

The Tension in Turkish Teacher Education: Conflict and Controversy during the Transformation from an Academic Approach to a Professional Approach

Sedat Yüksel

Uludağ University

Turkey

Most of the reforms, which have been undertaken in the last 30 years in the Turkish educational system, are about teacher education. When we examine the teacher education curriculum from the perspective of these reforms, it has been observed that there is a controversy between the academic and professional approaches used in these curricula. While the reforms undertaken in 1982 and 1997 were in favor of the academic approach, the latest reform undertaken in 2006 was made to strengthen the professional aspects of teacher education curriculum. In this paper, Turkish teacher education reforms are introduced in the light of the professional and the academic approaches, which have always been the topic of discussions about teacher education.

Key words: teacher education, teacher education reform, teacher education policy, Turkey

Introduction

Most of the reforms, which have been undertaken in the last 30 years in the Turkish educational system, are about teacher education. Teacher education has a history of more than 150 years in Turkey. The first teacher education school was established in 1848 and all teacher education institutions, whose curriculum was based on the professional approach, were governed by the Ministry of National Education [MONE] until 1982. Both subject-matter and educational courses were taught by the more experienced and certified teachers at MONE in this era.

Sedat Yüksel, Department of Educational Sciences, Uludağ University, Turkey.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sedat Yüksel, Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Görükle, Bursa 16059 Turkey. E-mail: sedaty@uludag.edu.tr

Foundation courses, methodology courses, and school practice were stressed in educational courses. The most comprehensive reform in teacher education institutions in respect to their structure was undertaken in 1982. Teacher education institutions, which were governed by MONE, were connected to universities with this reform. Due to this reform, it was the first time that an attempt had been made to transform teacher education from a professional approach to an academic approach.

This reform changed the personnel structure of these institutions too. Instead of instructors, who were once teachers but did not do any academic research or study, professors, who had never been teachers but had done a lot of research, were employed at these institutions. Since academic personnel came from the liberal arts, the mentality of the liberal arts dominated educational faculties. Instead of the professional skills of teachers, the knowledge of subject-matter was stressed and the curriculum was heavily loaded

with academic courses. However, there had been complaints about the inadequacy of the teaching skills of teachers graduated from these faculties and complaints reached their peak especially in 1990s. These complaints caused the Turkish Higher Education Council [HEC] to make changes in teacher education. A new reform was made by HEC in 1997 with the support of the World Bank. Although this reform, which was named “Restructuring Educational Faculties,” aimed at saving educational faculties from the academic approach, the tendency of academic approach has continued to exist.

This reform requires students, who are secondary school student teachers, in educational faculties to take the subject-matter courses from the faculty of liberal arts. There have been important changes in educational courses and theoretical educational courses have been reduced. When these reforms are examined, it can be seen that these reforms were affected by the teacher education systems in the USA and UK. Teacher education was aimed at being more academic with these reforms. This restructuring was discussed from different points of view and studies were done examining the positive and the negative aspects of it. HEC has started a new reform effort after taking into consideration the critiques of restructuring. The main points of the critiques are that student teachers were given an education stressing subject-matter and they did not have enough knowledge and skills in regards to education and general culture. HEC established study groups related to this topic before this reform. “Teacher Profession Study Group,” which was one of the study groups, prepared a report suggesting some improvements in the educational courses and these suggestions were sent to educational faculties to survey their opinions. “The Commission of Developing Educational Faculties” prepared the programs of education faculties in line with the opinions of the educational faculties. Some changes regarding programs were undertaken in this reform and general culture courses were added to programs (YÖK, 2006). Thus, the academic approach, which was heavily used in teacher education, was weakened and the professional approach was strengthened.

This study will discuss the controversy between the academic and professional approaches in the teacher education curriculum from the perspective of reforms undertaken in the last 30 years in teacher education in Turkey. The struggle between the academic model and the

professional model is one of the problems in the evolution of educational faculties (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Soder & Sirotnik, 1990) and this problem still continues to exist. In order to establish a theoretical framework, the national and international literature, which was related to the controversy between the academic and professional approach in the teacher education curriculum, were examined, the latest developments in Turkey were described, and the ideas related to this topic were analyzed in this research. An analysis of both national and international literature was used to supports my claims in this paper.

Theoretical Framework

When the history of teacher education is examined, it can be seen that most of the discussions were about whether the curriculum of these institutions should be academic or professional. In order to illuminate this discussion better, it may be appropriate to analyze the organizational structure of teacher education and its curricula.

Institutional and Structural Context of Teacher Education The discussions related to the academic and professional approach in teacher education were begun when teacher education was placed under the responsibility of universities. One of the main points of the discussions is that educational science is one of the youngest sciences. Educational science gradually became an autonomous discipline in the university in the 19th century. The chairs of education were established both in Europe and in the United States to meet the need for the training of professional teachers and for the scientific study of education. The first chair of education was established at Halle University, Germany in 1779, later, at St. Andrews and Edinburgh Universities, UK in 1876 and at University of Michigan, US in 1879 (Yang, 1998).

