The Levels of German Teacher Trainers Working in Turkey Regarding Reigeluth's Organizational Strategies

Veli Batdı[1] & Şenel Elaldı[2]

[1] Muallim Rıfat Education Faculty, Department of Educational Sciences, University of 7 Aralık, Kilis, Turkey

[2] Foreign Languages Department, University of Cumhuriyet, Sivas, Turkey

Correspondence: Şenel Elaldı, Foreign Languages Department, University of Cumhuriyet, Sivas, Turkey. Tel: 90-346-219-1665. E-mail: snlelaldi@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the views of German teacher trainers working in Turkey about their level regarding Reigeluth's organizational strategies and to analyze their views in terms of gender, geographic region, seniority, and graduated high school variables. While the population of the study consisted of German teacher trainers working in the seven regions of Turkey in the 2014-2015 academic year, the sample of the study comprised 53 German teacher trainers who were selected voluntarily accepted to participate in the study. Data were collected through "Organizational Strategies of German Teacher Trainers Scale" developed by the researchers. As the Content Validity Index value (0.92) was larger than the Content Validity Criterion value (0.56), the items were expressed to be meaningful. The findings revealed the participants to have a high level of organizational strategies. The results regarding the variables were as follows: a) Gender difference was mostly observed favoring the male teachers, b) geographic region difference frequently appeared favoring the Marmara and Black Sea Regions, c) seniority difference was seen favoring the 16-20 year range, d) graduated high school difference was mostly observed as a statistically insignificant variable. In-service training programs encompassing all the regions of Turkey were suggested to be designed regularly and systematically for professional development of foreign language teachers.

Keywords: instructional design, organizational strategies, German teacher trainers, 3-point Likert scale

1. Introduction

The point that practically everyone agrees on in education that people have different learning needs, ways and paces. However, schools and training programs are generally intended to teach a predetermined, fixed amount of content in a set amount of time by ignoring slower or faster learners (Reigeluth, 2012). Therefore, the main problem with education and training systems is not the teachers or the students, it stems from the system that is not designed to maximize learning (Reigeluth, 1987, 1994). In order to maximize learning, possible implementation of core ideas involved in some instructional strategies can be helpful to create a vision of instruction (Reigeluth, 2012, p. 14).

Pre-service and in-service training and mentoring support teachers in altering their instructional methods and implementing theoretical concepts in practice (Evans & Waring, 2006). Therefore, education professionals have demonstrated an increasing interest not only in instructional design and related assessment instruments, instructional models and pedagogical techniques (Hall & Moseley, 2005), but also in teachers' professional development (Rosenfeld & Rosenfeld, 2008). Providing training and opportunities to teachers to develop an understanding of students' learning style preferences that are related to individuals' preferred method of gathering, processing, interpreting, organizing and analyzing information, can result in greater comprehension and consideration of the unique learning needs of each individual under their tutelage (Kharb, Paramita Samanta, Jindal, & Singh, 2013). Thus, an understanding of learning styles can increase teachers' confidence and ability to incorporate varied instructional practices in a way that maintains an appropriate level of academic rigor (Noble, 2004). Furthermore, it is essential that teachers need to shape their approach to teaching and learning by developing a large repertoire of instructional strategies and use of them in varied settings to meet diverse students' needs (Hall & Moseley, 2005). Therefore, teachers are expected to become proficient in differentiating instruction to make learning more meaningful, and to enhance student success (Honigsfeld & Schiering, 2004).

Moreover, research has shown that students receiving instruction that is related to incorporating a variety of instructional methods demonstrated high achievement levels overall (Felder & Brent, 2005; Sternberg et al., 2008).

Instructional design encompasses the process involved in the systematic planning of instruction and therefore, it refers to "systematic and reflective process of translating principles of learning and instruction into plans for instructional materials, activities, information resources, and evaluation" (Smith & Ragan, 2005, p. 4). According to Reigeluth (2009), instructional design includes not only methods (or models, techniques, strategies, and heuristics), but also when and when not to use each method. In that vein, while an instructional method refers to "anything that is done purposely to facilitate learning or human development" (p. 21), other terms including strategy, technique, tactic, and approach are often used for part or all of this construct (Reigeluth, 2009). That is, the instructional method used for the learning task encompasses the instructional strategy as well (Smith & Ragan, 2005). Reigeluth (1983a) described a classification of instructional methods as composed of three characteristics: (1) Organizational Strategies (micro to macro), (2) Delivery strategies (media selection and utilization) for developing specific knowledge of instruction, (3) Management strategies for scheduling and allocating of resources. According to Reigeluth and Moore (1999), other ways of classifying methods include: (a) the type of learning (memorize information, understand relationships, apply skills, apply generic skills, affective development, or so forth), (b) the focus of the learning (a topic or a problem; a single domain or interdisciplinary), (c) the grouping for the learning (individuals, pairs, small groups, or large groups), (d) the interactions for the learning (with humans: student-teacher, student-student, or student-other; with nonhumans: student-tool, student-information, student-environment/manipulatives, or student-other), and (e) the support for the learning (cognitive support or emotional support).

