlüönen and Boylu (2007) concluded that school experience was criticized and viewed as negative by instructors in terms of its contribution to learning teaching as a profession: To mentor teachers and instructors, school experience was not implemented in accordance with the goals set by the universities and partner schools, and the problems were due to the fact that pre-service teachers, especially freshmen ones, started to gain school experience earlier. They thus were unwilling to implement school experience and practice teaching. In addition, mentor teachers mentioned that some of the instructors teaching school experience and practice teaching seldom or never went to partner schools and that pre-service teachers sent to partner schools varied in number. The mentor teachers claimed to suffer from the hours devoted to school experience and practice teaching, which were compulsory, while instructors complained about remuneration for school experience and practice teaching courses (Ünlüönen & Boylu, 2007).

Pre-service teachers felt inadequately prepared in terms of general culture, content-area knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, teaching methods and techniques, and the preparation of instructional materials (Temizkan, 2008). Kılıç (2007) concluded that pre-service teachers were not competent enough to do practice teaching or plan a lesson, although they perceived themselves competent enough to teach. Instructors and pre-service teachers had difficulty placing pre-service teachers at partner schools, getting prepared for practice, and doing practice during a limited amount of time (Bağcıoğlu, 1997). Aytaç (2010) highlighted that there was no system for selecting and placing faculty coordinators and instructors. Pre-service teachers also encountered problems during practice teaching, although they had a lot of theoretical knowledge (Çınar, 2010). They were not ready to teach a class, and lacked knowledge on how to construct an interactive classroom environment, resulting in traditional methods of teaching. They also complained about the limited opportunities to practice provided in Turkish public schools, and practice teaching that was not taken seriously (Çınar, 2010).

Yıldız (2006) found no collaboration between universities and partner schools, as mentor teachers were not aware of the purpose of school experience, as they were not informed by instructors and partner school administrators. Pre-service teachers did not have time to do groupwork, term plan, or simulate teaching, and the activities they conducted were not chosen according to predetermined criteria, and thus did not serve their purposes (Şallı, 2007).

The sources of pre-service teachers' problems could be grouped into five categories: Problems with pre-service teachers, problems with students, problems with mentor teachers, problems with the educational environment or system, and problems with instructors. Their good experiences of teaching could be sorted into three categories, namely, good experiences with pre-service teachers, good experiences with students, and good experiences with mentor teachers (Merç, 2004).

3.4. Roles and Expectations Related to School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey

Mentor teachers and pre-service teachers had very different perspectives on the role of mentor teachers – on whether mentor teachers ought to be guides, models or leaders, whether mentoring required additional skills than professional experience, and whether mentor teachers had the background knowledge to observe pre-service teachers systematically (Sarıçoban, 2008). Despite this, Katrancı (2008) found that mentor teachers viewed themselves undertaking their roles. On the other hand, Aytaç (2010) rejected this claim and concluded that mentoring was not sufficient enough at partner schools.

Pre-service teachers asked for help most from instructors, whereas they had lowest expectations for students at partner schools, while other pre-service teachers mostly met their expectations, but mentor teachers did not meet their expectations (Yeşil & Çalışkan, 2006).

Although pre-service teachers had high expectations for instructors, mentor teachers, partner school administrators, and other pre-service teachers, these expectations were not met (Yeşil & Çalışkan, 2006). Pre-service teachers' expectations for mentor teachers, instructors, and partner schools could be categorized under two themes (Sağ, 2008): (1) Being viewed as a colleague, and (2) support for the learn-to-teach process. Pre-service teachers expected mentor teachers, instructors, and partner schools to view them as colleagues and to behave in an equitable manner, and also asked mentor teachers, instructors, and partner schools to be aware of their lack of experience to provide necessary knowledge, and to observe and assess their teaching in a polite, supportive and encouraging manner (Sağ, 2008).

3.5. Implications for School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey

These studies on school experience and practice teaching provided recommendations for practice and further research. Becit, Kurt, and Kabakçı (2009) suggested that time devoted to practice teaching should be increased and that microteaching techniques should be used during practice teaching.