It can be said that these developments positively affected teacher education or at least, they revealed that teacher education required a scientific approach. However, leaving teacher education under the management of universities at the undergraduate level created some problems. There was some resistance to the establishment of chairs of pedagogy in universities and many faculty members considered pedagogy out of the realms of their

academic responsibility (Shen, 1999). That is, they perceived education as the lowest statute among the sciences and there were even discussions on whether education was a science or not (Yang, 1998). Moreover, the fact that educational sciences and teacher education are professional fields and stress practice is out of kilter with life in universities that aim at producing information and doing research. Thus, education faculties in general have relatively low status, were academically second-class, and received the lowest level of support of all programs on the university campus (Anderson & Hunter, 1962; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Goodlad, 1990; Laslet, 1986; McConnell, Anderson, & Hunter, 1962; Tom, 1997). Due to these reasons, education faculties on college campuses have remained isolated from the faculties of arts and sciences. The relationship between these faculties has generally been characterized by mutual suspicion and distrust (Lasley & Applegate, 1982).

Curriculum of Teacher Education The quality of teacher training is the main issue in the discussions about teacher education. These discussions point out the inadequacy of the curriculum of teacher education. There has been conflict between academicians and teacher educators over the balance of general versus professional content in the teacher education curriculum. Academicians believe that general education and knowledge of the discipline should be required in order to be a teacher. Most teacher educators, on the other hand, state that all prospective teachers must acquire a common body of knowledge about teaching and learning (Cruikshank, 1985).

These critiques of universities regarding educational faculties and teacher education are about educational courses. Some academicians (e.g., Bestor, 1953; Conant, 1963; Koerner, 1963; Lyons, 1980) claim that students lack knowledge of subject-matter, that most courses in teacher education curriculum do not cover the teaching profession, meaning that these courses do not have enough theoretical and intellectual content, that educational courses are uncertain and overlap, and that teachers lack the opportunities for necessary practice (Lortie, 1975).

While Bestor (1953) claimed that the education of future teachers should be done in the liberal arts and science faculties, Koerner argued that educational courses should be derived directly from academic disciplines and they should

be taught by persons qualified to teach in the appropriate academic department of the same institution. Conant (1963) having similar ideas about educational courses offered moderate suggestions. Conant discussed the differences between professors, public school teachers, and administrators and professors of arts, sciences and humanities. In order to find a middle ground, Conant outlined programs for elementary and secondary teachers. These programs stressed academic studies, minimal professional education, and unified method of instruction and practice teaching supervised by a clinical professor, an expert teacher with high university rank. However, these two opposing groups criticized Conant's proposal. While traditionalist criticized Conant's report for allowing pedagogical courses within the undergraduate curriculum, teacher educators criticized Conant's denial that their work rested on a sound empirical foundation.

The main assumption at the base of critiques about educational courses is that student teachers graduate without enough knowledge of subject-matter. Some writers sharing this assumption want liberal arts to be more important in teacher education. The liberal arts tradition stresses the special ties which connect intellectual arts, academic content, and teaching. Some writers suggest a liberal arts education to prepare subject-matter teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 1990).

Because of these critiques, universities ignored teacher preparation and concentrated on graduate training and research (Feiman-Nemser, 1990). In this period, educational faculties abandoned the model of professional education and inclined toward the academic model. As a result of this inclination, educational institutions moved away from teaching and service to more engagement in research and they moved away from the preparation of teachers to engagement in the preparation of more specialized personnel at the graduate level. In many cases, education faculties distanced themselves from the preparation of teachers and give importance to being an academic community (Shen, 1999).

Some reports (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986), which suggested the elimination of undergraduate teacher education in the 1980s, favored liberal arts education. The Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, which was established in 1984 in the UK to accredit teacher education programs, excluded some

theoretical courses such as history of education and sociology of education in order to make these programs more practical and appropriate for teacher education (Yang, 1998).

In conclusion, educational faculties have inclined to give more importance to research and academic education instead of giving emphasis on a professional approach because of opinions and critiques done after giving the responsibility to prepare teachers to universities. As a result of this inclination, educational courses were criticized, their proportion in the program was reduced, the proportion of subject-matter was increased, and experts were raised at the graduate level. Educational faculties distanced themselves from raising teachers.

The controversy between the academic and professional approach in teacher education takes place in Turkey too. The professional approach has been criticized heavily after universities took the responsibility to prepare teachers. Moreover, because of the inferior status of educational faculties in the universities, the pressure of the liberal arts faculties has increased and the weight of the academic courses in the program has increased. As a result of these conditions, educational faculties have distanced themselves from teacher education.

Education Reforms in Turkish Teacher Education

Teacher education in Turkey can be examined in five periods by taking into consideration the characteristics of teacher education.

Ottoman Period before the Foundation of the Republic of Turkey There had not been any teacher education institutions for centuries in the Turkish educational system and teachers had been selected among the graduates of “medrese” (Islamic Turkish University). These people were usually educated to become religious officials in the medrese. For this reason, they did not receive any information about the teaching profession. The educational system too was affected by western ideas when the Ottoman Empire started the movement towards westernization in 1839. The most important event in this era was the establishment of the first school for teacher

education in 1848 (Akyüz, 2004). The schools were connected to the Ministry of Education. The number of these schools was increased in later years. Although the curriculum of these schools mostly consisted of subject-matter courses, for the first time, the teaching methods course took place in this curriculum. The number of educational courses increased in the beginning of the 20th century (Binbaşıoğlu, 1995).

Republic Period (1923-1982) After the collapse of the Ottoman government, the Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923. In this era, Turkey selected a direction that aimed to allow her to take her place among the ‘developed’ nations of the world. Educational development has been regarded as the most important factor in reaching the level of the civilized European countries. To achieve this aim, several reforms and innovations started to take place in the early years of the Republic. During the reform movement, the Turkish educational system was centralized by enactment of the ‘Law of Unification of Instruction’ in 1924 (Akyüz, 2004; Webster, 1939). This act put all educational institutions (including teacher education institutions) under the control of the MONE as it had been during Ottomans.