Organizational Strategies include generative and supplantive instructional strategies to promote learning when designing instruction and include the answers of the following three questions: (1) what content is needed? (2) how should the content be presented? (3) how should instruction be sequenced? (Christopher, 2011). For generative strategies, learners are encouraged to construct their own idiosyncratic meanings from the instruction by "generating their own educational goals, organization, elaborations, sequencing and emphasis of content, monitoring of understanding and transfer to other context" (Smith & Ragan, 2005, p. 141). In supplantive strategies, instructors "supplant, facilitate or scaffold" more of the information processing for the learner by overtly or explicitly supplying all the events of instruction (Smith & Ragan, 2005, p. 142). Organizational strategies have two subcategories: micro and macro strategies. While micro strategies are characterized as presentation strategies, because of their concerned with the details of individual presentations to the learner, macro strategies are concerned with the selection, sequence, and organization (structure) of the subject-matter topics to be presented (Thomas & Risk, 2016). Designing a simple-to-complex sequence is based primarily on starting with the most fundamental, basic principles and elaborating one level at a time to more complex, narrow and local principles (Reigeluth & Rodgers, 1980). Therefore, Reigeluth's Elaboration Theory of Instruction involving the fact that some knowledge must be acquired before other knowledge can be learned (Reigeluth, Merrill, Wilson, & Spiller, 1980) deals with organizational strategies at the macro level, which is made up of four problem areas: selection, sequencing, synthesizing, and summarizing of subject matter content (Thomas & Risk, 2016). According to Reigeluth (1983b), by gradually elaborating, one level at a time, down to the desired level of detail. On the other hand, organizational strategies accommodate expanded version of Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction in general instructional characteristics including introduction, body, conclusion, and assessment to provide a flexible framework to sequence events at the lesson level and to illustrate their relationships (Reigeluth & Keller, 2009). According to Gagné (1985), nine events that provide a framework for an effective learning process are as follows: (1) gain attention, (2) provide a learning objective, (3) stimulate recall of prior knowledge, (4) present the material to be learned, (5) provide guidance for learning, (6) elicit performance, (7) provide feedback, (8) assess performance and, (9) enhance retention and transfer. The expanded event of instruction generated by Smith and Ragan (2005) has included four categories as introduction, body, conclusion and, assessment. Introduction part encompasses the following events: activating attention, establishing instructional purpose, arousing interest and motivation, and previewing lesson. The events in the body part are as follows: recalling prior knowledge, processing information, focusing attention, employing learning strategies, practice, and evaluating feedback. Additionally, while conclusion part includes summarizing and reviewing, transferring knowledge, and remotivating and closing events, assessment part has the events such as assessing performance, evaluating feedback and remediating (Smith & Ragan, 2005).

Delivery Strategies involve determining an appropriate medium of instruction and grouping strategies (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2015). According to Smith and Ragan (2005) in Web Chapter 1, the most prevalent delivery

strategy decision made at the lesson level concerns the instructional medium or media (print, teachers, computers, interactive multimedia, Internet, etc.) that will be used to deliver the instruction. Thus, when selecting a medium, they aligned the factors that should be taken into consideration are as follows: (1) The learning task along with the instructional conditions that facilitate the learning of that task, (2) The characteristics of the learners, (3) The learning context and other practical matters that influence the appropriateness of the medium, and (4) The attributes of the potential media (what each potential medium can and cannot do with regard to the prior three factors) (p. 4). On the other hand, grouping strategies positively contribute to students' learning and help them develop a host of skills that are increasingly important in the professional world (Caruso & Woolley, 2008). Although it is not always possible to expect the delivery of instruction individually, today teachers are determined to reach all students and struggling to tailor their instruction to individual student needs by teaching small groups (Willis & Mann, 2000). Harmer (1991) suggested that working in pairs or groups provides an opportunity for students to work in a conducing and facilitating environment and to check out understanding of concepts with their partners. It is also possible for teachers to observe how students in small groups respond and interact with the lessons being taught (Wasik, 2008).

Management Strategies include the scheduling and allocation of resources to implement the instruction and guide the orchestration of organizational and delivery strategies (Smith & Ragan, 2005).

As of July 2009, a protocol in accordance of the training of German teacher trainers was signed between Ministry of National Education [MoNE] and GOETHE Institut E.V. in Turkey for more efficient and effective teaching of German (MoNE, 2010, p. 138). Within the scope of this protocol, a hundred German teachers working any high schools of Turkey would be selected by examination and trained as teacher trainers through participating in the national and international seminars and courses (MoNE, 2009). In this context, it was aimed that other German teachers who did not participate in related seminars and courses would be trained by these 100 German teacher trainers. In this regard, this study encompassed German teachers who were appointed to the schools under the responsibility of the General Directorate of High Schools in Turkey and attended the seminar titled "German Language Teaching Methods and Techniques" that was held in Erzurum, a city in the East of Turkey, by MoNE Directorate General of Teacher Training and Development and GOETHE Institut E.V..

Although different studies were devoted to evaluating the views of teachers or students regarding instructional methods and strategies in different contexts, no study has been carried out in Turkey within this scope. In this regard, this study is the first type of its form focusing on the views of teacher trainers who work seven different regions of Turkey. Thus, this study attempts to reveal German teacher trainers' instructional design levels and aims at evaluating the views of German teacher trainers working in Turkey about their level regarding Reigeluth's organizational strategies. In line with this aim, the following sub-aims have been included in the study:

1) To determine the level of German teacher trainers working in highs schools regarding Reigeluth's organizational strategies.

2) To analyze their views in terms of gender, geographic region, seniority and, graduated high school variables.

2. Method

In this research, screening model, one of the descriptive research methods, was used. Screening model is a study approach which aims to describe a situation in the past or still existing in the present as it is (Karasar, 2005). Additionally, the aim of screening model is to collect faiths, attitudes, opinions and, perspectives of people on a current topic in education and to identify their behaviors (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2006).

2.1 Population & Sample

The population of the study consisted of German teacher trainers working in the seven regions of Turkey, namely, Mediterranean, Black Sea, Marmara, Aegean, Central Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia and, Southeastern Anatolia in the 2014-2015 academic year. However, the sample of the study comprised 53 German teacher trainers who were selected voluntarily accepted to participate in the study. While most of the questionnaires were distributed via email (N:42), some of the them were administered by telephone (N:6) and a small number of them were filled out by hand (N:5) with the help of H. P. who is a German teacher trainer working in Elazığ province. Distribution of the sample according to variables is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of the German teacher trainers taking part in the sample according to variables