Gömlüksiz, Mercin, Bulut and Atan (2006) recommended that instructors visited partner schools, participated in and monitored practice teaching, shared their ideas with mentor teachers, informed them of the necessary steps, and taught pre-service teachers how to prepare daily, yearly and unit plans, how to utilize course books, how to prepare and use worksheets, and how and when microteaching should be practiced.

Ceylan and Akkuş (2007) implied that (1) collaboration between universities and partner schools, and among pre-service teachers, should be improved, (2) contact with partner schools should be established in order to send groups of pre-service teachers to those schools instead of considering a list of partner schools prepared by the Directorate of National Education, (3) the number of pre-service teachers sent to partner schools should be decreased to two or three, (4) effective seminars should be offered by universities and partner schools to inform pre-service teachers about their future activities and to enable mentor teachers to improve their mentoring skills (Ünlü-Saratlı, 2007), (5) partner school administrators and mentor teachers should be informed of the significance of their activities and their role in preparing pre-service teachers for teaching, (6) regular meetings should be arranged for universities and partner schools to assess their partnership, (7) partner schools should be carefully selected and groups of pre-service teachers should not be sent to inappropriate partner schools and finally (8) courses taught at universities should be translated into practice.

Sağ (2007) also suggested that a division of studies on practice teaching should be established at universities in order to influence policy-making on practice teaching, determine partner schools that match universities well, help mentor teachers, who are highly-qualified in terms of teaching, attend in-service training seminars, design, implement and develop in-service training programs for partner school administrators and mentor teachers and collaborate with the Directorate of National Education and partner schools, determine the qualifications of instructors and organize activities to develop their mentoring skills, inform people responsible for school experience, report and publish studies on practice teaching at the end of each semester, develop projects and do research on practice teaching, organize national and international meetings, seminars, and symposia, and publish research.

Büyükgöze-Kavas and Bugay (2009) highlighted that pre-service teachers suggested that the time devoted to practice teaching should be increased, that the courses taught in pre-service education should be reorganized for life after graduation, and that the number of electives should be increased. However, Ünlüönen and Boylu (2007) stated that both instructors and mentor teachers did not find it necessary to increase the time devoted to school experience and practice teaching, as the time devoted was stated to be enough. Ünlü-Saratlı (2007) argued that the time

devoted to practice teaching should be increased, to enable pre-service teachers to learn from different types of teachers and students, and to do activities in different schools.

Ünlüönen and Boylu (2007) underlined that both instructors and mentor teachers recommended that school experience should be gained in the second semester of the third year rather than in the first year, although some instructors even thought to exclude school experience from teacher training programs. However, Ünlü-Sarathlı (2007) claimed that school experience should be gained in the first year. Both instructors and mentor teachers stressed that the number of pre-service teachers per instructor or mentor teacher in school experience and practice teaching should be decreased and underlined that school experience should be a prerequisite to practice teaching, and that the partner schools to which pre-service teachers are sent should be determined by the proximity of partner schools to universities (Ünlü-Sarathlı, 2007). They also stressed that solutions should be provided to issues in the partnership between universities and partner schools, and that school experience and practice teaching done in the same partner school contributed to pre-service teachers' adaptation to the school environment (Ünlü-Sarathlı, 2007).

Ünlü-Sarathlı (2007) also made several suggestions for effective mentoring. First, pre-service teachers gaining school experience prior to others should collaborate with other teachers who have not done it yet. Second, pre-service teachers should be given the chance to select their mentor teachers, to establish a mentor-mentee relationship. Third, school experience should be considered as twofold – part theory, part practice. Observation techniques, theories of school environment, professional knowledge and practical knowledge should be taught prior to school experience. Fourth, pre-service teachers' perceptions and expectations of school experience should be determined, and activities should be designed based on those expectations. For solving collaboration and communication problems, mentoring hours should be arranged for certain days of the week, and meetings should be organized by instructors, mentor teachers, and pre-service teachers to assess the students' teaching weekly.