Different teacher education institutions were established for different levels of education in this era. In order to raise primary and secondary school teachers, primary teacher schools and higher teacher schools were established. Although there are different schools for each level, the main points of these schools are that the teaching staff does not have a strong academic background but they have a strong professional background and these schools used mainly the professional approach in their programs since all of these schools were connected to MONE. In this era, strong connections were established between teacher education programs and the schools. Also developing students’ teaching skills and attitudes was the main concern of these teacher education schools (Binbaşıoğlu, 1995). This curriculum is similar to those of Teacher Schools in Western Europe and Normal Schools in the USA. These schools stressed both educational courses and teaching practice at schools as well as establishing a strong relationship between the theory related to education and practice (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; De Landsheere, 1988). The teacher education schools which were founded in this era in Turkey had the same characteristics. Later, since many students were sent to

France and Germany, which had a strong tradition of education, between the years of 1910 and 1940, the curriculum of teacher education institutions stressed the professional approach more. After graduating, these students, having had been imbued with the pedagogical understanding of these countries, started to work in teacher education institutions. The books of European educators (e.g., Decroly, Freire, Kerschensteiner) were translated into Turkish and used in these institutions (Tuncor, 1996). These conditions increased the weight of the professional approach in these institutions. Moreover, that the MONE did not have any request to increase the weight of the academic approach enabled the professional approach to continue to in a place of prominence. There were also critiques in this era such as the idea that teacher education was open to political effects since these schools were connected to the MONE, new teacher education institutions were opened without the required groundwork, the academic aspect of the teacher (instructor) in these schools were not stressed, and politics affected the hiring and advancement of the instructors (Akyüz, 2004; Kaya, 1984). Since these schools were not autonomous, they were affected intensively by the political requests of the MONE. The MONE readily interfered with the curriculum and the appointment of the instructors. These unfavorable situations created doubts about the quality of teachers.

The Reform of 1982 A major change in teacher education was made in 1982. A unified system of higher education was introduced and the responsibility for teacher education was transferred to the universities through the HEC. Teacher training colleges were transformed into new faculties of education. Thus, teacher education responsibilities and activities were transferred from the MONE to the autonomous universities (Binbaşıoğlu, 1995; Küçükahmet, 1993). Thus, teacher education became autonomous. Turkey had the same process as the USA and UK had had about a hundred years ago. In fact, it can be said that the increasing effect of American education caused the universities in Turkey to develop the responsibility to prepare teachers. While there had been a strong tradition of European education in Turkey until the 1960s, many students have been sent to the USA for graduate and under graduate education after this date. After returning to Turkey, these students started to work at the teacher education institutions

and they started to change educational practices in Turkey according to American educational thought. There were some new ideas claiming that academic and subject-matter courses should be taught more. There were also critiques about sending students abroad in the area of the educational sciences.

Although there are discussions both for and against this reform, in general, leaving teacher education to universities is considered a positive act. Teacher education has been liberated from political influence and a free and academic structure has been established with this reform (Duman, 1998). However, most of the critiques were done by MONE. MONE has doubted that universities can accomplish effective teacher education. For example, after this reform, V. Dinçerler, who is a minister, argued that teachers should be raised by a “Teacher Preparation Center” that was planned to be established as an institution connected to the MONE. According to him:

The knowledge of teaching courses can not be effectively given at the educational faculties. Those who govern these faculties are from other professions and they are not educators; ... professional formation, general and culture courses are given and evaluated in big classrooms at the universities. It is thought-provoking that students can gain the spirit, ideals, and behaviors required by the teaching profession in such environments (Duman, 1991, pp. 198-199).

As the minister of education put it, unfortunately, professional development, general culture, and the practice activities of student teachers were not considered important in most educational faculties. Moreover, educational classes were taught in large classrooms. In particular, students were not able to gain skills and affective traits of the teaching profession because instructors were mostly from the liberal arts majors (Duman, 1991; Okçabol 2005). In short, it can be understood that an appropriate atmosphere for the teaching profession could not be established at the universities. MONE was correct in its critiques. That is, the Teacher Education Institutions were transformed into educational faculties, most of the instructors were dismissed from their jobs in these institutions, and open positions were filled with the academicians from liberal arts faculties. These academicians from liberal arts had been having problems with gaining promotions since there had been a

large number of instructors in the liberal art faculties. For example, since there were no available positions for professors, many associate professors could not become professors. For this reason, many academic personnel from the liberal arts started work at the educational faculties in which they would not have promotional problems. The curriculum of educational faculties easily became more academic with these new academic staff. Since every educational faculty could prepare their own curriculum, many academic courses were added to the curriculum. According to these academicians, teachers did not have enough knowledge of subject-matter, while others complained that teachers were lacking in respect to having a professional ethos. Liberal arts academicians were not in favor of teacher education either (King, 1987; Schewebel, 1985; Tyson, 1994). For example, James B. Conant stated in 1944 that the academicians were in dispute with the educators in universities and the academicians were prejudiced against education (Kandel, 1957). Naturally, teaching staff coming from the liberal arts did not attach any importance to skills, knowledge, and attitudes of teaching. They also perceived educational courses as unimportant. These academicians who argued that teachers did not have enough knowledge of subject-matter, stressed that subject-matter is important at the secondary education level and argued that liberal arts faculties should prepare high school teachers (Saçlı, 1998; TDV, 1996). Some writers also stated that educational faculties should be shut down since the liberal arts can raise the best teachers (Duru, 1998). Those writers who think that teachers are weak in respect to their knowledge of subject-matter were more effective and teacher education curriculum became more academic in nature, especially after universities administered teacher education. In this era, the academicians in the departments of educational sciences in educational faculties and the personnel in MONE favored the professional approach while the academicians from the liberal arts favored the academic approach. The MONE and the academic personnel in the departments of educational sciences claimed that teachers were not given the necessary knowledge and skills of teaching compared to the era before 1982 with scientific meetings (e.g., MEB, 1989; 1993a; 1993b; 1996) and scientific publications (e.g., Duman, 1991; Küçükahmet, 1993; Okçabol, 2005). Moreover, those academicians, who claimed that universities distanced themselves from giving