Variables		N	%
Gender	Male	39	73.6
	Female	14	26.4
Seniority (Year)	1-5	7	13.2
	6-10	15	28.3
	11-15	13	24.5
	16-20	12	22.6
	21+	6	11.3
Graduated High School	Science High School	3	5.7
	Anatolian Teacher High School	13	24.5
	Anatolian High School	8	15.1
	Anatolian Technical-Vocational High School	2	3.8
	Regular High School	27	50.9
Education status	Bachelor's degree	39	73.6
	Master's degree	12	22.6
	PhD	2	3.8
The geographic region where he/ she works	Mediterranean Region	7	13.2
	Black Sea	7	13.2
	Marmara	6	11.3
	Aegean,	5	9.4
	Central Anatolia Region	10	18.9
	Eastern Anatolia Region	13	24.5
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	5	9.4
Total		53	100

2.2 Data Collection

A twenty item instrument for measuring the level of Organizational Strategies of German Teacher Trainers (OSGTT) was developed in the light of review of literature regarding Reigeluth's (1983a) organizational strategies and 12 subject matter experts (SMEs) (1 Associate Professor in German Language and Literature, 2 Assistant Professors in German Language and Literature, 7 German teachers, and 2 Turkish teachers). Reigeluth (1983) has proposed three components of instructional strategies as Organizational, Delivery and Management strategies. Since general characteristics of the organizational strategies include *Introduction*, *Body*, *Conclusion* (*Closure*) *and*, *Assessment* parts, the instrument also contains these parts as sub-dimensions. Therefore, a 3-point Likert scale, ranging 1 (Never), 2 (Partially Agree) and, 3 (Completely Agree), is used as a four dimension scale, namely *Introduction* including 5 items, *Body* 7 items, *Conclusion* (*Closure*) 4 items, and *Assessment* 4 items. Jacoby and Matell (1971) proclaim that a three-point Likert scale (bipolar scale) provides an appropriate discrimination and validity (as cited in Dell-Kuster et al., 2014). They suggested that both reliability and validity are independent of the number of response categories, and according to their results, collapsing data from longer scales into two-point or three-point scales would not diminish the reliability or validity of the resulting scores (Preston & Colman, 2000). Furthermore, several research studies in which a 3-point scale was used have been conducted and reported in the literature (i.e., Dell-Kuster et al., 2014; Karadağ & Çalışkan, 2006; Podolskiy, 2013; Sarı, 2007; Wang, 2009). The calculated mean scores of the OSGTT scale are as follows: 1-1.66=*Completely Disagree*; 1.67-2.32=*Partially Agree*; 2.33-3.00=*Completely Agree*.

Content Validity Ratio (CVR), created by Lawshe (1975), is used for item level analysis of validity (Effendi, Matore, & Khairani, 2015). According to Lawshe (1975), when 12 SMEs for rating of the items are used, a CVR

of at least .56 would be required to retain the item. To determine an index of the content validity for a test as a whole, the mean CVR across all retained items is computed resulting in the Content Validity Index (CVI) (Shultz & Whitney, 2004, p. 91) which is an index of inter rater agreement based on experts' ratings of item relevance (Polit, Beck, & Owen, 2007). When SMEs were asked to score the relevance of each item, the value for each item was computed separately and resulted as a CVI of .92, indicating a good level of agreement between the experts. Due to being this value larger than the 0.56 Content Validity Criterion (CVC) [(0.92>0.56) (CVI>CVC)], it can be interpreted as that the content validity of the items in the questionnaire are statistically significant at the 0.05 level (Veneziano & Hooper, 1997). Content Validity Ratios (CVRs) of the items are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Content Validity Ratios (CVRs) of the items regarding the OSGTT scale

Item Num.	ITEMS	N_N	CVR	
7	I activate the attention of students while teaching a lesson	12	1.00	Introduction: 0.932
8	I inform students of the gains.	11	0.83	
9	I establish instructional purposes (instructional gains).	12	1.00	
10	I keep the attention of students alive during the lesson	12	1.00	
11	I provide an overview of the course	11	0.83	
12	I stimulate recall of relevant prior knowledge of students	11	0.83	Body: 0.927
13	I present information and examples about the gains	11	0.83	
14	I focus students' attention	12	1.00	
15	I employ learning strategies	12	1.00	
16	I guide students	12	1.00	
17	I reveal the reaction of students on the learned subject by providing the participation of students	12	1.00	
18	I give continuous feedback	11	0.83	
19	I summarize the subject covered in the course	12	1.00	Conclusion (Closure): 0.915
20	I enhance transfer of what learned	11	0.83	
21	I provide re-motivation for students on learning	11	0.83	
22	I do the course closing	12	1.00	
23	I evaluate the performance of students for the gains.	11	0.83	Assessment: 0.915
24	I give feedback to the students in consequence of assessment	12	1.00	
25	I make the necessary changes to my plan by reviewing the assessment results	12	1.00	
26	I implement modifications and improvements in my new plan.	11	0.83	

Number of Experts: **12 N_N:** Number of experts thinking the activities *efficient*

Content Validity Criterion(CVC): **0.56**　　Content Validity Indices : (CVI): **0.923**

[(0.92>0.56) CVI> CVC]

2.3 Data Analysis

In the analysis of data, the SPSS 18.0 package program was used focusing on frequencies, percentages for individual data, independent sample t-test and ANOVA: Scheffe and LSD for the analysis of parametric Likert type items and the Mann Whitney U test for the non-parametric items which are given in Table 7 (See Appendix). P-values that were ≤0.05 were considered to be significant.

3. Results

The results according to the items are presented separately.

3.1 The Views of German Teacher Trainers in Turkey on Their Levels Regarding Introduction Sub-Dimension of Reigeluth's Organizational Strategies

The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding introduction sub-dimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding introduction sub-dimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies

Item	Teachers' Views	Mean	SD
7	I activate the attention of students while teaching a lesson	2.70	.50
8	I inform students of the gains	2.89	.32
9	I establish instructional purposes (instructional gains).	2.,77	.42
10	I keep the attention of students alive during the lesson.	2.51	.64
11	I provide an overview of the course	2.62	.56
Average		2.70	.33

The participants' views on the item 7, a non-parametric item, namely *I activate the attention of students while teaching a lesson* are at the *Completely Agree Level* on the 3-point Likert scale, with a mean of 2.70 (SD=.50). This result indicates that German teacher trainers are pretty good at getting students' attention during the lesson. Additionally, there is a significant difference between the views of the participants in terms of the gender variable (MWU_7=156.000; $p<0.05$), favoring the male teacher trainers; and in terms of the geographic region variable, according to the results of the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test, there is a significant difference (F=2.452; $p<0.05$) among the views of the participants working in the Mediterranean, Black Sea, Marmara, Central Anatolia and, Eastern Anatolia Regions, favoring the Marmara Region ($\overline{x}_1$=2,14, $\overline{x}_2$=2,71, $\overline{x}_3$=3,00, $\overline{x}_5$=2,80, $\overline{x}_6$=2,85).