Bağcıoğlu (1997) stated that if the people responsible for practice teaching – instructors, mentor teachers, and pre-service teachers – understood and fulfilled their responsibilities, most of the problems would disappear. Kazan (2006) implied that further research should be done on e-portfolios, whose use was viewed as positive during practice teaching. As pre-service teachers receiving foreign language education were observed to be unready for the class and to lack knowledge about constructing an interactive classroom environment, resulting in traditional methods of teaching, they should be supported by additional language courses or education for one semester during their undergraduate education (Çınar, 2010). The themes generated from the findings of all the studies reviewed are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Common Themes Generated From the Studies Reviewed

Themes	Studies	f	%
Variables related to school experience and practice teaching	(Şaşmaz-Ören, Sevinç, & Erdoğan, 2009); (Yıldız, 2006); (Davran, 2006); (Katrancı, 2008); (Aytaç, 2010); (Kocatürk, 2006); (Yılmaz, 2007); (Ceylan & Akkuş, 2007); (Merç, 2004); (Doğan, 2009); (Şahin, Erdoğan, & Aktürk, 2007); (Yeşil & Çalışkan, 2006); (Öztuna-Kaplan, 2006); (Bağcıoğlu, 1997); (Caner, 2009)	15	41.7
Positive views on school experience and practice teaching	(Becit, Kurt, & Kabakçı, 2009); (Özgür, Bukova-Güzel, Kula, & Uğurel, 2009); (Özmen, 2008); (Demircan, 2007); (Ceylan & Akkuş, 2007); (Şaşmaz-Ören, Sevinç, & Erdoğan, 2009); (Temizkan, 2008); (Kazan, 2006); (Caner, 2009); (Hergüner, Arslan, & Dünder, 2002); (Dilmaç & Dilmaç, 2008); (Eraslan, 2008); (Sarıçoban, 2008); (Ünal, 2008)	14	38.9
Negative views on school experience and practice teaching	(Ünlüönen & Boylu, 2007); (Eraslan, 2008); (Gömleksiz, Mercin, Bulut, & Atan, 2006); (Özgür, Bukova-Güzel, Kula, & Uğurel, 2009); (Yeşil & Çalışkan, 2006); (Kocatürk, 2006); (Ünlü-Saratlı, 2007); (Özmen, 2008); (Demircan, 2007); (Şallı, 2007); (Sağ, 2007); (Büyükgöze-Kavas & Bugay, 2009); (Baştürk, 2008); (Ünal, 2008); (Dilmaç & Dilmaç, 2008); (Temizkan, 2008); (Kılıç, 2007); (Bağcıoğlu, 1997); (Aytaç, 2010); (Çınar, 2010); (Yıldız, 2006); (Merç, 2004)	22	61.1
Roles and expectations related to school experience and practice teaching	(Yeşil & Çalışkan, 2006); (Sağ, 2008); (Sarıçoban, 2008); (Katrancı, 2008); (Aytaç, 2010)	5	13.9
Implications for school experience and practice teaching	(Becit, Kurt, & Kabakçı, 2009); (Gömleksiz, Mercin, Bulut, & Atan, 2006); (Ceylan & Akkuş, 2007); (Ünlü-Saratlı, 2007); (Sağ, 2007); (Büyükgöze-Kavas & Bugay, 2009); (Ünlüönen & Boylu, 2007); (Bağcıoğlu, 1997); (Kazan, 2006); (Çınar, 2010)	10	27.8

4. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this review can be clustered into five common themes, such as variables affecting school experience and practice teaching, positive views on school experience and practice teaching, negative views on school experience and practice teaching, roles and expectations related to school experience and practice teaching, and lastly implications for school experience and practice teaching.

The most striking finding of this review is that about 60% (22 out of 36) of the studies reviewed present negative views of the people responsible for school experience and practice teaching (instructors, mentor teachers, partner school administrators, pre-service teachers) on both.

Despite positive views on the advantages of school experience and practice teaching, the stated problems encountered are mostly due to the people responsible for school experience and practice teaching. The stated drawbacks are as follows: lack of effective mentoring, lack of implementation of school experience and practice teaching, limited or no interaction between mentor teachers and pre-service teachers, limited or no collaboration between universities and partner schools, perceived incompetency of pre-service teachers doing practice teaching, the difficulty of placing pre-service teachers at partner schools, the limited time for preparing and practicing, limited or no systems built for the selection and placement of faculty coordinators and instructors, limited or no opportunities provided in public schools, practice teaching which is not seriously taken by the people responsible for school experience and practice teaching, and the unawareness of mentor teachers of the purpose of school experience. These problems seem to be consequences of off-task, unmotivated and uninterested mentor teachers and instructors, who can thereby be regarded as another major concern. Mentor teachers and instructors should

