



Initial Teacher Education in Turkey and England: Comparing Competencies and Standards*

Necla Köksal**

Anne Convery***

Abstract

Problem Statement: There have been major reforms in the Turkish educational system within the framework of the requirements for full membership of the EU. One requirement is that there should be conspicuous development in educational spheres, including teacher education. In this context, Turkey has given particular attention to teacher education and defined a set of Teacher Competencies for teachers. The new Teacher Competencies are largely based on the Teacher Standards of England and Wales, with Britain being considered a model of good practice in teacher education.

Purpose of the Study: This study investigates how the Turkish and English educational systems were compared according to the use of Competencies and Standards for teacher education in a European and global context.

Method(s): In this study, document analysis was used to investigate the similarities and differences between the Turkish Competencies and the English Standards in Ministry of National Education (MONE) and Teacher Training Agency (TTA) documentation. The categories were developed in terms of the English Standards.

Findings and Results: Both the Turkish Competencies and the English Standards are structured around a series of sub-areas. The similarities between the two countries are numerous. There are fewer differences, however, but some are significant. In terms of our analysis here, similar categories are Relationships with children and young people, Framework, Communicating and working with others, Personal professional development, Assessment, monitoring and giving feedback, Subjects and curriculum, Literacy, numeracy and ICT, Achievement and diversity, Planning, Teaching and learning, Reviewing teaching and learning, Learning environment, and Team working and collaboration. The differences were determined as Health and well-being,

* The research reported in this paper has been supported by Pamukkale University Scientific Research Project Centre, Turkey.

** Assist.Prof.Dr. Pamukkale University, Department of Educational Sciences, Denizli, Turkey.
E-mail: nkoksal@pau.edu.tr

*** Lecturer, University of Nottingham, Unesco Centre for Comparative Education Research (USSER), Nottingham, UK. E-mail: Anne.Convery@nottingham.ac.uk

Knowing the students, Teaching and learning process, and attaching importance to National and Global values.

Conclusions and Recommendations: We conclude what the reasons for the differences might be and what Turkey should take account of when revising the Competencies. Similarly, English educational policy makers scrutinizing the Turkish Competencies could usefully draw on their notion of the democratic classroom and on their focus on national culture. We have made some recommendations to contribute to two countries' teacher education by shedding light on the Standards and Competencies. It is difficult to take all suggestions into account because each country has a different cultural context. In Turkey, however, some Standards might be incorporated in order for Turkey to come into line with other EU countries.

Keywords: Teacher competencies, teacher standards, comparative studies, teacher education.

INTRODUCTION

Teachers have always been important to both the academic achievement of their students and their all-round development. However, what must the teacher of the future be able to do to ensure that students have the necessary skills and attitudes to enable them to be active and mobile citizens in the twenty-first century? How can initial teacher education programmes support new teachers to become effective practitioners able to provide high quality learning opportunities? In this context of high quality teachers and teacher education programmes, many countries throughout the world define their own set of teacher standards which pre-service teachers are expected to attain during their training.

A number of writers have clarified the necessity and aim of the teacher standards. According to the Teacher Development Agency (TDA) for England and Wales (2007), "Professional Standards are statements of a teacher's professional attribution, professional knowledge and understanding, and professional skills". "During the last decade, there has been an increase in the number of professional standards describing competencies for teachers in secondary and higher education. In the 1990s several professional standards were developed for teachers in, for example, the US (NBPTS 2001), the UK (TDA, <http://www.tda.gov.uk/teachers/professionalstandards.aspx>) and Australia (<http://education.qld.gov.au/staff/development/standards/standards.html>) and for teacher educators in the US (Association of Teacher Educators 1996)" (Koster and Dengerink, 2008: 136). Correspondingly, Sachs (2003: 175) points out "the development of standards have been part of a two pronged initiative by governments and bureaucracies in Australia, the UK, the US and elsewhere with the aim to improve educational performance of educational systems and to improve the practices of teachers in classrooms". Therefore, it seems that policy-makers in different countries need to develop and revise their own teacher standards to improve the quality of the teaching profession.

In this paper, we firstly conceptualise the rationale for the study, based upon the concepts of globalisation and harmonization (Turkey's candidacy to the EU), in relation to the development of teacher standards. Secondly, we discuss the need for an understanding of terminology and thirdly, we describe the way in which Turkish competencies have been developed, with reference to the English standards. Finally, we compare the teacher standards and competencies of the two countries and discuss the findings.

Rationale for the study

This study is situated within the wider context of a globalised world, in which the internationalisation of education is increasingly apparent. Set against this background, Turkey, as an aspirant member of the EU, is undertaking a period of rapid transformation in its educational policy and practice. In terms of full membership requirements, Turkey needs to raise the quality of its educational system (Isikoglu et al, 2009). In this process, the development of teacher education has been regarded as an important issue in reaching the level of other Member States. Turkey has been working to develop the principles of teacher education in order to attain European Union standards (Aksit, 2007; Grossman, Onkol and Sands, 2007).

This article aims to provide a comparison of the Standards for Qualified Teacher Status in England and the Generic Teacher Competencies in Turkey. There are two main reasons why England and Turkey have been chosen for this study. England¹, as a member of the EU, has been selected for the purpose of this comparison because it is internationally recognised as a model of good practice in teacher education and because it was one of the five countries selected for examination by the Ministry of National Education of Turkey (MONE), as a basis for establishing its own competencies. Turkey has long been interested in international best educational practice, having at the time of the new Republic invited John Dewey in 1924 to “provide ideas for reforms and recommendations benefiting the Turkish educational system and propelling it towards a modern educational establishment” (Wolf-Gazo, 1996: 1). The factors discussed below further address the question of why these two countries have been chosen for the study.