The views regarding the item 8, one of the nonparametric items, namely, *I inform students of the gains* are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.89 (SD=.32). This result indicates that students are informed in advance about the gains by the participants. Additionally, related to this item, there is a significant gender difference (MWU_8=197.500; $p<0.05$) favoring the male participants (MR_1=29.30, MR_2=21.17). On the other hand, in terms of the geographic region variable, there is a significant difference as well (F=3.865; $p<0.05$). According to the Scheffe test results, this difference is among the Mediterranean, Black Sea and Eastern Anatolia Regions ($\overline{x}_1$=2,43, $\overline{x}_1$=3,00, $\overline{x}_6$=2,92), favoring the Black Sea Region.

The level of the participants related to the item 9, a nonparametric item, namely, *I establish instructional purposes (instructional gains)* is at the *Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.77 (SD=.42). This shows that the participants are able to put forward instructional purposes at a pretty good level. There is a significant difference in terms of the gender variable (MWU_9=189.500; $p<0.05$) favoring the male participants (MR_1=29.51); and there is a significant difference in terms of the seniority variable (F=3.918; $p<0.05$) between the 11-15 and 16-20 year ranges favoring the 16-20 year range ($\overline{x}_3$=2.54, $\overline{x}_4$=3.00).

The participants' views regarding the item 10, namely, *I keep the attention of students alive during the lesson*, are at *the Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.51 (SD=.64). This shows that the participants have an exceptional level of keeping students' attention alive. Furthermore, there is a significant gender difference ($t_{(51)}$=3.493, $p<0.05$), favoring the male participants ($\overline{x}$=2.68; $\overline{x}$=2.07); and a significant geographic region difference (F=2.567; $p<0.05$). According to the LSD test results, the geographic region difference is among the views of the participants working in the Aegean, Black Sea, Marmara, Eastern Anatolia and, Southeastern Anatolia Regions, favoring the Marmara Region ($\overline{x}_1$=2.28, $\overline{x}_2$=2.86, $\overline{x}_3$=3.00, $\overline{x}_4$=1.80, $\overline{x}_6$=2.54, $\overline{x}_7$=2.60).

The participants views regarding the item 11, namely, *I provide an overview of the course* are at the *Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.62 (SD=.56). This result indicates that they usually make general explanations for the course.

3.2 The Views of German Teacher Trainers in Turkey on Their Levels Regarding Body Subdimension of Reigeluth's Organizational Strategies

The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding Body subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies are given in Table 4.

Table 4. The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding Body subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies

Item	Teachers' Views	Mean	SD
12	I stimulate recall of relevant prior knowledge of students.	2.79	.41
13	I present information and examples about the gains.	2.60	.53
14	I focus students' attention in the subject	2.64	.52
15	I employ learning strategies	2.81	.39
16	I guide students	2.62	.59
17	I reveal the reaction of students on the learned subject by providing the participation of students	2.60	.53
18	I give continuous feedback.	2.79	.41
Average		2.69	.25

As given in Table 4, the participants' views related to the item 12, namely I *stimulate recall of relevant prior knowledge of students* are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.79 (*SD*=.41). This result indicates that the participants tend to use stimulants for activating the prior knowledge of students. There is a meaningful difference among the views of the participants in terms of the region variable (F=3.848; p<0.05). According to the Scheffe test results, this difference is between the participants working in the Black Sea Region ($\overline{x}_1$=3.00) and those working in the Aegean Region ($\overline{x}_1$=2.20), favoring those working in the Black Sea Region.

The participants' views regarding the item 13, namely I *present information and examples about the gains* are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.60 (SD=.53). This result shows that the participants are good at presenting information and examples about the gains.

The participants' views for the item 14, namely *I focus students' attention in the subject*, are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.64 (*SD*=.52). This is interpreted as that the participants are able to attract students' attention in the subjects.

The views of the participants for the item 15, namely, *I employ learning strategies* are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.81 (*SD*=.39), indicating that they are good at applying learning strategies. There is a meaningful difference among the views of the participants in terms of the region variable (F=2.612; p<0.05). According to the LSD test results, this difference is among the Mediterranean, Marmara, Aegean, Central Anatolia and, Eastern Anatolia Regions ($\overline{x}_1$=2.43, $\overline{x}_2$=2.57, $\overline{x}_3$=3.00, $\overline{x}_4$=3.00, $\overline{x}_5$=2.90, $\overline{x}_6$=2.92), favoring the Marmara and Aegean Regions.

The participants' views regarding the item 16, namely, *I guide students* at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.62 (*SD*=.59), indicating that they are good enough to guide students.

The views on the item 17, namely, *I reveal the reaction of students on the learned subject by providing the participation of students*, are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.60 (*SD*=.53). This result can be interpreted as that the participants contribute to the active participation of their students and they are good enough to reveal the reaction of students on the learned subject.

The views related to the item 18, namely, *I give continuous feedback*, are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.79 (*SD*=.41). Furthermore, there is a significant difference in terms of the seniority variable (F=2.451; p<0.05) and the graduated high school variable (F=3.990; p<0.05). According to the Scheffe test results, the difference is between the 11-15 ($\overline{x}_3$=2.61) and 16-20 ($\overline{x}_4$=3.200) years of seniority, favoring the 16-20 year range; and between the Anatolian Teacher high school ($\overline{x}_2$=3.00) and Anatolian high school ($\overline{x}_3$=3.40), favoring the latter.