be intrinsically motivated to help pre-service teachers gain experience and practice teaching. Pre-service teachers, in turn, should be cognitively ready for school experience and practice teaching. If the people responsible for practice teaching – instructors, mentor teachers, and pre-service teachers – understood and fulfilled their responsibilities, most of the problems would disappear (Bağcıoğlu, 1997). The aforementioned drawbacks support the claim that teacher training in Turkey has serious problems (Aydın & Baskan, 2005) which can be resolved by on-task, intrinsically motivated and interested mentor teachers and instructors. These teachers owe a responsibility to student teachers and their future students. The mentoring of pre-service teachers thus warrants great attention. As mentoring has become popular around the world, identifying and preparing good mentors has become more demanding (Rowley, 1999). Rowley (1999) identifies the qualifications of a good mentor. First, a good mentor is dedicated to the role of mentoring. Second, a good mentor is accepting of the novice teacher. Third, a good mentor is good at providing instructional support. Fourth, a good mentor is effective in different interpersonal contexts. Fifth, a good mentor models continuous learning, while, sixth, communicating hope and optimism. This review on school experience and practice teaching indicates that mentor teachers and instructors have not been fully dedicated to their role, and that there are no predetermined criteria for selecting mentor teachers and instructors (Aytaç, 2010). Correspondingly, it is recommended that there should be predetermined criteria for selecting mentor teachers and instructors, and that mentor teachers and instructors should be dedicated to their roles. However, possessing mentoring skills alone will not provide appropriate support for pre-service teachers, that is, pre-service teachers should also learn to manage their mentor teachers, being aware of their feelings of vulnerability, as they may feel judged by the pre-service teachers (Maynard, 2000).

Although some studies argued that school experience should be gained in the first year (Ünlü-Sarathı, 2007), others recommended that school experience should be gained in the second semester of the third year (Ünlüönen & Boylu, 2007). Although teacher training programs were restructured in 2006 and it was decided that school experience should be gained in the second semester of the third year, no one has explicitly studied whether that decision was correct. The possible consequences of scheduling school experience gained in the second semester of the third year have not been investigated and might be further studied. Finally, this review is limited to 36 studies consisting of research articles, theses, and dissertations about school experience and practice teaching. The number of studies on school experience and practice teaching should be increased to arrive at more satisfactory generalizations.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The special thank goes to Justin Wedell, Fatma Yalvaç, and Manolya Tunçer, English language specialists at Afyon Kocatepe University, who have volunteered their time and expertise to proofread and correct the English edition, and also to Bayram Çetinkaya, assistant professor of Turkish language education at Afyon Kocatepe University, who has shown unyielding interest in Turkish language proofreading and editing.

6. REFERENCES

- Aydın, A., & Baskan, G. A. (2005). The problem of teacher training in Turkey. *Biotechnology and Biotechnological Equipment*, 19(2), 191-197.
- *Aytaç, A. (2010). *Öğretmenlik uygulaması dersi kapsamında uygulama öğretim elemanlığının değerlendirilmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey.
- *Bağcıoğlu, G. (1997). *Genel, mesleki ve teknik eğitim fakültelerindeki öğretmenlik uygulaması dersine ilişkin öğretim elemanı ve öğrenci görüşleri*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Baştürk, S. (2008). Öğretmenlik uygulaması dersinin uygulama öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine dayalı olarak değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama*, 7(14), 231-248.

