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ABSTRACT. The main purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between candidate teachers’ views about their previous educational experiences and visions about their future teaching. A total of 190 preservice teachers from 4 programs of Primary Teaching Department in Education Faculty of İnönü University were taken into the sample. To collect data, a questionnaire developed by the researchers was used. The questionnaire included 68 items related to pedagogical instructional activities. The analysis revealed a significant association between preservice teachers’ visions about their future teaching and their views about their previous education experiences but only at primary level. Also, significant differences were found in terms of gender and departments between preservice teachers’ views about their previous educational experiences and between their visions of their future teaching.
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INTRODUCTION

The instructional activities in educational institutions at primary, secondary and higher education stages are centered around teacher, students, and curriculum. Among these three stakeholders of education, teachers’ role is especially important. She is the one who actually implements the curriculum in order to process the human raw material. In Varş’s words (1973: 48), “teacher is the one who puts the state’s educational policy into practice, and affects, in turn, this policy with practical results, and benefits from the researches about specialization in educational and provides problems to these researches as well. Always in close interaction with students, teachers are responsible for making changes in students’ behaviors in accordance with Ministry’s goals.” Given such a critical role, students should be raised at educational faculties accordingly to become effective teachers. Yet, teacher training is a challenging process. While effective teaching can be defined in concrete terms based on the contemporary teaching theories and best practices, it might be highly demanding to have the prospective teachers acquire especially the cognitive and affective behaviors required to become effective teachers. Especially their pre-existing beliefs about teaching can be one of the major obstacles to deal with. In Bandura’s words “people’s behavior is better predicted from their beliefs than from the actual consequences of their actions” (as cited in Pajares, 1992). While teacher training process can be regarded as formation of a beliefs system about effective teaching, it may require diagnosing the pre-existing ones first and then modifying them when they do not suit with the effective teaching norms.

Effective teachers and effective teaching

Çermik (1997: 67) defines the teacher of 2000s, emphasizing her quality, as one who “communicates effectively, always reads and searches, always follows the latest scientific developments in her field, has respect for human, has awareness and responsibility about the events around her, and has the capacity to meet what is expected from her.” Recently the Directorate General of Teacher Training and Education under Ministry of National Education made a comprehensive research in an effort mainly to define what is expected of a good teacher, and as a result of that research it announced the General Qualities of Teaching Profession, which can be used as guiding benchmarks to determine teacher training policies, develop curricula to be used in faculties of education, train in-service teachers, select teachers, evaluate teachers’ performances, and help teachers
to know better about themselves and improve themselves professionally (Directorate General of Teacher Training and Education, 2006). These qualities were defined in 244 performance indicators which are categorized under 6 main titles: Personal and Professional Values – Professional Development, Knowing about Students, Learning and Teaching Process, Tracing and Evaluating Students’ Learning and Progress, School-Family and Society Relations, and Knowledge of Curriculum and Content.

These quality indicators which as a whole depend on a constructivist understanding require teachers to implement the curricula so as to conduct a productive instruction in class by diversifying the strategies, methods and techniques, optimizing teacher-student communication, thus involving students into instructional activities (Gözütok, 2000; Gürbüztürk, 1992). Advocates of constructivism suggest that knowledge is created from and by the interaction between students, or between students and teachers (Cheng et al., 2009). In this respect, teachers’ role in class is not transferring knowledge monotonously, but rather supporting students through discovery-based activities in which they themselves construct knowledge by their unique way of seeing and interpreting the world (Brewster, Ellis & Girard, 2004: 30). Unlike the teachers with traditional beliefs who generally use didactic instructional practices, teachers with constructivist beliefs are more likely to employ student-centered practices (Isikoğlu et al., 2009). Achieving this effective way of instruction requires the teacher to be well-organized and to know the learning needs of the students very well. Stronge, Tucker, and Hindman (2004: 128) define the features of an effective teacher based on a comprehensive study of the relevant literature in a more detailed way:

1. Effective teachers use effective instructional strategies such as mastery learning and methods that work for different types of learners, such as hands-on learning that taps verbal, visual, and kinesthetic learners.
2. Effective teachers are strong communicators of the knowledge or skills they want to convey to the students.
3. Effective teachers support (scaffold) their students while they are constructing meaning from the content, especially when they are given opportunities to build on basic understanding and expand it into more complex, metacognitive thinking.
4. Effective teachers use questioning strategies that emphasize higher level thinking and student dialogue to enhance students learning in general, and young children’s language development and analytical thinking skills, in particular.
5. Effective teachers actively involve students in the learning process, thus increasing student motivation and assimilation of new knowledge and skills.