3.3 The Views of German Teacher Trainers in Turkey on Their Levels Regarding Conclusion (Closure) Subdimension of Reigeluth's Organizational Strategies

The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding Conclusion (Closure) subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies are given in Table 5.

Table 5. The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding Conclusion (Closure) subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies

Item	Teachers' Views	Mean	SD
19	I summarize the subject covered in the course.	2.72	.45
20	I enhance transfer of what learned	2.70	.44
21	I provide re-motivation for students on learning.	2.81	.39
22	I do the course closing	2.77	.50
Average		2.75	.32

As given in Table 5, the views regarding the item 19, namely, *I summarize the subject covered in the course*, are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.72 (*SD*=.45). There is a meaningful gender difference among the views of the participants ($t_{(51)}$=3.520; $p<0.05$), favoring the male participants ($\overline{x}$=2.84, $\overline{x}$=2.40); and there is a meaningful seniority difference (F=3.855; $p<0.05$). According to the Scheffe test results, this difference is between the participants working in the 16-20 year range ($\overline{x}$=2.91) and those working in the 21 and above year range ($\overline{x}$=2.38), favoring the former. On the other hand, there is also a meaningful significance in terms of the graduated high school variable (F=2.803; $p<0.05$) and in terms of the geographic region variable (F=2.312; $p<0.05$). According to the LSD test results, the difference related to the graduated high school variable is between the participants who graduated from Anatolian high schools ($\overline{x}_3$=2.37) and those who graduated from regular high schools ($\overline{x}_5$=2.85), favoring the latter while the difference related to the geographic region variable is among the participants working in the Mediterranean, Black Sea, Marmara, Aegean, and Central Anatolia Regions ($\overline{x}_1$=2.28, $\overline{x}_2$=2.85, $\overline{x}_3$=3.00, $\overline{x}_4$=2.80, $\overline{x}_5$=2.90), favoring the Marmara Region.

The views on the item 20, namely, *I enhance transfer of what learned*, are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.70 (*SD*=.44). This result shows that the participants contribute to knowledge transfer of students at an expected level. There is a meaningful seniority difference (F_{17}=5.278; $p<0.05$) between the participants working in the 6-10 year range ($\overline{x}_2$=3.00), and those working in the 11-15 ($\overline{x}_3$=2.46); 21 and above ($\overline{x}_3$=2.54) year range favoring the 6-10 year range.

The views of the participants regarding the item 21, namely, *I provide re-motivation for students on learning* are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.81 (*SD*=.39), indicating that the participants have a good level of re-motivating students to learn. Related to this item, there is a meaningful seniority (F_{21}=3.213; $p<0.05$) and geographic region difference (F=2.810; $p<0.05$) among the views of the participants. According to the Scheffe test results, the seniority difference is between the participants working in the 16-20 year range ($\overline{x}_4$=3.00) and those working in the 6-10 ($\overline{x}_2$=2.93), 21 and above ($\overline{x}_3$=2.70) year range, favoring the 16-20 year range. According to the LSD test results, the geographic region difference is between the participants working in the Mediterranean Region and those working in the Black Sea, Marmara, Aegean, Eastern Anatolia Regions, favoring those working in the Black Sea, Marmara and, Aegean Regions ($\overline{x}_1$=2.57, $\overline{x}_2$=3.00, $\overline{x}_3$=3.00, $\overline{x}_4$=3.00, $\overline{x}_5$=2.70, $\overline{x}_6$=2.92).

The views regarding the item 22, namely, *I do the course closing*, are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.77 (*SD*=.50), indicating that they have a good level of doing the course closing. There is a meaningful difference among the views of the participants in terms of the geographic region variable (F=2.433; $p<0.05$) favoring the Black Sea, Marmara and Central Anatolia Regions ($\overline{x}_2$=3.00, $\overline{x}_3$=3.00, $\overline{x}_5$=3.00).

3.4 The Views of German Teacher Trainers in Turkey on Their Levels Regarding Assessment Subdimension of Reigeluth's Organizational Strategies

The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding Assessment subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies are given in Table 6.

Table 6. The views of German teacher trainers in Turkey on their levels regarding Assessment subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies

Item	Teachers' Views	Mean	SD
23	I assess the performance of students for the gains.	2.49	.57
24	I give feedback to the students in consequence of assessment.	2.47	.64
25	I make the necessary changes to my plan by reviewing the assessment results.	2.58	.60
26	I implement modifications and improvements in my new plan.	2.57	.57
Average		2.53	.36

Table 6 shows that the participants' views regarding the item 23, namely, *I assess the performance of students for the gains* are at *the Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.49 (*SD*=.57). This shows that the participants have a good level of evaluating students' performance for gains.

The views on the item 24, namely, *I give feedback to the students in consequence of assessment* are at *the Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.47 (*SD*=.64), indicating a high level of giving feedback to the students in consequence of evaluation that the participants have. Furthermore, there is a significant gender difference ($t_{(51)}$=3.138; $p<0.05$) between the male ($\overline{x}$=2.63) and female ($\overline{x}$=2.06) participants favoring the males. Additionally, there is a significant difference among the views of the participants in terms of the seniority variable (F_{24}=3.342; $p<0.05$) and in terms of the geographic region variable (F=2.810; $p<0.05$). According to the LSD test results, while the participants working in the Marmara and Black Sea Regions ($\overline{x}_2$=3.00, $\overline{x}_3$=3.00) have the highest levels, those working in the Aegean, Southeastern Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia and, Central Anatolia Regions ($\overline{x}_1$=2.00, $\overline{x}_4$=2.20, $\overline{x}_7$=2.20, $\overline{x}_6$=2.30, $\overline{x}_5$=2.60) have the lowest levels respectively.

The participants' views on the item 25, a nonparametric item, namely, *I make the necessary changes to my plan by reviewing the assessment results* are at *the Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.58 (*SD*= .60), indicating their a good level of making necessary changes in the plans according to evaluation results. There is a significant gender difference among the views of the participants (MWU_{25}=177.000; $p<0.05$), favoring the females ($\overline{x}$=2.87, MR_2=34.20; $\overline{x}$=2.47, MR_1=24.16).