- *Becit, G., Kurt, A. A., & Kabakçı, I. (2009). Bilgisayar öğretmen adaylarının okul uygulama derslerinin yararlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1), 169-184.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad: Mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 407-420.
- Burns, B. A., Grande, M., & Marable, M. A. (2008). Factors influencing teacher candidates' participation in a paid field experience with urban students. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 17(2), 101-116.
- *Büyükgöze-Kavas, A., & Bugay, A. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının hizmet öncesi eğitimlerinde gördükleri eksiklikler ve çözüm önerileri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(25), 13-21.
- *Caner, M. (2009). *A study on blended learning model for teaching practice course in pre-service English language teacher training program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- *Ceylan, T., & Akkuş, Z. (2007). Okul deneyimi II uygulamalarının öğretmen adayları üzerinde yarattığı davranış değişiklikleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(1), 213-226.
- Christensen, L. M., McNair, L., Patterson, J., & Wade, S. (1998, October 15-17th). *Professional partnerships in polyphonic voice*. Paper presented at the National Professional Development School Conference, Towson University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Clarke, R. H. (1999, February 24-27th). *University/school collaboration: A case study*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
- *Çınar, S. (2010). *Yabancı dil öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik uygulaması dersi kapsamında öğretim davranışlarının incelenmesi: Ampirik – nitel bir araştırma*. Unpublished master's thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey.
- *Davran, E. (2006). *İlköğretim kurumlarındaki öğretmenlik uygulamasının öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik yeterliliklerini kazanmaları üzerindeki etkisi: Van ili örneği*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Van, Turkey.
- *Demircan, C. (2007). Okul deneyimi II dersine yönelik öğrenci görüşlerinin incelenmesi: Mersin Üniversitesi Örneği. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(2), 119-132.
- Deniz, S., & Şahin, N. (2006). The restructuring process of teacher training system in Turkey: A model of teacher training based on post-graduate education (PGCE). *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 21-26.
- *Dilmaç, O., & Dilmaç, S. (2008). Resim-iş eğitimi anabilim dalında öğretmenlik uygulaması dersinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(1), 137-150.
- *Doğan, S. (2009). *An investigation of pre-service elementary mathematics teachers' views and reflections about elementary mathematics classes based on their observations in school experience courses*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Eraslan, A. (2008). Fakülte-okul işbirliği programı: Matematik öğretmeni adaylarının okul uygulama dersi üzerine görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34, 95-105.
- *Gömlüksiz, M. N., Mercin, L., Bulut, İ., & Atan, U. (2006). Okul deneyimi II dersine ilişkin öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri: Sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 23, 148-158.
- Hargreaves, A. (1996). Transforming knowledge: Blurring the boundaries between research, policy, and practice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(2), 105-122.
- *Hergüner, G., Arslan, S., & Dündar, H. (2002). Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencilerinin okul deneyimi dersini algılama düzeyleri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(11), 45-57.
- Jeffrey, J. V., & Pollock, J. N. (2010). Reciprocity through co-instructed site-based courses: Perceived benefit and challenge overlap in an urban school-university partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(3), 81-99.
- *Katrancı, M. (2008). *Öğretmenlik uygulamasında uygulama okulu koordinatörleri ve uygulama öğretmenlerinin görev ve sorumluluklarını yerine getirme düzeyleri: Kırıkkale ili örneği*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale, Turkey.
- *Kazan, Z. (2006). *Elektronik gelişim dosyasının eğitim amaçlı tasarlanması ve öğretmenlik uygulaması dersinde kullanımının değerlendirilmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Kılıç, I. (2007). *Müzik öğretmenliği lisans programı öğrencilerinin "özel öğretim yöntemleri" derslerinde kazandıkları yeterliklerin "öğretmenlik uygulaması"nda kullanım açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Kocatürk, F. (2006). *Okul deneyimi II ile ilgili uygulama öğretim elemanlarının, uygulama öğretmenlerinin ve öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Laker, A., Craig-Laker, J., & Lea, S. (2008). Sources of support for pre-service teachers during school experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(2), 125-140.
- Maynard, T. (2000). Learning to teach or learning to manage mentors? Experiences of school-based teacher training. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 8(1), 17-30.