teacher education by valuing too much the academic approach, argued that specialized educational universities should have been established as there were universities of technology or economics (Altunya, 2000, 2006; Ataunal, 2003).

As a matter of fact, the research done in this era indicated that student teachers' level of knowledge of teaching was poor and their attitudes towards teaching were lacking (Can, 1987, 1989; Sözer, 1992). In fact, this situation is not surprising at all. According to the literature, when the responsibility to conduct teacher education was given to universities, universities were not willing to take this responsibility and they perceived teacher education to be of low status (Borrowman, 1956; Clark & Marker, 1975; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Ducharme, 1985; Gideonse, 1984; Goodlad, 1990). Moreover, another problem seen in this era was the structure issue caused by giving universities the responsibility to raise teachers. These kinds of problems are similar to those in most western countries having similar experiences. After the job of raising teachers was given to universities, universities did not take this job seriously and they could not accept educational faculties (Kavcar, 2002; Okçabol, 2005; Özdemir, 1998). The administrators of universities, who could not exactly understand teacher education and were unwilling to do this job, made mistakes in selecting academic staff. Most of the deans of educational faculties were selected among the professors who did not have any relationship to teacher education. As stated above, most of the instructors working in teacher education institutions of MONE had quit their jobs and the graduates of liberal arts or academicians were employed in these openings. These academicians selected their assistants from the graduates of the liberal arts (Ataman, 1998; Önsöy, 1998). About half of the academic personnel working in educational faculties graduated from the liberal arts (Korkut & Doğan, 2004). Under these negative conditions, it is hardly surprising that student teachers' level of knowledge of teaching and their attitudes towards teaching were poor.

The structure of these personnel also affected the curricula of educational faculties and the curricula in Turkey quickly became academic. The curricula of educational faculties copied the curricula of the liberal arts. For example, the curriculum of the chemistry teacher departments in educational faculties is very similar to that of the department of chemistry in the liberal arts. The only difference between

them is that the educational faculties have educational courses. That is, the curriculum of the educational faculties became more difficult than that of the liberal arts. This situation increased the number of critiques. These critiques were at a peak in the 1990s. For example, MONE criticized severely the curricula of educational faculties at the meeting of “coordination and cooperation in teacher education” in 1995:

(In teacher education) the courses should not contain only subject-matter, the courses in the curricula of teacher education should be different from those of liberal arts faculties since knowledge and skills are important to teach (MEB, 1996, p. 32).

The intense critiques towards the programs of educational faculties caused these programs to be renewed.

Restructuring Teacher Education-1997 In the 1982 reform, the educators were pleased that teacher education was conducted at the university level and the status of the teaching profession was raised. Moreover, that teacher education is generally executed by universities in the world was welcomed warmly. However, complaints had been made on the grounds that teachers had insufficient teaching skills. No precautions had been taken against these complaints and moreover, there had been an increase in the number of the instructors whose background was liberal arts instead of a decrease. These critiques reached their peak towards the 1990’s because of these factors. As a result of these intense critiques, HEC needed to interfere with teacher education. The second reform named “restructuring teacher education” was announced in 1997. This reform was put into practice in the academic year of 1998-1999. While the first reform done in 1981 brought important structural changes, this second reform brought changes especially in the programs and implementations.

With this reform (a) the subject-matter courses in the curricula were prevented from teaching intensively and deeply and the subject-matter courses in teacher education at the level of secondary school would be taught by the professors from the faculties of liberal arts; (b) there were important changes in the numbers and credits of educational courses. The theoretical courses, especially the foundational courses (e.g., educational history, educational philosophy, and educational sociology) – except educational psychology

– were eliminated from the program. Instead of these courses, subject-matter and pedagogy were blended. “Special teaching methods” courses, which was named “pedagogical content knowledge” by Shulman (1986), was added to the program. (c) the practice hours of students in the school were increased; (d) masters degree education without the thesis programs were implemented for the first time in Turkey for the programs of teacher education. According to this, those students who graduate from educational faculties will successfully complete their subject-matter courses in the liberal arts faculties for 3.5 years and these successful students will take their educational practice courses from the educational faculties. Those students who graduate from the liberal arts faculties will take their educational and practice courses from educational faculties after completing their four year education in liberal arts faculties (YÖK, 1997).