Preservice teachers’ beliefs about teaching

In Turkey, as institutions to raise especially primary and secondary school teachers, educational faculties in most of the universities are responsible for equipping future teachers with knowledge and skills in accordance with the teacher training policies of the Board of Higher Education (BHE). As there were various implementations between different Educational Faculties in the past, a project called Promoting the National Education was launched by the cooperation of BHE and World Bank between 1994-1997, which mainly aimed at standardizing the teacher training curricula in all educational faculties (Aydın, 1998). The curricula developed as a result of this project were put into force as of 1998-1999 academic year nationwide aiming at rendering a more functional preservice teacher training based on an integrity of both theory and practice, with the superiority given to latter. In this respect, preservice teachers in the educational faculties are now being trained in terms of "knowledge about their subject field, knowledge about teaching profession, and general knowledge of the world ".

This comprehensive training process is supposed to form some beliefs on the part of the preservice teachers about what kind of a teacher they want to be. This set of beliefs can be called as teacher beliefs, which Ng et al. (2009) define as “the ideas that influence how teachers conceptualize teaching”. These beliefs are reasonably expected to be in line with those three main categories of pedagogical knowledge and the accompanying skills and attitudes they have gained at the faculty. Yet,
these beliefs can be shaped alternatively by their previous experiences as students in primary, secondary, or higher education, i.e. how their teachers have actually taught them, what instructional strategies, methods and techniques their previous teachers used. As a matter of fact, there is a robust agreement in the relevant literature that preservice teachers’ views about what kind of a teacher they want to be are affected by their experiences in their previous education (Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Chan, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1989; Lortie, 1975; Pajares, 1992; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000; Zeichner & Liston, 1987).

Theorists generally agree that beliefs are created through a process of enculturation and social construction (Pajares, 1992). Therefore, it sounds reasonable that student teachers have developed their beliefs in teaching and learning before entering the educational faculties based on the practices their former teachers did (Chan, 1999). These beliefs can be about teachers’ roles, students’ roles, and the nature and teaching of the content (Haser & Star, 2009). Raths (2001) puts that, when learned at an early age, these beliefs about teaching are possibly “linked to a sense of self” and are “difficult to change”. Even “these conservative beliefs remain latent during formal training in pedagogy at the university and become a major force once the candidate is in his or her own classroom” (Raths, 2001). Here, one may pose the question “Do these beliefs not change during formal training at university?” Parajes (1992) answers this question by resembling the preservice teachers to insiders:

“The classrooms of colleges of education, and the people and practices in them, differ little from classrooms and people they have known for years. Thus, the reality of their everyday lives may continue largely unaffected by higher education, as may their beliefs. For insiders, changing conceptions is taxing and potentially threatening. These students have commitments to prior beliefs, and efforts to accommodate new information and adjust existing beliefs can be nearly impossible.”

Changing student-teachers’ conceptions of teaching is not an easy process and may need the establishment of a sympathetic and supportive environment (Kember, 1997). Especially preservice or novice in-service teachers with rather lower levels of self-efficacy might resort to their long lasting pre-existing teaching beliefs in case of having survival needs or self concerns while teaching. Thus, to be able to deviate from more traditional or wrong ways of teaching requires preservice (and in-service teachers) to be comfortable being challenged by the students (Ng et al., 2009). Although teaching practicum is a good opportunity for the preservice teachers to gain this sense of comfort, if the practice school teacher provides a model similar to those the preservice teacher has previously had, her set of teaching beliefs will be consolidated, approved, or justified in a sense. Thus, Cheng et al. (2009) suggest that universities and schools work in partnership to foster facilitating school and classroom contexts for them to practice most contemporary pedagogical approaches like constructivism in teaching and learning.

Things get worst when preservice teachers bring and preserve some common persisting misconceptions about proper teaching (Stuart & Thurlow, 2000). For example, Hase & Star (2009) found, concerning Turkish preservice Maths teachers, that preservice teachers’ beliefs about effective teaching are generally shaped by the national examination system, which they have already experienced as students and which leads them mistaken effective teaching with examination-oriented teaching.