- *Merç, A. (2004). *Reflections of pre-service EFL teachers throughout their practicum: What has been good? What has gone wrong? What has changed?* Unpublished master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Miles, B. M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- *Özgür, Z., Bukova-Güzel, E., Kula, S., & Uğurel, I. (2009). Matematik öğretmen adaylarının gözünden liselerdeki mesleki ön uygulama deneyimlerine yönelik süreçlerin resmi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(3), 227-252.
- *Özmen, H. (2008). Okul deneyimi - I ve okul deneyimi - II derslerine ilişkin öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, 25-37.
- *Öztuna-Kaplan, A. (2006). *Fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının epistemolojik inanışlarının okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasındaki yansımaları: Durum çalışması*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Patterson, G. (1999). The learning university. *The Learning Organization*, 6(1), 9-17.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Rowley, J. B. (1999). Supporting new teachers: The good mentor. *Educational Leadership*, 56(8), 20-22.
- Ruohotie-Lyhty, M., & Kaikkonen, P. (2009). The difficulty of change: The impact of personal school experience and teacher education on the work of beginning language teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 295-309.
- *Sağ, R. (2007). Okul uygulama çalışmaları birimi neden kurulmalıdır? *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 128-136. Retrieved January 17, 2011 from <http://efd.mehmetakif.edu.tr/arsiv/02012008dergi/dosyalar/128%2520-%2520136.pdf>
- *Sağ, R. (2008). The expectations of student teachers about cooperating teachers, supervisors, and practice schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 32, 117-132.
- *Sarıçoban, A. (2008). Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması derslerine ilişkin uygulama öğretmenleri ve öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(3), 31-55.
- Schwab, R. L., Defranco, T. C., & McGivney-Burrelle, J. (2004). Preparing future teacher-leaders: Experiences from the University of Connecticut's five-year teacher education program. *Educational Perspectives: Teacher Education Reform*, 36(1-2), 20-25.
- Semerci, Ç., & Taşpınar, M. (2003). Restructuring of teacher training system in Turkey. *Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 37(6), 137-146.
- Sivakumaran, T., Holland, G., Clark, L., Heyning, K., Wishart, W., & Flowers-Gibson, B. (2011). University-school partnerships for clinical experiences: Design, implementation, assessment, and data collection. *Journal of Case Studies in Education*, 1, 1-9.
- Sahin, A. E. (2007). İlköğretim bölümü mezunlarının başarılarının mezun oldukları lise türlerine göre karşılaştırılması. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 29, 113-128.
- Sahin, A. E. (2010). Professional status of elementary teaching in Turkey: A Delphi study. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 16(4), 437-459.
- *Şahin, İ., Erdoğan, A., & Aktürk, A. O. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının okul uygulamalarından doyumlarını yordayıcı faktörler. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 509-517.
- *Şallı, G. (2007). *Okul deneyimi I dersinin resim-iş eğitimi programı öğretmen adayları açısından uygulanabilirlik düzeyi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Şaşmaz-Ören, F., Sevinç, Ö. S., & Erdoğan, E. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının okul deneyimi derslerine yönelik tutumlarının ve görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(58), 217-246.
- *Temizkan, M. (2008). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları üzerine bir araştırma. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(3), 461-486.
- *Ünal, E. (2008). *A descriptive and comparative study of the practicum component in EFL teacher training programs at different universities in Turkey*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Ünlüönen, K., & Boylu, Y. (2007). Ticaret ve turizm eğitim fakültesinde uygulanan okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması derslerine yönelik öğretmen ve öğretim elemanı görüşleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Milli Eğitim*, 173, 331-360.
- *Ünlü-Saratlı, E. (2007). *Okul deneyimi-I dersi uygulamasında ilköğretim fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarına sunulan danışmanlık (mentoring) hizmetinin yeterliliği: Siirt ili örneği*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- *Yeşil, R., & Çalışkan, N. (2006). Okul deneyimi I dersinde işbirliği sürecinin değerlendirilmesi: Kırşehir eğitim fakültesi örneği. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 46, 227-310.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.