International comparisons between different countries' education systems are vital as the process of globalisation has far-reaching effects on educational systems worldwide, to which Kubow and Fossum (2007:4) draw attention: “educational reforms in the first part of the 21st century will be shaped by debate about how nations should educate students for a global world in light of nation-state allegiances”. Furthermore, Carnoy (1999, cited in Vulliamy, 2004) identifies five impacts of globalisation on educational systems. One of the major influences is that the quality of national education systems is increasingly being compared internationally. Turkey, as an aspirant member of the EU, needs to revise educational policies to be able to compete on a global stage. In terms of PISA 2003 and 2006, the

¹ For the purposes of this study, although the TDA Standards apply to both England and Wales, we have chosen an English context.

performance of Turkish students was below the OECD average of 500 (OECD, 2006). This level of result indicates that Turkey should re-evaluate its teacher education programmes, and give priority to raising the quality of teachers whose purpose is to educate students for a global world.

If nations require a curriculum based on knowledge and understanding for students who have different cultural backgrounds, they might compare various countries' educational systems, as stated by Noah and Eckstein (1969): "Comparative education began with observations about foreign peoples and their education and developed into descriptions of foreign school systems". This article is located within this context.

Turkey is situated on the extreme eastern edge of the EU whereas England is situated in Western Europe. As a result of its candidacy to the EU, Turkey is required to implement fundamental transformations regarding its economic and legislative structures including the education system (Öztürk, 2005: 2). European integration, officially referred to as 'harmonization' (Dale, 1999: 12) requires "all member nations to seek and pool some of their national policy-making capacity to the regional organization". In terms of the EU's educational guidelines, which were introduced by the Maastricht Treaty (<http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf>, 1992), there have been many educational changes in primary and secondary curricula and teacher competencies in Turkey. "An expert group [at the European Commission, 2004] has been meeting since 2002 on the topic of improving the education of teachers and trainers, and by 2004 had prioritized the development of common European Principles for teacher and trainer competences and qualifications..." (Sayer, 2006: 66). These competences are, for example, ICT, learning how to learn, interpersonal and civic competences, entrepreneurship and cultural awareness (European Commission, 2004: 7). Despite the fact that Turkey has had some difficulties in adopting some of the EU's educational guidelines, the new educational policies for teachers have been followed, reforms have been implemented and new research has been carried out to compare and interpret results. Since this paper focuses on teacher standards and competencies in the context of England and Turkey, it is necessary to firstly describe the main developments and changes in the teacher education systems in these two countries.

The English Context

In the decade 1985-95, there were considerable changes in initial teacher training in England and Wales with a shift of emphasis from 'education' to 'training' (Booth, et al., 1995, cited in Godek, 2000: 5). The most significant changes have included the formalisation of partnership schemes between schools and universities (Furlong and Maynard, 1995; Booth, et al., 1995; Davies and Ferguson, 1997; Turner-Bisset, 1999, cited in Godek, 2000: 5; Grossman and Sands, 2008), an increase in the time spent in partnership schools by students and an increased involvement of teachers and schools in teacher education and, finally, 'competence-based teacher education...' (CBTE) (Furlong and Maynard, 1995; Davies and Ferguson, 1997; Turner-Bisset, 1999, cited in Godek, 2000: 5)

Over a period of twelve years from 1980, higher education institutions decided the content and structure of initial teacher education programs in England. This was followed by a period of sustained government intervention in initial teacher training (Furlong, et al., 2000, cited in Young, 2004: 7). There were three main government policy concerns:

- 1) maintaining an adequate supply of well qualified applicants,
- 2) establishing a national framework that could provide for greater accountability for content and quality, and
- 3) reformulating teacher professionalism away from notions of teachers as academic experts to teachers as highly competent practitioners.

Big steps were taken to implement government policy. First, “in 1992, the Department for Education (DfE) broke with tradition by setting out a series of Competences (later called Standards)” (Stephens, et. al., 2004). The Teacher Training Agency was formally established as a non-departmental public body on 21 September 1994. Its primary purpose was, “to improve the quality of teaching, and raise the standards of teacher education and training and to promote teaching as a profession in order to improve the standards of pupils’ achievement and the quality of their learning ...” (Jacques, 1998: 14).

Since then, the Teacher Training Agency (renamed the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) in 2005) has made many significant changes to improve the quality of teacher training. In 1997, the Teacher Training Agency’s Standards for the Award of Qualified Teacher Status were introduced (Bleach, 2000: 121). Student teachers have to meet all the standards during their initial training (Bleach, 2000; Stephens, et. al., 2004; Taylor, 2007) in order to identify strengths and priorities for future professional development during their first year of teaching (Gay, 2007:80). The standards were revised in 2002 and again in 2007, to fit the whole life-span of the teaching profession from Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), to Induction Year Teachers, Classroom Teachers, Advanced Skilled Teachers and Excellent Teachers. The Professional Standards for QTS are composed of three main areas. These areas are: Professional Attributes, Professional Knowledge and Understanding, and Professional Skills.

The table below illustrates the main developments in initial teacher education in England and summarises the changes that took place between 1980 and 2007.

Table 1. Timeline of teacher education developments in England

1980s Teacher Training institution more independent
1992 Competences introduced by DfE
1994 Teacher Training Agency (TTA) established
1997 Standards introduced by TTA and terminology changed from competence to standard
2002 Standards revised
2007 Standards revised

The Turkish Context

It is difficult to summarize teacher education in the Turkish education system because different policy implementations have frequently changed the situation (Akyüz, 2003). During the 1980s, potential teachers could gain qualified teacher status through different training institutions. MONE had three routes into teaching. These were:

- University-based Faculties of Education for training secondary school teachers, providing a four-year undergraduate programme (Yüksek Öğretmen Okulu);
- Foreign Language Institutes for training teachers of foreign languages, providing a three-year undergraduate programme (Yabancı Dil Yüksekokulu);
- Institutes of Education for training primary school teachers, providing a two-year undergraduate programme (Eğitim Enstitüsü) (Higher Education Council HEC, 2007).