In this respect, it was regarded important to investigate the association between the previous learning experiences of the preservice teachers and their visions about their future teaching i.e. their beliefs about teaching. Therefore, the problem of this study can be articulated as “What is the association between preservice teachers’ views about the extend to which their previous teachers (at primary, secondary or higher education) performed certain instructional activities and their beliefs about how well they will perform these effective instructional activities in the future when they become teachers?”. It is expected that such a study can yield inputs to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher training curriculum.
Purpose of the study

Main purpose of this study is to find whether there is an association between preservice teachers’ previous learning experiences in formal education (their previous teachers as teaching models) and their views about what kind of a teacher they want to be. Based on this main problem, following sub-problems were tested:

1. Is there a significant association between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences in primary school (primary teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching?
2. Is there a significant association between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences in secondary school (secondary teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching?
3. Is there a significant association between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences in higher education (higher education teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching?
4. Is there a significant difference between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences as a whole (previous teachers as models) in terms of their programs?
5. Is there a significant difference between preservice teachers’ visions about their future teaching in terms of their programs?
6. Is there a significant difference between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences as a whole (previous teachers as models) in terms of their gender?
7. Is there a significant difference between preservice teachers’ visions about their future teaching in terms of their gender?

METHOD

This study is based on survey design. The population of this study comprised about 300 senior preservice teachers studying in 4 programs at Primary Education department (Science, Maths, Social Studies and Primary School Teaching) during 2003-2004 academic year. The sample of the study was made up of 210 students selected using “stratified sampling method” among the forth graders in the mentioned programs of the primary education department. The final sample refined after the incomplete questionnaire forms were discarded was 190 totally (see Table 1).

Table 1. Distribution of the preservice students by programs and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science teaching</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math teaching</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School teaching</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection

The instrument used in this study to collect data about preservice teachers’ previous education experiences and visions about their future teaching was developed based on general literature about effective teaching, with a special emphasis on constructivist education in terms of lesson planning, instructional strategies, methods and techniques, and class management (Brooks ve Brooks, 1999; Demirel, 1997; Deryakulu, 2000; Gözütok, 2000; Gürbüztürk, 1992; Sönmez, 1997; Stronge, Tucker, and Hindman, 2004: 128; Taymaz, 1995; Varş, 1998). The first part of the questionnaire consisted of 34 items defining preservice teachers’ former education experiences (previous teachers’ instructional practices) in primary, secondary and higher education and second part repeats the same 34 items but this time expressing preservice teachers’ visions about future teaching (what kind of a teacher they want to be in the future). Sample items include “1. Our teachers explained the objectives at the beginning of each lesson or unit.” for previous education experience part, and “1. I am going to explain the objectives at the beginning of each lesson or unit.” for the visions for future teaching part;
“10. Our teachers did their best to involve us to the lessons.” for previous education experience part, and “10. I am going to do my best to involve my students to the lessons.” Other sample items (two parts integrated to save space) include “13. Our teachers associated/I am going to associate the lesson content with the real life”; “18. Our teachers provided/I am going to provide students with clues when they had/have difficulty in answering the questions.”; “23. Our teachers gave/I am going to give research-based assignments to the students.”; “30. Our teachers evaluated/I am going to evaluate the students’ success based on their/my own criteria. (Reversed item)”; “34. Our teachers gave/I am going to give feedback to students after exams by highlighting the mistakes and correcting them”. Content and face validity of the questionnaire was tested adequate with consultation to teaching staff specialized in departments of curriculum and instruction, and Turkish language teaching. The reliability of the both sets of items (“preservice teachers’ former education experiences” and “preservice teachers’ visions of future teaching”) were tested by estimating the Cronbach-Alpha coefficients in a pilot study on 150 preservice teachers chosen randomly among the population of the study. The overall reliability of the instrument was found r= 0.83. In the first part of the questionnaire, preservice teachers were asked to mark points from 1 to 5 (representing range between Never-Always) to indicate to what extent their previous teachers in primary, secondary and higher education (separately) did the 34 general performance indicators regarding effective teaching. Similarly, in the second part they are asked to mark points from 1 to 5 (representing range between Never-Always) to indicate to what extent they want to do the same 34 performance indicators regarding effective teaching as a part of their teaching vision. Thus, higher scores (total scores rage between 34 min. and 170 max., and 102 as average) indicate either approving the efficacy of previous teaching practices or higher aspirations with regard to teaching in the future.