The 1997 reform is a much contested reform. The changes (e.g. masters education without thesis, eliminating theoretical courses in the educational courses, and increasing the school practice) in the curricula of teacher education institutions are harmonious with the suggestions that took place in the reports of the Carnegie Forum (1986) and the Holmes Group (1986) in the USA. The reports stressed that teachers should know well at least one subject, they should be educated more in the liberal arts, and professional education should consist of well structured, examined, and intensive clinical experiences. In fact, these kinds of ideas were stated intensively in the 1950s and 1960s. The aim was that teachers should know their subject matter very well. However, the educational courses prevented this aim being realized (Bestor, 1953; Conant, 1963; Koerner, 1963; Kramer, 1991; Lynd, 1953; Mitchell, 1981). As can be seen, there are educational courses at the base of these critiques. While these courses were being criticized for being too idealist and impractical (Koehler, 1985; Lortie, 1975), on the other hand, they were criticized for being too simple and without foundation (Beyer & Zeichner, 1982; Lyons, 1980). As a result of these critiques, the curriculum in the USA has become more academic in nature and the practice of teaching has been weighted more. Theoretical educational courses were abolished (Sadker & Sadker, 2000). This change in the USA has affected teacher education in Turkey and the same changes took place in 1997. As stated before, the American literature has affected

Turkish educators after 1960. The power of this affect can be seen in the reform of Restructuring Teacher Education. The ideas of American writers and the suggestions in the reports of the Carnegie and Holmes Group were put into practice in Turkey. Naturally, there have been critiques about this reform too. The critiques about this reform are: courses like psychology, sociology, philosophy and foundational courses were eliminated from the curriculum, although they were necessary for the teaching profession (Bülbül, 1999; Kavcar, 1999; Okçabol, 2005), the current structure of the program was insufficient to develop student teachers' attitudes towards teaching (Kavcar, 1999), and liberal arts were given more power in teacher education (Ataman, 1998). When the innovations implemented with this reform are examined, the differences between subject-matter and educational courses are revealed. The subject-matter courses which had been taught by professors from the education faculties were taught by professors from the liberal arts faculties. Moreover, student teachers were given an opportunity to have acquire a college degree from the liberal arts. Educational courses also became courses given by educational faculties as a separate category. As a result of this, the connections are broken between these two groups of courses. Ideally, these two groups of courses should be holistic, that is, the relationship between them should be strong (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990). However, the program became molecular. This molecularity may cause student teachers not to make the connections between subject-matter courses and how they should be taught. However, the elimination of the foundational courses from the curriculum does not serve the students' aim of integrating the courses and developing a professional understanding of the teaching profession. Foundational courses enable teachers to analyze better the meaning, purpose, and effects of educational organization; provide more extensive educational understanding than other courses do; enable the fragmented information that belongs to different scientific branches to be used in education. Experts in many scientific branches do not need to transfer the findings they have found to education. For this reason, this is an important task for foundational courses (Arnstine, 1984; Broudy, 1967; Feiman-Nemser & Norman, 2000; Howell & Shimahara, 1969; Reynolds, 1993).

When the decisions of the 1997 reform are inspected, it can be seen that curricula became more academic in nature

after universities took the responsibility to prepare teachers. However, the aim of this reform is to make the academic approach more systematic. While all courses were given by the teaching staff of educational faculties before this reform, subject-matter courses are now taught by the teaching staff of liberal arts faculties. Thus, the contribution of liberal arts to teacher education increased. On the other hand, this reform enabled student teachers to have more practice at the schools and to increase their professional development. In short, the professional side of teacher education suffered but the academic side became stronger.

Latest Developments in Teacher Education- 2006

As stated above, educators increased their critiques with the restructuring reform that enabled teacher education to be more academic. These intense critiques had an outcome eight years later and HEC decided to update and change the curricula of educational faculties. HEC, here, aimed to make small range changes instead of making wide ranging changes and changing the programs across the board. In order to do this, educational faculties established a program renewal group consisting of 25 persons. Drafts of teacher education curricula were prepared with the participation of two experts from MONE. The proposed curricula were sent to educational faculties to solicit their opinions. "The Commission of Developing Education Faculties" prepared the final version of the curricula by taking into consideration the ideas of educational faculties (YÖK, 2006). The programs were implemented in the academic year of 2006-2007.

The most important arrangements in the reform are: (a) The principle of using the same curricula in the education faculties is expanded, faculties have been given power to determine the courses by themselves up to 30%, and they have been given an opportunity to open selective courses. (b) Accepting the deficiencies in terms of the general culture aspect of the programs, a new aim is that student teachers should have intellectual knowledge. As general culture courses, a history of science, an introduction to philosophy etc., and foundational courses have been added to the program.

When the arrangements of the 2006 reforms were examined, it can be seen that the academic approach was reduced and the professional side of teacher education was strengthened. HEC stated that since current teacher

education programs could not attain the affective goals of their curricula, general culture courses were added to the program, the number of educational courses were increased, and the foundational courses which previously had been abolished were added to the program. Thus, the academic approach has moved in the direction of a professional approach for 30 years.

Conclusion

It can be seen that there has been a continuous conflict and controversy between the academic and professional approach in the curriculum of teacher education when the system of teacher education is examined in its historical context. The professional approach was used in teacher education before 1982 in Turkey. Unfortunately, the advocates of the academic approach did not support their ideas with scientific publications. The professors in the universities did not state any views about this topic since universities did not have the responsibility to prepare teachers and the professors did not perceive teacher education as being their job. It was mostly educators and the instructors of the teacher education institutions who stated their ideas about this issue (Altunya, 2006).