“Until 1982 teacher training faculties and institutions were affiliated to MONE in Turkey and after that date they were connected to HEC (Higher Education Council). Thus, they gained an autonomous status, functional structure and common standards, and most important of all, they acquired a legal base” (Duman, 1991, cited in Deniz ve Şahin, 2006: 22). In this process, names of the faculties, lengths of programmes, and structure of the departments and programmes were modified (HEC, 2007). With the 1981 higher education reform, all of the faculties of education provided a four-year undergraduate programme, and “starting in 1998, all faculties of education in Turkey follow a standardized curriculum prescribed by the Higher Education Council” (Saban, 2003: 832).

According to Saban (2003) most of the faculties of education in Turkey offered programmes for training preschool (kindergarten) teachers, elementary teachers (both classroom teachers for primary schools and special subject teachers for middle schools), and secondary teachers who were employed by both the Ministry of Education and private schools. Furthermore, universities provided pedagogical courses for undergraduate students enrolling in the faculties of science and letters. Students could obtain secondary teaching status during or after having obtained a bachelor’s degree in their fields of study.

Many research projects have been carried out by researchers or institutes to define the quality of teachers. “The World Bank-funded national education development project (NEDP): Pre-service Teacher Education component was implemented in Turkey between 1994 and 1999 by the Turkish Higher Education Council (HEC). The technical assistance was provided by the British Council and Arizona State University. The aim was to improve the pre-service education of teachers in Turkey. Towards the end of the project, the HEC instituted a parallel reform: the restructuring of the faculties of education. Restructuring involved instituting new programmes and courses, changing the composition of departments, and revising the content of courses” (Grossman, Onkol and Sands, 2007: 138). Within NEDP, the teacher competencies were defined by HEC. The aim of these competencies was for students to gain them through theoretical and practical strategies (Grossman, Sands and Brittingham, 2010).

HEC also conducted a pilot project in 1999, on the accreditation of faculties of education (Brittingham and Sands, 2009). The research project “The Profile of the Modern Teacher” was set up to define teacher quality by the Educational Research and Development Department (ERDD) in 1999. Their profile categories were: to have subject knowledge; to value children and teaching; to know students and have effective communication skills; to plan a lesson; to identify teaching methods and techniques; to ensure active involvement of students by organising the learning environment; to know their rights and responsibilities; to ensure personal development; to be democratic; and to respect human rights (Onural, 2005). MONE and the General Directorate of Teacher Training cooperated for the handbook of guidance in producing teacher competencies, which were organized in three sections: education-teaching competencies; knowledge and skills of culture; and subject knowledge and skills, published in 2000.

Meanwhile, in 1999, the Ministry of National Education collaborated with the universities in Turkey to revise and develop teacher competencies which cover professional knowledge, skills and attitudes, with the aim of increasing the quality of teachers in accordance with the specific needs of the time and of society (Koc et al, 1998).

“A research project based on teacher competencies was drafted within the scope of the Support for Basic Education Project which came into force with the agreement signed between the Turkish Government and the European Commission in 2000. The general objectives of the project were: to improve the quality of education and access to education; to improve the living conditions of people in disadvantaged rural and urban regions and slum areas; to provide basic education to children, young people and adults who previously fell outside the scope of education and; to support improvement in teacher supply” (MONE, 2006: 1). In 2004, a seminar was given to develop the draft for teacher competencies, led by an international consultant, Dawn Quist, a British academic. A commission, composed of Turkish and international experts, was set up to develop and establish a Turkish policy document of teacher competencies

“All the previous studies on teacher competencies that were conducted by the Board of Higher Education-MONE, General Directorate of Teacher Training and ERDD within the scope of Development of National Education Project, and competency documents of 5 countries (UK, USA, the Seychelles, Australia and Ireland) prepared by the project secretariat, were reviewed by adopting a holistic and systematic approach” (MONE, 2006: 2). It is not clear why these five countries were selected, but all are English-speaking. As a result of discussions of the draft proposals, the commission set out the Teacher Generic Competencies consisting of 6 main areas of competency, 31 sub-competencies and 233 performance indicators. The six main areas are:

- personal and professional values-professional development,
- knowing the student,
- learning and teaching process,
- monitoring and evaluation of learning and development,
- school-family and society relationships,
- knowledge of the curriculum and content.

After the first implementation of the generic teacher competencies in 2005, it was expected that both pre-service and in-service teachers attain these competencies. MONE has run many seminars for in-service teachers to introduce the new competencies and to demonstrate how they are applied in the teaching process. The HEC, however, while revising the formation courses for teacher education, has not yet produced a competency-based curriculum.

The table below demonstrates the important dates which affect the development of the teacher competencies for teacher education in Turkey, and outlines the changes that occurred between 1981 and 2005.

Table 2. Timeline of teacher education developments in Turkey

1981 Higher Education Council (HEC) established
1981 Teacher Training Schools connected to HEC
1990 Teacher Training programs increased to 4 years
1994-9 Reforms in Teacher Education by HEC
1998-2001 Competencies introduced by HEC
2002 Competencies introduced by MONE
2005 Competencies implemented by MONE

METHOD

In this study, document analysis was used to investigate the similarities and differences between the Turkish Competencies and the English Standards. Documents consist of public and private records that qualitative researchers obtain about a site or participants in a study and these sources provide valuable information in helping researchers understand central phenomena in qualitative studies (Creswell, 2005). In this study, the main documents were gathered for document analysis. The data sources of the study were Ministry of National Education (MONE) and Teacher Training Agency (TTA) documents about competencies and standards. Descriptive analysis technique was used to analyze the documents. The categories obtained from the English standards and similar Turkish competencies took part in the same categories.

