

**PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' AND  
SUPERVISORS' VIEWS ON SUBJECT  
AREA COMPETENCY LEVELS OF ELT  
PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi**

**Elmas SÜNTAR**

**Eskişehir 2021**

**PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' AND SUPERVISORS' VIEWS ON SUBJECT  
AREA COMPETENCY LEVELS OF ELT PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS**

**Elmas SÜNTAR**

**MA THESIS  
Department of Foreign Language Education  
MA in English Language Teaching Program  
Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya İPEK**

**Eskişehir  
Anadolu University  
Graduate School of Educational Sciences  
July 2021**

## **APPROVAL OF JURY AND THE INSTITUTION**

## ÖZET

### ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ VE DANIŞMANLARIN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ KONU ALAN YETERLİLİK DÜZEYLERİNE İLİŞKİN GÖRÜŞLERİ

Elmas SÜNTAR

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı  
İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programı

Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Temmuz 2021

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hülya İPEK

Bu çalışma, İngilizce Öğretmenliği aday öğretmenlerinin konu alanı yeterlilik düzeylerine ilişkin danışmanların ve aday öğretmenlerin algılarını araştırmayı ve karşılaştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu amaçla, bu çalışma açıklayıcı sıralı karma yöntem tasarımı kullanmıştır. Çalışmanın ilk aşamasında, 51 aday öğretmen ve 15 danışmandan nicel veri toplamak için İngilizce Öğretmeni Özel Alan Yeterlilik Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın ikinci aşamasında, derinlemesine nitel veri toplamak için dört aday öğretmen ve dört danışman ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Nicel veriler betimsel istatistik yöntemiyle ve nitel veriler içerik analizi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, aday öğretmenlerin ve danışmanların aday öğretmenlerin konu alanlarında yetkin olduğuna inandığını ortaya koymuştur. Danışmanlar ve aday öğretmenler, aday öğretmenleri en yeterli olarak Dil Becerilerini Destekleme konusunda, en az yeterli olarak Ölçme ve Değerlendirme konusunda algılamışlardır. Bununla birlikte, aday öğretmenlerin yetkinliklerine ilişkin öz algıları, danışmanların aday öğretmenlerin konu alanı yetkinliği hakkındaki görüşlerinden daha yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. En önemli fark aday öğretmenlerin kendilerini yeterli, ancak danışmanların aday öğretmenleri kısmen yeterli olarak algıladığı Ölçme ve Değerlendirme kategorisinde bulunmuştur. Görüşme sonuçları aday öğretmenlerin geliştirmesi gereken, öğrenciler için uygun dinleme pasajları bulmak, mesleki gelişim faaliyetlerini planlamak, öğrencilere hazırlıksız konuşma görevleri vermek vb. gibi bazı konu alanı yeterliliklerini tanımlamıştır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** İngilizce öğretmenleri, Yeterlilik, Konu alan yeterliliği, Aday öğretmenler, Danışmanlar

## ABSTRACT

### PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' AND SUPERVISORS' VIEWS ON SUBJECT AREA COMPETENCY LEVELS OF ELT PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

Elmas SÜNTAR

Department of Foreign Language Education  
MA Program in English Language Teaching

Anadolu University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, July 2021

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya İPEK

The present study aimed to investigate and compare supervisors' and pre-service teachers' views of subject area competency levels of English Language Teaching pre-service teachers. Within this aim, this study adopted the explanatory sequential mixed method design. In the initial phase of the study, the English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale was utilized to collect quantitative data from 51 pre-service teachers and 15 supervisors. For the second phase of the study, semi-structured interviews with four pre-service teachers and four supervisors were conducted to gather in-depth qualitative data. The quantitative data were analyzed descriptively, and the qualitative data were analyzed using content analysis. The findings revealed that pre-service teachers and supervisors viewed pre-service teachers as competent in their subject areas. Pre-service teachers were perceived as the most competent in Supporting Language Skills and the least competent in Assessment and Evaluation by supervisors and pre-service teachers. However, pre-service teachers' self- perspectives of their competency were higher than supervisors' views on pre-service teachers' subject area competency. The most significant difference was found in the Assessment and Evaluation category, in which pre-service teachers considered themselves competent, whereas supervisors perceived pre-service teachers as moderately competent. The interview results identified some subject area competencies that pre-service ELT teachers might need to improve, such as finding appropriate listening passages for the learners, planning professional development activities, giving unprompted speaking tasks to the students, etc.