The participants' views regarding the item 26, a nonparametric item, namely, *I implement modifications and improvements in my new plan* are at *the Completely Agree Level* with a mean of 2.57 (*SD*=.57), indicating their high level of implementing modifications and improvements in a new plan. There is a significant gender difference among the views of the participants (MWU_{26}=192.000; $p<0.05$), favoring the males (MR_1=29.45; MR_2=20.80).

4. Discussion

The present study demonstrates the level of German teacher trainers working in high schools regarding Reigeluth's organizational strategies presented in four sub-dimensions in terms of different variables. The participants' levels regarding the *introduction* subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies which included 5 items are at the *Completely Agree Level* on the 3-point Likert scale, with a mean of 2.70 (*SD*=.33), indicating that German teacher trainers participating in this study are pretty good at fulfilling the applications in this sub-dimension. While the item 8, which is related to informing students about the gains, has the highest level of views among the participants with a mean of 2.89 (*SD*=.32), the item 10, regarding keeping the attention of students alive during the lesson, has the lowest level of views with a mean of 2.51 (*SD*=.64). As Tai (2014) implies, teachers need to work hard to captive and keep the attention of students alive in order to engage them to focus on the lesson. Especially, in order to organize teaching procedures in a foreign language class, it is necessary to focus students' attention and to involve them in the lesson (Cao, 2010). Besides drawing students' attention during lessons, another organizational of teaching procedure is associated with effective gains included in the curriculum in order to establish mastery skills. Since, information about gains can provide students with encouragement and increase in their progress (Gruneberg & Morris, 1994). Gender difference, on the other hand, is observed in the items 7, 8, 9 and, 10 existing within the structure of this sub-dimension favoring the male

participants. This can be interpreted as that the male participants are better at applying and organizing more strategies of teaching than their female colleagues. Furthermore, meaningful differences according to the geographic regions where the participants work are observed in the items 7, 8 and, 10 related to this sub-dimension. The results show that the participants working in the Marmara region are better at both activating the attention of students and keeping the attention alive during the lesson than those working in the other regions of Turkey. Additionally, related to this sub-dimension, only the item 9 has a significant seniority difference favoring the participants having 16-20 years of teaching experience.

The participants' levels regarding the *body* subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies which included 7 items are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.69 (*SD*=.25), demonstrating that they have a maximum level of competency in meeting the organizational applications offered in this sub-dimension. The item 15 regarding employing learning strategies has the highest level of views in this sub-dimension. According to Chamot (2004) learning strategies refer to the thoughts and actions that individuals use to accomplish a learning goal. There are hundreds of language learning strategies helping language learners promote their knowledge (Oxford, 2003) in order to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more effective, and more transferable to new situations (Oxford, 2011). Therefore, many studies show positive correlations between strategy use and beliefs about language learning (Barcelos, 200; Fazeli, 2011; Halbach, 2000; Hong, 2006). Related to this sub-dimension, while there are no gender differences, a significant seniority and graduated high school difference is observed regarding the item 18 favoring the participants having 16-20 years of teaching experience, and those who graduated from Anatolian high schools. As to geographic region variable, regarding the item 15, the results indicate that the participants working in all regions, except those working in the Southeastern Anatolia Region, are good at applying learning strategies.

The participants' levels regarding the *Conclusion (Closure)* subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies which included 4 items are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.75 (*SD*=.32), indicating their highest level of competence in summarizing what students learned during the lesson. As Duncan and Met (2010) emphasize, lessons generally end with an overview or summary of the objectives of the lesson that students provide by responding to teacher questions, summarizing with peers in pairs or small groups, or indicating verbally or nonverbally whether they feel they have met the lesson's objectives. The need for closure a lesson, on the other hand, plays a distinctive role in explaining students' motivation to learn (DeBacker & Drawson, 2009). Many research findings also show that closure affects cognitive processes associated with problem solving and evaluation of possible response alternatives (Richter & Kruglanski, 1998). Regarding this sub-dimension, while gender difference favoring the male participants and graduated high school difference favoring regular high schools are only observed in the item 19, the meaningful geographic region difference is seen in all the items which exist in this sub-dimension favoring all the regions except for Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions. This can be interpreted as that the participants working in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions have the lowest level of organizational strategies among the seven regions stemming from their inability to use teaching strategies or due to the attitudes of students living in these regions towards learning a European language. In line with this view, a study conducted by Akalın and Zengin (2007) has postulated that people in the Eastern and Southeastern parts of Turkey generally support Arabic language to be taught as a foreign language rather than English or other European languages due to the ties of kinship with the citizens of the Arabic-speaking border countries. As to seniority variable, there is a meaningful difference regarding the item 21 favoring the participants having 16-20 years of teaching experience.

The participants' levels regarding the *Assessment* subdimension of Reigeluth's organizational strategies which included 4 items are at the *Completely Agree Level*, with a mean of 2.53 (*SD*=.36), indicating that they are somewhat interested in fulfilling the applications offered in the evaluation sub-dimension. While the item 28, regarding making the necessary changes to the lesson plans after reviewing the evaluation results, has the highest views among the participants with a mean of 2.58 (*SD*=.60), the item 24, related to giving feedback to the students in consequence of evaluation, has the lowest views with a mean of 2.47 (*SD*=.64). However, giving effective feedback is an important factor for teachers to shape students' learning and performance (Petchprasert, 2012). Some researchers suggest that feedback is beneficial for learners in learning and teaching environment (Bitchener, 2008; Evan, Hartshorn, & Strong-Krause, 2011; Haifaa & Emma, 2014; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Leki, 1991; McCarthy, 2015; Spiller, 2009). Related to this sub-dimension, there is a significant geographic region difference favoring the participants working in the Marmara and Black Sea Regions in terms of giving feedback. Furthermore, there is a meaningful gender difference in the items 24 and 26 favoring the male participants, and 25 favoring the females.