In the next section the methodological approach used to analyse the documentation is described and the similarities and differences between the Standards and Competencies are outlined. The results are then discussed with reasons suggested for these distinctions.

FINDINGS

Similarities and Differences

Both the Turkish Competencies and the English Standards are structured around a series of sub-areas. The similarities between the two countries are numerous. There are fewer differences, however, but some are significant. In terms of our analysis here, we base our discussion around the following headings, which are the sub-sections from the English Standards: Relationships with children and young people,

Framework, Communicating and working with others, Personal professional development, Assessment, monitoring and giving feedback, Subjects and curriculum, Literacy, numeracy and ICT, Achievement and diversity, Planning, Teaching and learning, Reviewing teaching and learning, Learning environment, and Team working and collaboration.

Relationships with children and young people

In both countries there is an expectation that the teacher acts as a role model for the students. In England, Q2¹ requires the teacher to ‘demonstrate the positive values, attitudes and behaviour they expect from children and young people’. In Turkey, the teacher is required to ‘behave in accordance with the personal characteristics he/she wants to develop in his/her students’ (A). Clearly, in both countries the teacher as role model is an important concept. However, it is interesting to note that in Turkey, teachers explicitly develop ‘personal characteristics’ in their students, whereas in England teachers expect a set of ‘values, attitudes and behaviour’ from children and young people, and it is also implicit that they should be actively engaged in developing them.

Framework

In terms of teachers and their professional duties, both countries mention a legal requirement as part of their training framework. The English Standard requires an ‘awareness’ of the statutory framework: ‘be aware of the professional duties of teachers and the statutory framework within which they work’ (Q3), whereas Turkish teachers have to be more than ‘aware’: they have to ‘know the legislation related to his/her tasks, rights and responsibilities, and he/she should be able to act accordingly’ (A8). The implication of this difference lies in the interpretation of the meaning of ‘aware of’ and ‘know’, with the English Standard appearing to be more vaguely expressed than the Turkish Competence.

Communicating and working with others

In both countries, the requirement is for teachers to be good communicators, however, within this similarity there are significant differences. Teachers in England must ‘communicate effectively with children, young people, colleagues, parents and carers’ (Q4). In Turkey, on the other hand, teachers ‘perform written/verbal communication with families by means of continuous exchange of information about student progress’ (E5.2). Although the English standard emphasises a wider scale of communication, with ‘children, young people, colleagues and carers’, such an expression is not found in the Turkish Competency. It is explicitly pointed out that teachers need to communicate with families to share their children’s progression in Turkey. This difference could relate to the importance in Turkey of the family as a

¹ Both sets of standards/competencies are identified with the reference number from the published policy for example Q for England and A-F for Turkey.

unit, whereas in England children could live with a variety of ‘carers’, due to the breakdown of the family as a social unit.

England and Turkey both have a clear definition of cooperative work with others. In Turkey, the teacher is required to ‘establish cooperation with families by exchanging information about student progress’ (E5). In England, however, teachers should ‘have a commitment to collaboration and co-operative working’ (Q6), and this is not restricted to families. The difference in meaning of the two words ‘cooperation’ and ‘collaboration’ is important, since the concept of collaboration does not exist in the Turkish Competencies.

Personal professional development

Teachers are expected to take responsibility for their own professional development. In England, the requirement of (Q7a) is to ‘reflect on and improve their practice, and take responsibility for identifying and meeting their developing professional needs’. Turkish teachers are required to ‘be willing, persevering, lively, energetic, creative and aware of the responsibility to develop himself/herself’ (A5). Personal responsibility for teachers’ professional improvement is the common point in both countries. However, reflection on and improvement of teachers’ practice is only mentioned in the English Standards. In keeping with this theme, in terms of the English Standards, teachers should ‘have a creative and constructively critical approach towards innovation, being prepared to adapt their practice where benefits and improvements are identified’ (Q8). In Turkey, teachers are required to ‘develop and effectively use his/her critical thinking, problem solving, communication skills and aesthetic understanding’ (A5). Although the critical approach is emphasised in both countries, in Turkey the focus is on ‘problem solving, communication skills and aesthetic understanding’, which may relate to the focus on student-centred learning in the new curriculum (MEB, 2005a, cited in Isikoglu et al., 2009:350).

Assessment, monitoring and giving feedback

In both countries teachers should know the arrangements for assessing students’ performance. An English teacher must ‘know a range of approaches to assessment, including the importance of formative assessment’ (Q12). In Turkey, however, the teacher is required to ‘prepare testing and assessment plans after identifying proper testing strategies and tools for evaluating student achievements’ (D1). Although ‘formative assessment’ is emphasized in the English Standard, the term is not used in the Turkish document, although the concept is. The word ‘test’ is firstly considered as summative assessment in the Turkish Competency. However, the teacher is required to ‘identify alternative testing tools for a comprehensive assessment (portfolios, concept maps, trips, observations, interviews and etc.)’(D1.4) which indicates that testing tools are being used formatively. There seems to be a lack of conceptual clarity of the use of the word test in Turkey.

The issue of feedback emerges as a similarity between the two countries. In England, teachers should ‘provide timely, accurate and constructive feedback on learners’ attainment, progress and areas for development’ (Q27). Similarly, in

Turkey the teacher is required to ‘provide constructive and explanatory feedbacks to his/her students’ (C7,1).

Subjects and curriculum

The term ‘subjects and curriculum’ denotes the expectation that teachers in both countries should ‘have a secure knowledge and understanding’. The English standard Q14 requires the teacher to ‘have a secure knowledge and understanding of their subjects/curriculum areas and related pedagogy to enable them to teach effectively across the age and ability range for which they are trained’. In Turkey, the teacher should ‘have concrete knowledge and understanding consistent with principles, approaches, targets and content of the subject-specific curriculum’ (F2). It is interesting to note that in England the word ‘pedagogy’ is used explicitly whilst in Turkey the more implicit ‘approaches’ is found.