After these critiques, some argued that teachers did not have enough knowledge of subject-matter; others complained that teachers were insufficient in respect to having a professional ethos or approach. These people argued that teachers were weak in respect to their knowledge of subject-matter and teacher education curriculum became more academic in nature, especially after universities took over the administration of teacher education. However, there is a question here. Was the inefficiency of teachers caused only by the curriculum's inclination towards a professional approach? In my opinion, more influential than curriculum, various factors effecting teacher education should be taken into consideration. The most important of these factors is the status of educational faculties on campuses because educational faculties, students, and the programs are considered less important compared to other faculties, there is insufficient funding, and they are given a second-class status (Clark & Markel, 1975; Ducharme, 1985; Peseau, 1982). As a matter of fact, Lanier (1984) observed that "teacher education suffers from the illusion that great things

can be obtained with minor investments of time and resources" (p.24). It does not sound logical to increase the quality of teachers by adding more academic courses in the program without taking into consideration these realities about educational faculties. In fact, the research done to show the relationship between the knowledge of subject-matter and teaching skills give us contradictory results. While some research indicates a connection between knowledge of subject-matter and the performance of teachers or student success (Denton & Lacina, 1984; Druva & Anderson, 1983; Goldhaber & Brewer, 1997, 2000; Hawk, Cable, & Swanson, 1985; Monk & King, 1994), some research cannot find any relationship between teachers' knowledge of subject-matter and their teaching skills (Andrews, Blackmoon, & Mackey, 1980; Ayers & Qualls, 1979; Haney, Madaus, & Kreitzer, 1986; Hawk, Coble, & Swanson, 1985; Quirk, Witten, & Weinberg, 1973).

Moreover, there is some research showing that the knowledge about teaching and learning has a stronger relationship to the effectiveness of teachers than teachers' knowledge about subject-matter (Ashton & Crocker, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 1991; Denton & Lacina, 1984; Druva & Anderson, 1983; Evertson, Hawley, & Zlotnik, 1985; Ferguson & Womack, 1993; Guyton & Farokhi, 1987). Research in cognitive psychology indicates that in-depth knowledge of subject matter may actually impede the effective communication of concepts. As individuals develop expertise in a subject, they develop "technical shorthand" of concepts and terminology (Chi, Glaser, & Rees, 1982). This technical shorthand is not easily understood by novices. Effective teaching requires the expert to unpack, expand and simplify personal knowledge. Such pedagogical understandings are not typically acquired with subject-matter expertise but must be developed and viewed as distinct professional knowledge and skills.

All these research findings show that having only the knowledge of subject-matter cannot produce good teachers. As a result of this, current efforts to arbitrarily limit the number of educational courses in teacher education programs have failed to increase the quality of teachers without taking into consideration the content of the courses (Zeichner & Liston, 1990). Here, the main point for Turkey is that the effects of the relationships between subject-matter and educational courses have not been researched. Reforms cannot give positive results without such research.

Here, an important question needs to be answered in Turkish teacher education. Should the professional or the academic approach be preferred in the curriculum of educational faculties? What should be the weight of subject-matter and educational courses in the program? In order to answer these questions, comprehensive research should be done with teachers, principals and student teachers to determine if they are using the knowledge of subject-matter or educational courses more. However, there has not been sufficient research done with this group on this issue. There has been some research related to educational courses and their findings stated that students had negative views about the instructors of educational courses (Akpınar & Özer, 2004; Erden, 1995; Yüksel, 2004). Other research done with the participation of teachers revealed that the teachers found the subject-matter courses to be adequate and the educational courses were important. However, these teachers also stated in this research that these courses were not effectively taught (Okçabol & Gök, 1998). More extensive research should be done and the effects of the subject-matter and educational courses on teachers should be examined. Moreover, in order to increase the quality of teachers, communication channels between educational and liberal arts faculties should be opened and these two types of faculties should work collaboratively to raise teachers regardless of the approach that will be used in the programs. This task needs to be accomplished although it is very difficult since the differences, habits, and attitudes of these faculties have persisted for a great many years.

References

- Akyüz, Y. (2004). *Türk eğitim tarihi M.Ö. 1000- M.S. 2004* [Turkish history of education. 1000 B.C. – 2004 A. D.]. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Akpınar, B., & Özer, B. (2004). Teknik eğitim fakültesi öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi derslerinin öğrenci görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. [The evaluation of the course of the knowledge of teaching profession in the technical education faculties according to the ideas of students]. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14, 147-166.
- Altunya, N. (2000). *Eğitimde geleceğe bakış* [Looking at the future in education]. Ankara: Uygun.
- Altunya, N. (2006). *Gazi Eğitim Enstitüsü* [Gazi Education Institute] (1926-1980). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Andrews, J. W., Blackmon, C. R., & Mackey, J. A. (1980). Preservice performance and the national teachers exams. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61(5), 358-359.
- Ashton, P., & Crocker, L. (1987). Systematic study of planned variations: The essential focus of teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 2-8.
- Ataman, A. (1998). Eğitim fakültelerinin yeniden yapılandırılmasının düşündürdükleri [Remarks on restructuring of education faculties]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 14, 263- 270.
- Ataünal, A. (2003). Niçin ve nasıl bir öğretmen [What kind of teacher]? Ankara: MEV.
- Ayers, J. B., & Qualls, G. S. (1979). Concurrent and predictive validity of the national teacher examinations. *Journal of Educational Research*, 73(2), 86-92.
- Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational wastelands*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Beyer, L. E., & Zeichner, K. M. (1982). Teacher training and educational foundations: A plea for discontent. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3), 18-23.
- Binbaşıoğlu, C. (1993). *Türkiye’de eğitim bilimleri tarihi* [The history of educational sciences in Turkey]. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim.
- Borrowman, M. L. (1965) Liberal education and the professional preparation of teachers. In M. L. Borrowman (Ed.), *Teacher education in America. A documentary history* (pp.1-53). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Broudy, H. (1967). The role of the foundational studies in the preparation of teachers. In S. Elam (Ed.), *Improving teacher education in the United States* (pp. 1-22). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Bülbül, S. (1999). Öğretmen yetiştirmede yeniden yapılanma [Restructuring in teacher education]. In H. H. Tekişik (Ed.), *21 Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Eğitim Sistemi Ulusal Sempozyumu* (pp.252-256). Ankara: Tekişik.
- Can, G. (1987). Öğretmenlik meslek anlayışı üzerine bir araştırma (Ankara okullarında) [A research on professional apprehension (in Ankara)]. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 159-170.
- Can, G. (1989). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrencilere yönelik tutumları [Student teachers’ attitudes towards students].

- Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Carnegie Forum. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: The Forum.
- Chi, M. T., Glaser, R., & Rees, E. (1982). Expertise in problem solving. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence* (Vol.1, pp.7-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbum.
- Clark, D. L., & Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education (74th yearbook of the national society for the study of education)* (pp.53-86). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Conant, J. B. (1963). *The education of American teachers*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Cruickshank, D. R. (1985). *Models for the preparation of America's teacher*. Bloomington, IN: The Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). Are our teachers ready to teach? *Newsletter of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education*, 1, 6-7.
- Delandsheere, G. (1988) Concepts of teacher education. In M. J. Dunkin (Ed.), *The International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education*. (pp. 77-82). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Denton, J. J., & Lacina, L. J. (1984). Quantity of professional education coursework linked with process neasures of education. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 1(1), 39-46.
- Druva, C., & Anderson, R. (1983). Science teacher characteristics by teacher behavior and student outcome: A meta- analysis of research. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 20(5), 467- 479.
- Ducharme, E. R. (1985). Establishing the place of teacher education in the university. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 8-11.
- Duman, T. (1991). *Türkiye'de ortaöğretime öğretmen yetiştirme*. [Secondary teacher education in Turkey]. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim.
- Duman, T. (1998). Cumhuriyetimizin 75 yılında öğretmen yetiştirme sistemimiz ve sorunları [Our system of teacher education and problems in 75th anniversary of the our republic]. *Milli Eğitim*, 139, 36-43.
- Duru, İ. H. (1998). Eğitim fakülteleri tartışması [Conclusions on education faculties]. *Cumhuriyet Bilim Teknik*, 575, 15.
- Erden, M. (1995). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik sertifikası derslerine yönelik tutumları. [The attitudes of teacher candidates toward the courses of teaching certificate]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11, 99-104.
- Evertson, C. M., Howley, W. D., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 2-10.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In Houston, W. R., Haberman, M., & Sikula, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 212-233). New York: Macmillan.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Norman, P. (2000). Teacher education from initial preparation to continuing Professional development. In B. Moon, M. Ben-Peretz, & S. Brown (Eds.), *Routledge international companion to education* (pp. 732-755). London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, P., & Womack, S. T. (1993). The impact of subject matter and education coursework on teaching performance. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1), 55-63.
- Gideonse, H. D. (1984) A future role for liberal arts colleges in the preparation of teachers. In A. Tom (Ed.), *Teacher education in liberal arts settings* (pp.1-12) Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Ginsburg, M., & Clift, R. (1990). The hidden curriculum in teacher education. In Houston, W.R., Haberman, M., & Sikula, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 450-465). New York: Macmillan.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (1997). Why don't schools and teachers seem to matter? Assessing the impact of unobservables on educational productivity. *Journal of Human Resources*, 32(3), 505-523.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129-145.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Grossman, G. M., Onkol, P. E., & Sands, M. (2007). Curriculum reform in Turkish teacher education: Attitudes of teacher educators towards change in an EU candidate nation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(2), 138-150.
- Guyton, E., & Farokhi, E. (1987). Relationships among academic performance, basic skills subject matter knowledge, and teaching skills of teacher education graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(5), 37-42.
- Haney, W., Madaus, G., & Kreitzer, A. (1987). Charms talismanic: Testing teachers for the improvement of American education. In E. Rothkopf, (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (pp.169-238). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Hawk, P., Cobble, C., & Swanson, M. (1985). Certification: It does matter. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 12-15.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- Howell, J., & Shimahara, N. (1969). Educational foundations: Contributions at the undergraduate level. *Teachers College Records*, 71(2), 207-216.
- Kandel, I. L. (1957) *American education in the twentieth century*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Kavcar, C. (1999). Nitelikli öğretmen sorunu [The problem of quality teacher]. In H. H. Tekişik (Ed.), *Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Eğitim Sistemi Ulusal Sempozyumu* (pp. 267-279). Ankara: Tekişik.
- Kavcar, C. (2002). Cumhuriyet döneminde dal öğretmeni yetiştirme [Subject-matter teacher education in republic period]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 35(1), 1-14.
- Kaya, Y. K. (1984). *İnsan yetiştirme düzenimiz* [Our system of educating people]. Ankara: H. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi.
- King, J. (1987) The uneasy relationship between teacher education and the liberal arts & sciences. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 38(1), 6-10.
- Koehler, V. (1985). Research on preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(1), 23-30.
- Koerner, J. (1963). *The miseducation of American teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Korkut, H., & Doğan, E. (2004). Türkiye'de eğitim fakültelerinde görev yapan öğretim elemanlarının eğitim profilleri ve öğretmen adaylarının eğitim fakültelerine geliş kaynakları [Educational profiles of the instructors in education faculties in Turkey and the teacher candidates' sources to enter to education faculties]. *Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(2)146-179.
- Kramer, R. (1991) *Ed school follies: The miseducation of America's teachers*. New York: The Free Press.
- Küçükahmet, L. (1993). *Öğretmen yetiştirme (programları ve uygulamaları)* [Teacher education (curricula and practices)]. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Lanier, J. (1984). The preservice teacher education improvement project: A critical review. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(4), 24-28.
- Lasley, T. J., & Applegate, J. (1982). The education of secondary teachers: Rhetoric or reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1) 3-6.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lynd, A. (1953). *Quackery in the public schools*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Lyons, G. (1980). Why teachers can't teach. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62(2), 108-112.
- McConnell, T. R., Anderson, G. L., & Hunter, P. (1962). The university and professional education. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Education for the professions* (pp. 254-278). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (1989). *Öğretmen yetiştirme danışma kurulu toplantısı* [The information meeting for teacher preparation]. Ankara: Milli Eğitim.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (1993a). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ile eğitim fakülteleri arasında öğretmen yetiştirme toplantısı* [The meeting of teacher preparation]. Ankara: Milli Eğitim.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (1993b). *Öğretmen yetiştirmede koordinasyon ve işbirliği toplantısı* [The meeting of coordination and cooperation in teacher education]. Ankara: Milli Eğitim.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (1996). *Öğretmen yetiştirmede koordinasyon ve işbirliği toplantısı* [The meeting of coordination and cooperation in teacher education]. Ankara: Milli Eğitim.
- Mitchell, L. S. (1981). *The graves of academe*. Toronto: Little, Brown & Co.
- Monk, D. H., & King, J. K. (1994). Multilevel teacher resource effects on pupil performance in secondary mathematics and science: The case of teacher subject-