- *Yıldız, H. (2006). *YÖK / Dünya Bankası milli eğitimi geliştirme projesi kapsamında yer alan okul deneyimi II etkinliklerinin değerlendirilmesi: Sivas ili Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi örneği*. Unpublished master's thesis, Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, Turkey.
- *Yılmaz, G. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik uygulaması deneyimlerinin fen öğretimi öz yeterlik ve sınıf yönetimi inançlarına olan etkisi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ege University, İzmir, Turkey.
- * indicates the research articles, theses, and dissertations reviewed in the study.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Kuram ve uygulama arasındaki bağı güçlendirmek ve öğretmen adaylarına mesleki gelişimleri için destek sağlamak amacıyla öğretmen eğitiminde, üniversiteler ve uygulama okullarının birlikte çalışması gerektiğinin altı çizilmektedir. Türkiye de 1998-1999 eğitim-öğretim yılından itibaren üniversiteler ve uygulama okulları arasındaki, öğretmen yetiştirmede planlama ve Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) ile Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) arasındaki eşgüdüm eksikliğinin neden olduğu zayıf ilişkiyi dikkate alarak, öğretmen yetiştirme açısından hızlı bir gelişim süreci içerisine girmiştir. MEB ve YÖK arasında işbirliği kurulmaya çalışılmış ve bu, üniversitelerce sağlanan öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının yeniden yapılandırılması ve öğretmen adaylarının gerçek sınıf ortamında, gerçek öğrencilerle deneyim kazanmaları amacıyla kuramdan çok uygulamaya odaklanması ile sonuçlanmıştır. Ne var ki, Türkiye’de yeniden yapılandırılan bu öğretmen yetiştirme programları, kısıtlayıcı ve kuralcı özellikleri nedeniyle eleştirilmektedir. Standart, merkezi ve Türkiye’nin her yerinde uygulanıyor olmalarına rağmen, bu programların ülkenin tamamının ihtiyacını karşılayamadıkları iddia edilmektedir. Kuralcı ve durağan programlar yerine, yerel, bölgesel, ulusal ve küresel ihtiyaçlara cevap veren esnek ve dinamik öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının geliştirilmesi önerilmiştir. Bu ikilemden yola çıkılarak, bu çalışmada Türkiye’deki öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının etkililiği ile ilgili eğitim politikacıları, program geliştirme uzmanları ve öğretmen yetiştirenlerin bilgi sahibi olmaları için okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine bir inceleme yapılmıştır. Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması, öğretmen yetiştirmenin kimi ve nasılının güçlü bir kanıtı varsayıldığından bu inceleme, Türk yükseköğretiminde öğretmen yetiştirmenin şu anki durumunu daha iyi anlamak için okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması ile sınırlıdır.

Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine yürütülen çalışmalara ulaşmak için kapsamlı bir araştırma yapılmıştır. Bu incelemede şu veri tabanları kullanılmıştır: Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, ERIC, Humanities International Complete, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Kataloğu, Professional Development Collection, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection ve ULAKBİM Türk Ulusal Veri Tabanları. Anahtar sözcük ya da terimler olarak “okul deneyimi”, “ve”, “öğretmenlik uygulaması” kullanılmıştır. İnceleme, 2000 yılından günümüze yürütülen çalışmaları kapsamaktadır. Söz konusu veri tabanlarından üçü, ULAKBİM Türk Ulusal Veri Tabanları, Education Research Complete ve Academic Search Complete, 2002-2009 yılları arasında yapılan toplam 28 çalışma ortaya koymuştur. Bunların 23’ü ULAKBİM Türk Ulusal Veri Tabanlarına, dördü Education Research Complete veri tabanına, geriye kalan biri ise Academic Search Complete veri tabanına aittir. Bu çalışmalardan sadece 19’u, fakülte dergilerinde yayımlanan makaleler olup okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması ile ilişkilidir. Bu 19 çalışmaya ek olarak, okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine yapılan ve Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezinde kayıtlı yüksek lisans ve doktora tezleri de taranmıştır. “Okul deneyimi” için izinli yedi, “öğretmenlik uygulaması” için ise 10 çalışmaya çevrimiçi ulaşılabilmektedir. Okul deneyimi üzerine yapılan yedi çalışmadan altısı 2006-2009 yılları arasında yürütülen yüksek lisans tezi iken sadece biri 2006 yılında tamamlanan bir doktora tezidir. Bu tezlerden dördü nicel araştırma, ikisi nitel araştırma desenine sahip olup geriye kalan biri ise karma yöntemle çalışılmıştır. Öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine yapılan 10 çalışmanın sekizi 1997-2010 yılları arasında yürütülen yüksek lisans tezi iken ikisi sırasıyla 2007 ve 2009 yıllarında tamamlanan doktora tezleridir. Makale ve tezlerden elde edilen

veriler, kullanılan yöntem(ler)e göre analiz edilmiş ve oluşturulan temalar tablolar ile görselleştirilmiştir.