Literacy, numeracy and ICT

Both English and Turkish teachers must gain information and communication technology (ICT) skills. In England, the teacher is required to ‘know how to use skills in ... ICT to support their teaching and wider professional activities’ (Q17). In Turkey, the teacher should be ‘technology literate (has knowledge and skills related to technological concepts and applications) (A5.12), and s/he should ‘follow developments in information and communication technologies’ (A5.13). There seems to be some divergence in the use of the terms literacy and numeracy between the two countries. Despite the fact that both countries use technology in similar ways, it is notable that the Turkish Competencies do not require student teachers to demonstrate their literacy and numeracy skills.

Achievement and diversity

In relation to achievement and diversity, teachers in England and Turkey are expected to be able to understand social and cultural differences. In England, the teacher should ‘understand how children and young people develop and that the progress and well-being of learners are affected by a range of developmental, social, religious, ethnic, cultural and linguistic influences’ (Q18). The teacher in Turkey is required to ‘use his/her awareness and understanding of physical, emotional, social and cultural differences and needs of students with the aim of supporting and improving student learning’ (A1). Although the social and cultural differences of learners are considered in both countries, there are some differences based on the cultural backgrounds in the two countries. For instance, words such as ‘religious’, ‘ethnic’ and ‘linguistic influences’ are included in the English Standard, because of the ethnic and religious diversity in the population of the UK. These terms are not found in the Turkish Competency, as it is assumed that every child’s mother tongue is Turkish, and 98% of people are Muslim.

In keeping with the same theme, although making effective personalised provision for students with special needs is emphasized in both countries, the issue of an ‘additional language’ is only found in the English Standard. A teacher in England

is expected to ‘know how to make effective personalised provision for those they teach, including those for whom English is an additional language or who have special educational needs or disabilities, and how to take practical account of diversity and promote equality and inclusion in their teaching’ (Q19). A Turkish teacher must be ‘aware of his/her responsibilities, legal liabilities, intervention and evaluation methods for students with special needs, and should be able to prepare customized curricula’ (C5). It is pertinent to note that even though the teacher’s requirement for the provision of students with special needs is expressed, consideration of diversity and encouragement of equality are not referred to in the Turkish Competency. In England, however, the standard also stresses that the teacher should know how to implement these in his/her teaching.

Planning

There is a clear similarity between the Standards and Competencies as teachers must know how to plan a lesson. In England, the requirement is to ‘plan for progression across the age and ability range for which they are trained, designing effective learning sequences within lessons and across series of lessons and demonstrating secure subjects/curriculum knowledge’ (Q22). In Turkey, the teacher is expected to ‘plan methods, activities, course materials, testing-assessment techniques to be used with a student-centred approach consistent with objectives of the subject-specific curriculum together with his/her students’ (C1). Even though the English Standard refers to the necessity of ‘planning for progression’, it is less explicit compared with the Turkish Competency, which explains the dimensions of the plan. It is interesting to note that in Turkey, ‘a student-centred approach’ and planning a lesson with the students are stressed.

In both countries there is an expectation that the teacher should plan extra-curricular activities. In the English Standard the issue is mentioned explicitly that the teacher is required to ‘plan homework or other out-of-class work to sustain learners’ progress and to extend and consolidate their learning’ (Q24). In contrast, in the Turkish Competency the teacher is expected to ‘prepare plans for extra-curricular activities’ (C4.1), but it is not as clear as the English Standard which illustrates why the teacher should plan ‘homework or other out-of-class work’.

Teaching and learning

In England, the teacher is required to ‘have a knowledge and understanding of a range of teaching, learning and behaviour management strategies and know how to use and adapt them, including how to personalise learning and provide opportunities for all learners to achieve their potential’ (Q10). In Turkey, the sub area ‘behaviour management’ (C7) outlines the strategies that the teacher should use in class, and the sentence ‘diversifying education by taking into account the individual differences’ (C5) emphasises that the teacher should consider individual differences while organising the teaching-learning process.

Reviewing teaching and learning

As regards reviewing teaching and learning, in both countries the similarity is about modifying planning according to the learners' progress. Teachers in England must 'evaluate the impact of their teaching on the progress of all learners, and modify their planning and classroom practice where necessary' (Q29). In Turkey, teachers are required to 'review the teaching-learning process according to results and should be able to make necessary amendments' (D4). Reviewing the teaching and learning process makes teachers fully aware of their practice and contributes to both their own and learners' progression.

Learning environment

Both the Standards and Competencies emphasise the purposeful learning environments that pre-service teachers should establish to support students' learning. In England, the teacher should 'establish a purposeful and safe learning environment conducive to learning and identify opportunities for learners to learn in out-of-school contexts' (Q30). In Turkey, the teacher is required to 'organise learning environments including psychological and physical dimensions together with his/her students with the aim of realising the teaching-learning process efficiently' (C3). Whereas both countries refer to the 'physical dimension' of the learning environment, the psychological dimension is included only the Turkish Competency.

In keeping with the same theme, in England the teacher should 'establish a clear framework for classroom discipline to manage learners' behaviour constructively and promote their self-control and independence' (Q31). On the other hand, the Turkish Competency requires the teacher to 'create a democratic platform where students may attain self-control, understand rights and responsibilities of both their own and others, manage their emotions and opinions and express themselves' (C7). The similarity between these two requirements is a learning environment where students should achieve self-control. However there is a significant difference in establishing this learning environment for example, the English Standard emphasises a clear framework for classroom discipline whereas the Turkish Competency underlines a democratic platform.