5. Conclusion

This study attempted to analyze the views of German teacher trainers regarding Reigeluth's organizational strategies offered in four sub-dimensions in terms of gender, geographic region, seniority and graduated high school variables. The findings have revealed that the participants have a high level of organizational strategies. The results regarding the variables are as follows: a) Gender difference is mostly observed favoring the male teachers, b) geographic region difference frequently appears favoring the Marmara and Black Sea Regions, c) seniority difference is usually seen favoring the 16-20 year range, d) graduated high school difference is mostly observed as a statistically insignificant variable. In line with the findings, it is suggested that in-service training programs encompassing all the regions of Turkey should be designed regularly and systematically for professional development of foreign language teachers. It is also suggested that communication technology such as using of video conferencing via Skype can be used as a means of delivering in-service teacher training in rural areas which are often difficult to access.

References

Akalın, S., & Zengin, B. (2007). Türkiye'de halkın yabancı dil ile ilgili algıları. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *3*(1), 181-200.

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2000). *Understanding teachers' and students' language learning beliefs in experience: A Deweyan approach* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Alabama, Alabama.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 69-124. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Caruso, H. M., & Wooley, A. W. (2008). Harnessing the power of emergent interdependence to promote diverse team collaboration. *Diversity and Groups*, *11*, 245-266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1534-0856(08)11011-8

Cao, Y. (2010). *A new course in English curriculum & language teaching*. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Publishing House.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language*, *1*(1), 14-26.

Christopher, A. (2011). *Instructional Design: The Smith and Regan Model*. Retrieved from http://www.angelachristopher.net/uploads/8/3/2/4/832462/model_resourceassignment.pdf

DeBacker, T. K., & Crowson, H. M. (2009). The influence of need for closure on learning and teaching. *Educational Psychology Review*, *21*, 303-323. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-009-9111-1

Dell-Kuster, S., Sanjuan, E., Todorov, A., Weber, H., Heberer, M., & Rosenthal, R. (2014). Designing questionnaires: Health care survey to compare two different response scales. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-96

Duncan, G., & Met, M. (2010). *STARTALK (start talking): From paper to practice*. College Park, MD: National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland. Retrieved from http://www.startalk.umd.edu/lesson_planning

Effendi, M., Matore, E. M., & Khairani, A. Z. (2015). *Assessing content validity of IKBAR among field experts in Polytechnics*. The international conference on language education, humanities & Innovation (21-22 March, 2015). Retrieved from http://icsai.org/procarch/1iclehi/1iclehi-22.pdf

Evan, N., Hartshorn, J., & Strong-Krause, D. (2011). The efficacy of dynamic written corrective feedback for university matriculated ESL learners. *System*, *39*, 229-239. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.012

Evans, C., & Waring, M. (2006). Towards inclusive teacher education: Sensitising individuals to how they learn. *Educational Psychology*, *26*(4), 499-518. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410500342484

Fazeli, S. H. (2011). The exploring nature of language learning strategies (LLSs) and their relationship with various variables with focus on personality traits in the current studies of second/foreign language learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*, 1311-1320. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.10.1311-1320

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding student differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *94*(1), 57-72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00829.x

Gagné, R. (1985). *The conditions of learning and the theory of instruction* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Gruneberg, M., & Morris, P. E. (1994). Memory development. In *Theoretical aspects of memory* (2nd ed., Vol. 2). New York: Routledge.

Haifaa, F., & Emma, M. (2014). Oral corrective feedback and learning of English modals. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *136*, 322-329. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.337

Halbach, A. (2000). Finding out about students' learning strategies by looking at their diaries: A case study. *System*, *28*(1), 85-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00062-7

Hall, E., & Moseley, D. (2005). Is there a role for learning styles in personalized education and training? *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *24*(3), 105-243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02601370500134933

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language*. London: Longman.

Hattie, C., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hong, K. (2006). *Beliefs about language learning and language learning strategy use in an EFL context: A comparison study of monolingual Korean and bilingual Korean-Chinese University students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Texas.

Honigsfeld, A., & Schiering, M. (2004). Diverse approaches to the diversity of learning styles in teacher education. *Educational Psychology*, *24*(4), 487-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0144341042000228861

Karadağ, E., & Çalışkan, N. (2006). İlköğretim birinci kademesi öğrencilerinin drama yöntemine karşı tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *19*, 45-57.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kharb, P., Paramita Samanta, P., Jindal, M., & Singh, V. (2013). The learning styles and the preferred teaching—Learning strategies of first year medical students. *Journal of Clinical & Diagnostic Research*, *7*(6), 1089-1092. http://dx.doi.org/10.7860/jcdr/2013/5809.3090

Knowles, M., Holton, E., & Swanson, R. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). The quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, *28*, 563-575. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, *24*(3), 203-218. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, J. (2015). Evaluating written, audio and video feedback in higher education summative assessment tasks. *Issues in Educational Research*, *25*(2), 153-169.

MoNE. (2009). *Milli Eğitim istatistikleri: Örgün eğitim 2008-2009*. Retrieved from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2008_2009.pdf

MoNE. (2010). *MEB faaliyet raporu. T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı*. Retrieved from http://www.sp.gov.tr/upload/xSPRapor/files/iOXvk+Milli_Egitim_Bakanligi_2009_yili_faaliyet_raporu.pdf

Noble, T. (2004). Integrating the revised Bloom's taxonomy with multiple intelligences: A planning tool for curriculum differentiation. *Teachers College Record*, *106*(1), 193-211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2004.00328.x

Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: Concepts and relationship. *IRAL*, *41*(4), 271-278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.2003.012

Oxford, R. L. (2011). Review of teaching and researching language learning strategies. *Language Learning & Technology*, *15*(3), 47-49

Petchprasert, A. (2012). Feedback in second language teaching and learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, *10*(4), 1112-1120.