Data analysis

Data gathered were analyzed using SPSS software program. In this analysis, the associations between preservice teachers” views about their previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) for all three stages (primary, secondary and higher education) and their visions about their future teaching were tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r), and significance of the correlation was tested using t-test. The significance of the differences between male and female preservice teachers’ views about their previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) and their visions for future teaching were tested using t-test. And finally, the significance of the differences between views of the preservice teachers from four different programs (Science, Maths, Social Studies and Primary School teaching) about their previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) and their visions for future teaching were tested using ANOVA test, followed by an additional LSD test to figure out the sources of significant differences when appropriate. In all analyses, p > .05 was considered as statistically significant.

FINDINGS

The findings of the study were presented with tables in the order of sub-problems with the comments.

1. Findings regarding the association between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching

The findings about the association between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) in all three educational phases (primary, secondary and higher education) and their visions about their future teaching are presented in one compact table (see Table 2), but the comments for associations between visions and each stage is given separately.

Table 2 indicates that there is an association between preservice teachers’ previous experiences in primary education (primary school teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching practices (what kind of a teacher they want to be in the future). While the degree of correlation is low, the direction is positive, which suggests that preservice teachers are possibly
affected by their primary school teachers’ practices in terms of shaping their visions for future teaching, i.e., in terms of deciding about what kind of a teacher they want to be.

Table 2. Association between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational phases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05

On the other hand, no significant difference was observed between preservice teachers’ previous experiences in both secondary and higher education (secondary school and university teachers as models) and their visions about their future teaching practices (what kind of a teacher they want to be in the future). These findings suggest that preservice teachers are not affected by their secondary school or university teachers’ practices in terms of shaping their visions for future teaching, i.e., in terms of deciding about what kind of a teacher they want to be.

The presence and lack of significant difference might be caused mainly from the preservice teachers’ programs, i.e., primary education programs. The established way of teaching in secondary schools (with older students, namely adolescents) or at university (early adult students) are supposed to be different than teaching primary school students. Therefore, preservice teachers think their visioned future teaching practices (X (visions about future teaching)= 137, 415) are more consistent with their primary school teachers’ practices, though they find them not as adequate (X (primary experience)= 103,03) compared to their visioned practices. Thus, one remarkable finding of the study seems to be the inadequacy of scores regarding higher education experiences (X (higher education experience)= 95,2) and lack of any correlation between preservice teachers’ views about higher education teachers as models and their visions about future teaching. This result points to the fact that although teacher training at university is supposed to provide preservice teachers with scientific understandings and beliefs about teaching at primary level, it fails to do so and teaching staff fails to be good models in preservice teachers’ minds in terms of shaping their visions about future teaching.

2. Findings about the difference between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences as a whole (previous teachers as models) in terms of their programs

The results of ANOVA test with regard to whether there is a significant difference between the views of seniors from four different programs about their previous education experiences as a whole are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Preservice teachers’ previous education experiences according to program variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of difference</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4585</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>32997</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37582</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< 0.05

Table 3 shows that there is a significant difference between preservice teachers’ views about their previous education experiences as a whole according to their program. Results of the LSD test applied to find the source of difference are given in Table 4.
Table 4. Results of LSD test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School teaching</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science teaching</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies teaching</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math teaching</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< 0.05

Although all of the preservice teachers found their previous teaching experiences not satisfying, since their score are below the average score (X=102.00), preservice Primary School teachers’ views (X_{previous education experience}= 101.86) about their previous education experiences differ significantly from the views of all of the other preservice teachers, and preservice Math teachers’ views (X_{previous education experience}= 94.74) about their previous education experiences differ significantly from those of preservice Science teachers (X_{previous education experience}= 89.11). Based on this finding, it can be interpreted that preservice Primary School teachers had previous teachers who actually did the mentioned pedagogical activities more compared to the previous teachers of other preservice teachers, or this is a matter of perception and preservice Primary School teachers perceive it higher, while the other preservice teachers actually had poorer teachers in the past or they perceive them so now. The same is also true for the difference between preservice Math teachers and science teachers.