Team working and collaboration

The term 'team working and collaboration' indicates the expectation that teachers should share their experiences with their colleagues. In England, the teacher should 'work as a team member and identify opportunities for working with colleagues, sharing the development of effective practice with them' (Q32). In Turkey, the teacher is required to 'make good use of successful experiences of other teachers, administrators and experts' (A). In England, teachers explicitly 'work as a team member', whereas in Turkey teachers expect to share their experience with other teachers, administrators and experts. It is implicit that they should be actively engaged in being a team member in order to share their own experiences.

Significant Differences

Having discussed the main similarities and related differences between the English Standards and the Turkish Competencies, it is now apposite to turn our attention to the significant differences that are apparent. These are discussed firstly in relation to the English Standards, and secondly in relation to the Turkish Competencies.

‘Health and well-being’ is a sub area which appears only in the English Standards. It requires the teacher to ‘be aware of the current legal requirements, national policies and guidance on the safeguarding and promotion of the well-being of children and young people’ (Q21a) as well as being able to identify and support children whose well-being is affected by difficulties (Q21b). It is interesting to note that the Turkish Competencies do not include the notion of the ‘well-being’ of children.

A second significant difference is the Competency ‘knowing the students’ which has three sub-sections, namely knowing the developmental characteristics, considering their interests and needs, and valuing the student. These have no equivalence in the English Standards. In terms of this main area, the teacher is required to ‘know all the characteristics, interest and needs of the student, understands the socio-cultural and economic background of the student and his/her parents’ (B).

In the Turkish Competencies, the main area ‘teaching and learning process’ has 7 sub areas, 4 of them discussed above are similar to the Standards. However, 3 sub areas are different: preparation of materials requiring ‘the teacher should be able to prepare teaching materials by effectively using his/her facilities and considering student needs’, time management discloses that ‘the teacher should be able to make good use of the allocated time for teaching and learning by considering sections of the course’ and ‘organising extra-curricular activities’. It is relevant to point out that the English Standards includes planning ‘homework or other out-of-class work’ discussed above as a similarity, but there is no mention of the implementation of these works. In the Turkish Competencies, on the other hand, the sub area ‘organising extra-curricular activities’ requires the teacher to ‘organise and conduct activities (trips to theatres, museums, factories, parks and etc.) appropriate for age groups of students’.

It is interesting to note that in the Turkish Competencies, there is a sub area ‘attaching importance to National and Global values’ which mentions that teachers should ‘organise learning experiences by understanding that each society has its own cultural structure and unique values in accordance with child rights, human rights, the constitution and the principles of democracy. He/she should adopt national and universal values and should make efforts for his/her students to acquire these values by supporting that understanding, cooperation, friendship and peace at international level’. It is assumed that this reflects the evolution of the Turkish educational system as a result of being in the process of membership of the EU. The educational criteria are reflected on the Generic Teacher Competencies by policy-makers.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this article, the Turkish and English educational systems have been compared according to the use of the Standards and the Competencies for teacher education in a European and global context. As argued earlier in the paper, Turkey has developed its new teacher competencies with reference to the English Standards. This has been claimed here by illustrating the findings, which reveal more similarities than differences. We conclude what the reasons for the differences might be and what Turkey should take account of when revising the Competencies. Similarly, English educational policy makers scrutinising the Turkish Competencies could usefully draw on their notion of the democratic classroom and on their focus on national culture.

While the English Standard emphasises communication with children, young people, colleagues, parents and carers, the Turkish Competency emphasises only parents. Although the teacher is expected to improve his/her 'communication skills' for personal development, it is not mentioned explicitly why the teacher needs this improvement. Working in a school requires the teacher to communicate with others. The Turkish Competencies should take account of the importance of communicating with students and colleagues. The issue of collaboration is another area in which policy-makers in Turkey might scrutinize the English Standards. 'Because of the way it promotes shared reflection, professional learning and the pooling of collected expertise, collaboration is a central principle of organizational learning' (Hargreaves, 1994: 247). As cooperative work between teachers and others, collaboration should be emphasized in the Turkish Competencies to advocate the organizational learning.

As stated earlier, both countries have an explicit requirement for information and communication technologies. As Leask (2004) claims that teachers 'understand how ICT can support their own professional development and teaching and learning in their subject area' (p. 39), it seems that the importance of ICT has been recognised in both countries. Conversely, literacy and numeracy have not been emphasized in the Turkish Competencies. 'Literacy is about communication' and 'it is about identity and participation' (Gordon, 2007: 217), and also 'numeracy is an important life skill. In order to be numerate, pupils need to be able to apply their mathematical skills outside the maths classroom' (Bills and Bills, 2007: 231). According to Convery (2002), all students will need basic key skills such as the European Driving Licence in ICT capability, numeracy, literacy and communication to play a full role in the future of Europe. Clearly, these standards should be placed in the Turkish Competencies on preparing future teachers if policy-makers want student teachers to be able to act as 'European teachers'.

The comparison of diversity has shown that there is some divergence of comprehension between the two countries. In England, religious, ethnic and linguistic influences are important issues that teachers should discuss with their students, respecting the identities of those from minority ethnic groups (Howard, 2007), and consequently student teachers are expected to attain these standards because they are going to work with heterogeneous cultural and linguistic groups. In Turkey, on the other hand, these terms do not form part of the competencies. Even though most people are Muslim and their mother tongue is Turkish, there are some people from different ethnic backgrounds and religions. However, these differences

are not taken into consideration in teacher education. This is the other area where policy-makers in Turkey could look to English Standards, where student teachers are expected to gain appropriate knowledge, skills and understanding of diversity.