- matter preparation. In R. B. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *Choices and consequences: Contemporary policy issues in education* (pp. 29-58). Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Okçabol, R. (2005). *Öğretmen yetiştirme sistemimiz* [Our system of teacher education]. Ankara: Ütopya.
- Okçabol, R., & Gök, F. (1998). *Öğretmen profili araştırma raporu* [The report of teacher profile research]. Ankara: Eğitim-Sen.
- Önsoy, R. (1998). Üniversitelerimiz ve öğretmen yetiştirme [Our Universities and teacher education]. *Milli Eğitim*, 139, 18-20.
- Peseau, B. A. (1982). Developing an adequate research base for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(4), 13-15.
- Reynolds, R. J. (1993). *Foundational studies in teacher education*. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. (ERIC Document Republic Service No. ED385 519).
- Quirk, T. J., Witten, B. J., & Weinberg, S. F. (1973). Review of studies of the concurrent and predictive validity of the National teacher examination. *Review of Educational Research*, 43(1), 89-113.
- Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (2000) *Teachers, schools, and society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saçlı, Ö. A. (1998). Öğretmen yetiştirmede yeni yaklaşımlar [New approaches in teacher education]. *Milli Eğitim*, 137, 64-66.
- Schewebel, M. (1985) The clash of cultures in academe: The university and the education faculty. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4) 2-7.
- Shen, J. (1999). *The school of education. Its mission, faculty, and reward structure*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-15.
- Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (1990). Beyond reinventing the past: The politics of teacher education. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *Places where teachers are taught* (pp.385-411). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Sözler, E. (1992). *Eğitim fakültesi öğrencileri ile öğretmenlik sertifikası programı öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları* [Education faculty Students' attitudes toward the program of teacher certificate and teacher profession]. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Tom, A. (1997). *Redesigning teacher education*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Tuncor, F. R. (1996). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı yayınları bibliyografyası* [The bibliography of the publications of the Ministry of National Education]. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim.
- Tyson, H. (1994). *Who will teach the children. Prograss and resistance in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Türk Diyanet Vakfı (TDV) (1996). *Türk eğitim sistemi. Alternatif perspektif* [Turkey's education system. Alternative perspective]. Ankara: Türk Diyanet Vakfı.
- Uçan, A., Bakış, A.Y., Aydın, S., & Kaptan, S. (1980). *Öğretmen yetiştirme üzerine bir araştırma* [A research on teacher preparation]. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Webster, D. E. (1939). *The Turkey of Atatürk. Social process in the Turkish reformation*. Philadelphia: The American academy of Political and Social Science.
- Yang, S. (1998). *Comparison, understanding and teacher education in international perspective*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) (1997). *Report on Re-designing the Teacher Education Programs at the Faculties of Education in Turkish Universities*. Ankara: YÖK.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) (2006). *Eğitim fakültelerinde uygulanacak yeni programlar* [New curricula of Education Faculties]. Retrieved December 4, 2006, from Yükseköğretim Kurulu, http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/ogretmen/yeni_programlar.htm.
- Yüksel, S. (2004). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi derslerine yönelik direnç davranışları [Resistance behaviors of education faculty students to teaching certificate courses]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 4(1), 171-200.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1990). Restructuring teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 3-20.

Received July 5, 2007

Revision received February 6, 2008

Accepted May 23, 2008