3. Findings about the difference between preservice teachers’ visions of future teaching in terms of their programs

The results of ANOVA test with regard to whether there is a significant difference between the views of seniors from four different programs about their visions for future teaching are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Preservice teachers’ visions for future teaching according to program variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of difference</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25996</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< 0.05

Table 5 shows that there is a significant difference between preservice teachers’ visions for future teaching (what kind of a teacher they want to be) according to their program. The results of the LSD test applied to find the source of difference are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of LSD test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School teaching</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science teaching</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< 0.05

As it is seen in LSD table, preservice Primary School teachers’ views (X_{visions about future teaching} = 140.35) about what kind of a teacher they want to be (their vision of future teaching) are significantly higher than preservice Science teachers’ visions (X_{visions about future teaching} = 135.46) and preservice Math teachers’ visions (X_{visions about future teaching} = 134.66) for future teaching. Based on this finding, it can be interpreted that preservice Primary School teachers have higher aspirations about
their future career, so that they are more likely to perform the pedagogical teaching behaviors in the future more than Science and Math teachers. This can be a result of persistent teacher beliefs possibly formed by the better previous educational experiences of the preservice Primary School teachers as the literature suggests (Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Chan, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1989; Lortie, 1975; Pajares, 1992; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Additionally, this superiority of preservice Primary School teachers can be attributed to the overrepresentation of theoretical and practical courses in their curriculum which enable them to comprehend the teaching-learning procedures better.

4. Findings about the difference between preservice teachers’ previous education experiences as a whole (previous teachers as models) in terms of their gender

The results of t test with regard to whether there is a significant difference between the views of female and male preservice teachers about their previous education experiences as a whole are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Preservice teachers’ previous education experiences according to gender variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97.48</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< 0.05

Table 7 shows that in the first place both female and male preservice teachers think that their previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) were not good enough in quality as the means were lower than average. Nevertheless, a comparison between female and male preservice teachers’ views about their previous education experiences as a whole yielded a significant difference in favor of the female preservice teachers. These findings suggest that although both genders do not perceive their former teachers as pedagogical enough, female ones seem to have had relatively better previous experiences or they perceive so.

5. Findings about the difference between preservice teachers’ visions of future teaching in terms of their gender

The results of t test with regard to whether there is a significant difference between the views of female and male preservice teachers about visions for future teaching are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Preservice teachers’ visions for future teaching according to gender variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>139.87</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>134.96</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< 0.05

Table 8 shows that firstly both female and male preservice teachers think that (or their visions for future teaching point to the fact that) they quite want to be a teacher in the future who will meet the qualifications of a good teacher. Secondly, the comparison between female and male preservice teachers’ visions about future teaching yielded a significant difference in favor of the female preservice teachers. These findings suggest that while both genders want to be good teachers who meet pedagogical requirements, female ones seem to have higher aspirations with respect to being better teachers in the future compared to male preservice teachers. Given the similar results about the previous education experiences, it can be interpreted that female preservice teachers with relatively better previous education experiences now have significantly higher visions about their future teaching.
DISCUSSION and CONCLUSIONS

Ng et al. (2009) quotes that pre-service teachers bring with them to educational faculties a set of well-established beliefs about teaching that are firm and resistant to change. These beliefs can be either favoring or disfavoring effective teaching. When latter is true, teacher educators must diagnose and change those beliefs that hinder the efficacy of teacher education (Raths, 2001). This study aimed first of all to diagnose such beliefs by investigating the association between preservice teachers’ views about their previous formal education experiences in primary, secondary and higher education (their previous teachers as models) and what kind of a teacher they want to be in the future (their visions for future teaching). Also these views of theirs about past and future were tested for possible significant differences in terms of department and gender. The results of the analyses were discussed below.

There was a significant association between their visions about future teaching and their primary school experiences (but not the other stages), which is probably because they will be primary school teachers in the future. This finding of the study seems in agreement with the relevant literature (Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Chan, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1989; Lortie, 1975; Pajares, 1992; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000; Zeichner & Liston, 1987), which suggest that teachers’ beliefs about teaching are affected by their experiences in their previous education. This very finding also seems to support the view that some of the basic concepts about teaching are acquired in childhood experiences (as early as six years old) and are more resistant to change (Raths, 2001; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000). Thus, in the present study, too, the earliest educational experiences (primary school experiences) were found to have an association with preservice teachers’ beliefs about their future teaching.