In the English Standards, the issue of health and well-being is based on the 'Every Child Matters' legislation which was published after the Victoria Climbié case by the DfES in 2003. 'Every Child Matters sought to provide a unifying vision for children's services by setting out five outcomes which are enjoy and achieve, achieve economic well-being, stay safe, be healthy and make a positive contribution' (Husbands, 2007: 267). In terms of the standard, student teachers should know 'the current legal requirements and national policies on the safeguarding' and 'support students who are affected by difficulties'. It is striking that health and well-being is not part of the Turkish Competencies. It is inevitable that if a teacher teaches in a class, he/she must be competent to deal with the students' health, well-being and safety issues. In this respect, this issue should be considered and included in the competencies in preparing student teachers.

The competence 'attaching importance to National and Global values' (in Turkey) is assumed to be an encouraging feature through EU membership because of the indicators of global values. However, the emphasis on national values which requires the teacher to 'support development of national values of students' is different from the English Standards. As asserted by Stephens et al. (2004) 'even though the English Standards do refer to pupils' social, cultural, linguistic, religious, gender and ethnic backgrounds and to a Programme of Study for Citizenship, there is little (if any) reference to the promotion of national culture' (p. 123). Student teachers should be aware of their own national culture, and have an understanding of national values.

In both countries, the term 'learning environment' is similar even though their establishment is different. In Turkey, the expectation is for teachers to create a democratic platform which includes 'creating a safe and comfortable environment, determining classroom rules together with students etc.' In England, on the other hand, the focus is on classroom discipline to manage learners' behaviour. Stephens et al. (2004) claim that 'teachers in England are expected to set clear standards of pupil behaviour and pupils are portrayed as obedient'. At the same time it seems that teachers are encouraged to 'plan a lesson with the students' in Turkey. This is also an indicator of creating a democratic platform. Overall, the emphasis should be on classroom democracy, where students' and teachers' contributions are equally valued.

In summary, we have made some recommendations to contribute to two countries' teacher education by shedding light on the Standards and Competencies. It is difficult to take all suggestions into account because each country has a different cultural context. In Turkey, however, some Standards might be incorporated in order for Turkey to come into line with other EU countries. As Zgaga (2007) stated 'The European Network on Teacher Education Policies (ENTEPE) started from the general view that a European teacher must have the same basic skills as any good teacher' (p. 7). In this respect, 'communication with students, collaboration with colleagues, knowledge of literacy and numeracy, and understanding of diversity' should capture the consideration of policy-makers.

REFERENCES

- Aksit, N. (2007) Educational reform in Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27, 129-137.
- Akyüz, Y. (2003) Eğitim tarihimizde günümüze kadar öğretmen yetiştirilmesi ve sağlanması ilkeleri, uygulamaları (sayfa: 48-66). *Eğitimde yansımalar: VII Çağdaş eğitim sistemlerinde öğretmen yetiştirme sempozyumu*. Ankara: Tekişik Yayıncılık.
- Bills, C., and Bills, L. (2007) Numeracy across the curriculum, in Brooks, V., Abbott, I., and Bills, L. (eds.) *Preparing to teach in secondary schools*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Bleach, K. (2000) *The newly qualified secondary teacher's handbook*. London: The Cromwell Press.
- Brittingham, B. and Sands, M. K. (1999) Standards and Accreditation in Teacher Education in Turkey. YÖK, Ankara.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Convery, A., (2002) *Changing attitudes to Europe: British teacher education and the European dimension*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, the University of Nottingham.
- Dale, R. (1999) Specifying globalization effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 1-17.
- Deniz, S., and Sahin, N. (2006) The restructuring process of teacher training system in Turkey: a model of teacher training based on post-graduate education (PGCE), *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (1), 21-26.
- Gay, B. (2007) School effectiveness and improvement, in Dillon, J., and Maguire, M. (eds.) *Becoming a Teacher*. London: Open University Press.
- Godek, Y. (2002) *The development of science student teachers' knowledge based in England*. Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, the University of Nottingham.
- Gordon, J., (2007) Literacy across the curriculum, in Brooks, V., Abbott, I., and Bills, L. (eds.) *Preparing to teach in secondary schools*. Berkshire: Open University Press
- Grossman, G. M., Onkol, P. E. and 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, 138-150.
- Grossman, G. M. and Sands, M. K. (2008) Restructuring reforms in Turkish teacher education: Modernization and development in a dynamic environment. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28 (1), 70-80.
- Grossman, G. M., Sands, M. K. and Brittingham, B. (2010) Teacher education accreditation in Turkey: the creation of a culture of quality. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30 (1), 102-109.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing teachers, changing times*. London: Cassell.
- Hovard, S., (2007) Schooling, ethnicity and English as an additional language, in Brooks, V., Abbott, I., and Bills, L. (eds.) *Preparing to teach in secondary schools*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Husbands, C., (2007) Does every child matter? Education, social care and the new agenda for children's services, in Brooks, V., Abbott, I., and Bills, L. (eds.) *Preparing to teach in secondary schools*. Berkshire: Open University Press
- Isikoglu, N., Basturk, R. and Karaca, F. (2009) Assessing in-service teachers' instructional beliefs about student-centered education: A Turkish perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 350-356.
- Jacques, K. (1998) The teacher training agency, higher education and the professionalism of initial teacher educators, in Richards, C., Simco, N. and Twiselton, S. (eds.) *Primary Teacher Education*. London: Falmer Press.