Kullanılan yöntemlere göre taranan makalelere ilişkin sonuçlar, bu çalışmaların 13'ünün nicel, beşinin nitel ve geriye kalan birinin betimleyici çalışmalar olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, taranan yüksek lisans ve doktora tezlerinin 10'u nicel, beşi nitel ve geriye kalan ikisi ise karma yönetime sahip tezlerdir. Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması üzerine yapılan çalışmaların incelendiği bu araştırmanın sonucunda oluşan beş ortak tema şöyledir: (1) Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasını etkileyen ve yordayan değişkenler; (2) Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin olumlu görüşler; (3) Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin olumsuz görüşler; (4) Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin roller ve beklentiler; (5) Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin öneriler.

Bu çalışmanın en çarpıcı sonucu şudur: Taranan çalışmaların yaklaşık %60'ında (36 çalışmanın 22'sinde), okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması ile ilgili kişiler, uygulama öğretim elemanları, uygulama öğretmenleri, uygulama okulu yöneticileri, öğretmen adayları, vs. okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin olumsuz görüş bildirmişlerdir.

Okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin olumlu görüşler ve avantajlara rağmen, belirtilen sorunlar, çoğunlukla okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasının kimi ve nasıldan kaynaklanmaktadır. Çoğunlukla belirtilen sorunlar şöyledir: Etkili rehberlik sağlamada ve okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasında görülen eksiklikler, uygulama öğretmenleri ve öğretmen adayları arasındaki etkileşim sınırlılığı ya da yokluğu, üniversiteler ve uygulama okulları arasındaki işbirliği sınırlılığı ya da yokluğu, öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik uygulaması ile algıladıkları yetersizlikleri, öğretmen adaylarının uygulama okullarına yerleştirilmesinde karşılaşılan sorunlar, uygulamaya hazırlık ve sınırlı sürede uygulamanın getirdiği güçlükler, fakülte koordinatörleri ve uygulama öğretim elemanlarının seçimi ve yerleştirilmesi için oluşturulan bir sistemin eksikliği ya da yokluğu, devlet okullarında sunulan olanakların sınırlılığı ya da yokluğu, okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması ile ilgili kişilerin öğretmenlik uygulamasını ciddiye almamaları ve uygulama öğretmenlerinin, okul deneyiminin edinimi için yapılan etkinliklerin amaçlarının ve içeriklerinin farkında olmamalarıdır.

Ne var ki, bu sorunların, odaklanılması gereken başka bir sorun olan, ilgisiz, güdülenmemiş, görevden uzak uygulama öğretmenlerinden ve öğretim elemanlarından kaynaklandığı görülmektedir. Bu yüzden uygulama öğretmenleri ve öğretim elemanları, öğretmen adaylarının okul deneyimi edinmeleri ve öğretmenliği etkili bir şekilde pratik edebilmeleri için içten güdülenmiş olmalıdırlar. Ayrıca, okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması için bilişsel olarak da hazır olmalıdırlar. Söz konusu sorunların, Türkiye'de öğretmen yetiştirmenin ciddi bir sorun olduğu iddiasını güçlendirdiği ve görev odaklı, içten güdülenmiş, ilgili uygulama öğretim elemanları ve öğretmenleri gerektirdiği söylenebilir. Karşılaşılan sorunlar, uygulama öğretim elemanları ve öğretmenlerine, öğretmen adayları ve gelecekteki öğrencileri için sorumluluklar yüklemektedir. Dolayısıyla, etkili rehberliğe önem verilmesi, uygulama öğretmeni ve öğretim elemanlarının seçimi için ölçütlerin oluşturulması ve kendilerini rollerine adanmalarının sağlanması önerilebilir.

Bu inceleme, okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulamasına ilişkin makaleleri, yüksek lisans ve doktora tezlerini içeren toplam 36 çalışma ile sınırlıdır. Bu sayı, okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması ile ilgili daha sağlıklı genellemelere ulaşılabilmesi için artırılabilir.

Citation Information

Kasapoğlu, K. (2015). A Review of Studies on School Experience and Practice Teaching in Turkey. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 30(1), 147-162.