Among four programs, Primary School teachers were found to have had significantly the best educational experiences in the past, though they still find their previous experience (former teachers as models) not sufficient as their total score is below the average. Another difference was also observed between preservice Math teachers’ views about their previous education experiences and those of preservice Science teachers in favor of the former group. Accordingly the preservice Primary School teachers, who had significantly the highest scores regarding their previous educational experiences, were found to have significantly higher aspirations about their future career, so that they are more likely to perform the pedagogical teaching behaviors in the future. Given this finding that primary school teachers both have significantly better previous educational experiences and better beliefs about future teaching, it can be concluded that better educational experiences tend to form better teaching beliefs, but there is no significant association between poor previous experiences and worse teaching beliefs. Also theoretical and practical courses in the teacher training curricula which provide the preservice teachers with knowledge and skills about effective teaching-learning procedures might have played a complementary role enriching their teacher beliefs (Cheng, et al. 2009).

With respect to gender, both female and male preservice teachers were found to think that their previous education experiences (previous teachers as models) were not good enough in quality, while female preservice teachers’ views about their previous education experiences as a whole yielded a significantly higher score over male preservice teachers. As for the preservice teachers’ visions for future teaching, both genders quite want to be good teachers meeting the qualifications accordingly. Moreover, the comparison between two genders about future teaching yielded a significant difference in favor of the female preservice teachers. The literature about the teacher beliefs similarly points to the superiority of female in terms of having more approved teaching beliefs e.g. constructivist beliefs in general (as cited in İsköstğlu et al., 2009) or beliefs regarding student-centeredness, being supportive and well organised (as cited in Ng et al., 2009).

In the light of the findings of this study, the following can be suggested:

1. This study can be replicated expanding the sample to include preservice teachers in other programs by detailing the education-instruction activities for certain educational stages.
2. In this study, it was found that preservice teachers see their experiences in higher education not good enough to take as models. Moreover no correlation was found between students’ visions for future teaching and their higher education experiences. This finding indicates that teaching staff at the department of primary education can not provide students with good models. Thus, teaching staff in educational faculty should be emphasized that how they conduct their lessons and do the activities should represent a miniature of primary schools, since their way of teaching is consciously or unconsciously posing a model for their students.

3. If the prospective Primary School teachers’ higher aspirations in terms of performing pedagogical activities in the future (thus becoming good teachers) can be attributed to the overrepresentation of theoretical and practical courses in their curriculum which enable them to comprehend the teaching-learning procedures better, the other programs (Science, Social Studies and Math teaching) can also include in their curricula such practices more.
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Öğretmen Adaylarının Geçirdikleri Örgün Eğitim Yaşantıları ve Nasıl bir Öğretmen Olmak İstediğlerine dair Görüşler


Yöntem: Çalışma taraiki modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın evreni 2003-2004 akademik yılında İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesinin İlköğretim Bölümü’nde (Fen Bilgisi Öğretmenliği, İlköğretim Matematik Öğretmenliği, Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenliği ve Sinif Öğretmenliği) öğrencilerine devam eden 300 son sınıf öğrencisi oluşturulmaktadır. Tabakalı örneklemde toplam 210 son sınıf öğrencisi工作室 oran olarak seçilmişdir. Veri toplamak amacıyla araştırımlar tarafından geliştirilen ve etkili bir öğretmen süreciyle ilgili 68 maddeden oluşan bir ankete formu kullanılmıştır. İki bölümden oluşan ankette formunun ilk bölümünde yer alan 34 madde, öğretmen adaylarının geçmiş öğrenme yaşantılarını soruları maketmaktadır. İkinci bölümde ise gelecekte nasıl bir öğretmen olmak istedikleriyle ilgili görüşlerini belirlemek amacıyla bu 34 madde yenden düzenlenerek sorulmuştur. Eksik ve hatalı ankett formları atıftaktan sonra çalışanın örneklem grubu toplam 190 kişi olarak belirlenmiştir.