- Koç, S. et al. (1998) Faculty-School Partnership, YÖK, Ankara.
- Koster, B., and Dengerink, J. J., (2008) Professional standards for teacher educators: how to deal with complexity, ownership and function. Experiences from the Netherlands. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 31 (2), 135-149.
- Kubow, P., K., and Fossum, P., R., (2007) *Comparative education*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Leask, M., (2004) Teaching and learning with ICT: an introduction, in Capel, S., Leask, M. And Turner T. (eds.) *Learning to teach in the secondary school*. London: Routledge Falmer
- Noah, H., J., and Eckstein, M., A., (1969) *Doing comparative education: Three decades of collaboration*. New York: Macmillan. CERC's Electronic Book. <http://www.hku.hk/cerc/1a.html>, accessed 12.01.2009.
- Onural, H., (2005) Öğretmen adaylarının ideal öğretmen niteliklerine ilişkin görüşleri. XVI. *Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi*. 28-30 Eylül.
- Öztürk, M. (2005) *Developing the EU and European dimension in geography education in Turkey; student teachers' attitudes and the role of initial teacher education* Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, the University of Nottingham.
- Sachs, J. (2003) *Teacher professional standards: controlling or developing teaching?* *Teachers and Teaching*, 9 (2), 175-186.
- Sayer, J. (2006) European perspectives of teacher education and training. *Comparative Education*, 42 (1), 63-75.
- Saban, A. (2003) A Turkish profile of prospective elementary school teachers and their views of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 19, 829-846.
- Stephens, P., Tonessen, F. E., and Kyriacou, C. (2004) Teacher training and teacher education in England and Norway: a comparative study of policy goals. *Comparative Education*. 40 (1), 109-130.
- Taylor, A. (2007) Developing understanding about learning to teach in a university-schools partnership in England. *British Educational Research Journal*. 34 (1), 63-90.
- Vulliamy, G. (2004) The impact of globalisation on qualitative research in comparative and international education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*. 34 (3), 261-284.
- Wolf-Gazo, E. (1996) John Dewey in Turkey: An educational mission. *Journal of American Studies of Turkey*. 3, 15-42.
- Young, J. (2004). Systems of educating teachers. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*. 32 (1), 1-33.
- Zgaga, P. (2007) Teacher professional development for the quality and equity of lifelong learning. *Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union Conference*. Portugal: 27 and 28 September.
- <http://otmg.meb.gov.tr/YetGenel.html>, accessed 22.07. 2007
- <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/ogretmen/akr2/ek3/ek31.html>, accessed 12.01.2011
- <http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/basic2004.pdf>, accessed 18.01.2010
- <http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf> , accessed 22.01.2011
- <http://www.pisa.oecd.org/document> accessed 05.02.2011

Türkiye'nin Genel Öğretmen Yeterlikleri ile İngiltere'nin Öğretmen Standartlarının Karşılaştırılması

Özet

Problem Durumu: Avrupa Birliğine üyelik çerçevesinde, Türk eğitim sisteminde birçok reform yapılmıştır. Bu reformlar arasında öğretmen eğitime ilişkin gelişmeler de yer almaktadır. Bu bağlamda, öğretmen eğitime önem veren Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı öğretmenlerin sahip olması gereken yeterlikleri yeniden düzenlemiştir. Geliştirilen yeterlikler büyük ölçüde öğretmen eğitiminde iyi örnekler sahip bir ülke olan İngiltere'nin Öğretmen Standartlarını temele almıştır. Bu nedenle, araştırmada “öğretmen yeterlikleri ve öğretmen standartlarının benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları nelerdir?” sorusuna yanıt aranmıştır.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışma küresel ve Avrupa bağlamında, Türkiye'nin öğretmen yeterlikleri ile İngilizlerin öğretmen standartlarının karşılaştırılmasını amaçlamıştır. Eğitimde iyi örnekler sahip ülkelerin sistemlerinden yararlanmak amacıyla karşılaştırmalı çalışmaların önemi vurgulanmıştır.

Yöntem: Çalışmada iki ülkenin yeterliklerini ve standartlarını karşılaştırmak amacıyla nitel araştırma yöntemlerinde doküman analizi kullanılmıştır. Bu kapsamda iki ülkenin konu ile ilgili ulusal dokümanları analiz edilmiştir. Kategorilerin belirlenmesinde; İngiliz Öğretmen Standartlarında yer alan alt başlıkların her biri bir kategori olarak ele alınmış, bu kategorilerle örtüşen ve örtüşmeyen yeterlikler belirlenmiştir. Önce örtüşen kategorilerin altında yer alan standartlar ve yeterlikler açıklanmış, daha sonra farklılık gösterenler açıklanmıştır.

Bulgular: Dokümanların analizinden elde edilen bulgulara göre: İngiltere'de öğretmen standartlarının üç ana bölümden Türkiye'de ise altı bölümden oluştuğu görülmüştür. Bu ana bölümlerin altında yer alan alt bölümlerdeki benzer noktalar; öğretmenlerin görev ve sorumluluklarını yerine getirme, meslektaş ve velilerle iletişim, kişisel ve mesleki gelişim, öğrenmeyi değerlendirme ve gelişimi izleme, program ve içerik bilgisi, plan yapma ve öğrenme ortamlarını düzenleme olarak belirlenmiştir.

Sonuç ve Öneriler: Sonuç olarak standartlardaki ve yeterliklerdeki farklılıkların nedenlerinin neler olabileceği ve Türkiye'nin yeterlikleri yeniden geliştirirken neleri dikkate alması gerektiği üzerinde durulmuştur. Aynı şekilde İngiliz eğitim politikacılarının da demokratik sınıf ortamı ve ulusal kültürle ilgili standartların belirlenmesinde Türkiye'nin yeterliklerini incelemeleri yararlı olacaktır. İki ülkenin

kltrel farklılıkları dikkate alındığında tm nerileri dikkate almak ok mmkn deęildir. Ancak Trkiye'nin hem İngiltere hem de dięer Avrupa lkelerinde ortak olan standartlara kendi yeterliklerinde yer vermesi ęretmen eęitimi aısından yararlı olacaktır.

Anahtar Szckler: ęretmen yeterlikleri, ęretmen standartları, karşılařtırmalı arařtırmalar, ęretmen eęitimi.