Podolskiy, D. A. (2013). Multimethod approach to measuring values in a school context: Exploring the association between Congruence—Discrepancy Index (CO DI) and task commitment. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, *6*(2), 44-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.11621/pir.2013.0204

Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Owen, S. V. (2007). Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Appraisal and recommendations. *Res Nurs Health*, *30*, 459-467. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nur.20199

Preston, C. C., & Colman, A. M. (2000). Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: Reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. *Acta Psychologica*, *104*, 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-6918(99)00050-5

Reigeluth, C. M., & Rodgers, C. A. (1980). The elaboration theory of instruction: Prescriptions for task analysis and design. *NSPI Journal*, *19*(1), 16-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4180190109

Reigeluth, C. M., Merrill, M. D., Wilson, B. G., & Spiller, R. T. (1980). The Elaboration Theory of Instruction: A model for sequencing and synthesizing instruction. *Instructional Science*, *9*(3), 195-219. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00177327

Reigeluth, C. M. (1983a). *Instructional-design theories and models: Vol. 1. An overview of their current status*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reigeluth, C. M. (1983b). Current trends in task analysis: The integration of task analysis and instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, *6*(4), 24-35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02906215

Reigeluth, C. M. (1987). The search for meaningful reform: A third-wave educational system. *Journal of Instructional Development*, *10*(4), 3-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02905306

Reigeluth, C. M. (1994). The imperative for systemic change. In C. M. Reigeluth, & R. J. Garfinkle (Eds.), *Systemic change in education* (pp. 3-11). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Reigeluth, C. M., & Moore, J. (1999). Cognitive education and the cognitive domain. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models*: *Vol. 2*. *A new paradigm of instructional theory* (pp. 51-68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Reigeluth, C. M. (2009). Instructional theory for education in the Information Age. In C. M. Reigeluth, & A. Carr-Chellman (Eds.), *Instructional-design theories and models, Volume III: Building a common knowledge base*. New York: Routledge.

Reigeluth, C. M., & Keller, J. B. (2009). Understanding instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth, & A. Carr-Chellman (Eds.), *Instructional-design theories and models*, *Volume III: Building a common knowledge base*. New York: Routledge.

Reigeluth, C. (2012). Instructional theory and technology for the new paradigm of education. *RED, Revista de Educación a Distancia*, *32*(30), 1-18. Retrieved from http://www.um.es/ead/red/32/reigeluth.pdf

Richter, L., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1998). Seizing on the latest: Motivationally driven recency effects in impression formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*, 313-329. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1354

Rosenfeld, M., & Rosenfeld, S. (2008). Developing effective teacher beliefs about learners: The role of sensitizing teachers to individual learning differences. *Educational Psychology*, *28*(3), 245-272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410701528436

Sarı, E. (2007). *Anasınıfına devam eden 5-6 yaş grubu çocukların, annelerinin çocuk yetiştirme tutumlarının, çocuğun sosyal uyum ve becerilerine etkisinin incelenmesi* (Published Master's thesis). University of Gazi, Ankara, Turkey.

Shultz, K. S., & Whitney, D. J. (2004). *Measurement theory in action: Case studies and exercises*. Sage publications.

Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Spiller, D. (2009). *Assessment: Feedback to promote student learning*. Waikato: Wāhanga Whakapakari Ako.

Sternberg, R., Grigorenko, E., & Zhang, L. (2008). Styles of learning and thinking matter in instruction and assessment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*(6), 486-506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00095.x

Tai, Y. (2014). The application of body language in English teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(5), 1205-1209. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.5.1205-1209

Thomas, M., & Risk, M. (2016). *Instructional Design Theories and Strategies: A Powerful Tool*. Retrieved from http://www.dpcaptioning.com/A%20Powerful%20Tool.pdf

Veneziano, L., & Hooper, J. (1997). A method for quantifying content validity of health-related questionnaires. *Am J Health Behav*, *21*(1), 67-70.

Wang, A. (2009). Multiculturalism in the college English curriculum. *Journal of Multicultural Gender and Minority Studies*, *3*(1), 1-12.

Wasik, B. (2008). When fewer is more: Small groups in early childhood classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 515-521. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10643-008-0245-4

Willis, S., & Mann, L. (2000). *Differentiating instruction finding manageable ways to meet individual needs. Curriculum Update*. Retrieved From http://www.ascd.org/publications/curriculum-update/winter2000/Differentiating-Instruction.aspx

Appendix

Table 7. The Mann Whitney U and t test results of German teacher trainers regarding the 7th, 8th, 9th, 25th and 26th items of the OSGTT Scale in terms of gender variable

Question 7

Group	n	Mean	SD	df	Levene's F	Levene's p	t	p	M.W.U	M.W.U p	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Male	38	2.84	.37								30.39	1155.00
Female	15	2.33	.62	51	11.428	.001	3.697	.001	156.000	.001	18.40	276.00
Total	53											

Question8

Group	n	Mean	SD	df	Levene's F	Levene's p	t	p	M.W.U	M.W.U p	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Male	38	2.97	.16								29.30	1113.50
Female	15	2.67	.49	51	68.152	.000	3.465	.001	197.500	.002	21.17	317.50
Total	**53**											

Question9

Group	n	Mean	SD	df	Levene's F	Levene's p	t	p	M.W.U	M.W.U p	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Male	38	2.86	.34								29.51	1121.50
Female	15	2.53	.52	51	16.748	.000	2.762	.008	189.500	.009	20.63	309.50
Total	53											

Question25

Group	n	Mean	SD	df	Levene's F	Levene's p	t	p	M.W.U	M.W.U p	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Male	38	2.47	.60									
Female	15	2.87	.52	51	11.067	.002	-2.219	.013	177.000	.011	24.16	918.00

| | | | | | | | | | | 34.20 | 513.00 |
| Total | 53 | | | | | | | | | | |

Question26

Group	n	Mean	SD	df	Levene's		t	p	M.W.U		Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
					F	p			M.W.U	p		
Male	38	2.68	.47									
											29.45	1119.00
Female	15	2.27	.70	51	4.540	.038	2.513	.015	192.000	.032		
											20.80	312.00
Total	53											

p<.05

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).