**Keywords:** English language teachers, Competency, Subject area competency, Pre-service teachers, Supervisors

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya İPEK for her continuous support, feedback and encouragement. Without her invaluable guidance and persistent help, this thesis would not have come to an end.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee: Prof. Dr. Belgin AYDIN, Assoc. Prof. Dr. İlknur İSTİFÇİ, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali MERCÇ and Asst. Prof. Dr. Gonca SUBAŞI for their useful comments and constructive suggestions for my study.

In addition, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the administration of Anadolu University English Language Teaching Program for allowing me the opportunity to pursue my graduate study. I would also express my gratitude to all pre-service teachers and supervisors for their participation in the process of data collection.

Above all, my eternal thanks and gratitude go to my mother, Emine SÜNTAR and my father, Alaattin SÜNTAR for their love and unwavering belief in me. Besides, I would also like to thank my sister, Reyhan ERTUĞRUL who always encouraged and motivated me to complete this process. I have always felt very lucky thanks to her.

Last but not least, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my love, Rıdvan İVACIK for his unconditional support and encouragement throughout the process of conducting this study.

Elmas SÜNTAR

Eskişehir 2021

Tarih :

### ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYGUNLUK BEYANNAMESİ

Bu tezin bana ait, özgün bir çalışma olduğunu; çalışmamın hazırlık, veri toplama, analiz ve bilgilerin sunumu olmak üzere tüm aşamalarında bilimsel etik ilke ve kurallara uygun davrandığımı; bu çalışma kapsamında elde edilen tüm veri ve bilgiler için kaynak gösterdiğimi ve bu kaynaklara kaynakçada yer verdiğimi; bu çalışmamın Anadolu Üniversitesi tarafından kullanılan “bilimsel intihal tespit programı”yla tarandığını ve hiçbir şekilde “intihal içermediğini” beyan ederim.

Herhangi bir zamanda, çalışmamla ilgili yaptığım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya çıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonuçlara razı olduğumu bildiririm.

İmza

Öğrencinin Adı Soyadı

..../..../20....

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND RULES**

I hereby truthfully declare that this thesis is an original work prepared by me; that I have behaved in accordance with the scientific ethical principles and rules throughout the stages of preparation, data collection, analysis and presentation of my work; that I have cited the sources of all the data and information that could be obtained within the scope of this study, and included these sources in the references section; and that this study has been scanned for plagiarism with “scientific plagiarism detection program” used by Anadolu University, and that “it does not have any plagiarism” whatsoever. I also declare that, if a case contrary to my declaration is detected in my work at any time, I hereby express my consent to all the ethical and legal consequences that are involved.

.....

**(Signature)**

.....

**(Name and Surname of the Student)**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
COVER PAGE.....	i
APPROVAL OF JURY AND THE INSTITUTION .....	ii
ÖZET .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND RULES.....	vii
ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYGUNLUK BEYANNAMESİ.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xii
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background of the Study .....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study .....	4
1.4. Significance of the Study .....	4
1.5 Definitions .....	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	7
2.1. Teacher Competencies .....	7
2.2. Subject Area Competencies of Teachers.....	10
2.3. Related Research in Literature.....	13
2.3.2. Research on Subject Area Competency of In-service English Language Teachers.....	13
2.3.3. Research on Subject Area Competency of Pre-service English Langauge Teachers.....	17

	<u>Page</u>
<b>3.METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.2. Research Setting and Participants.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.3. Instruments.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>3.3.1 English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.3.2. Semi-structured interviews .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.4. Data Collection Procedure .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.5. Data Analysis .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4. RESULTS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.1. Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-Service Teachers.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4.2. Supervisors’ Perspectives on Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-         Service Teachers.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.3. Comparison of Pre-service Teachers’ and Supervisors’ Perspectives on         Pre-service Teachers’ Subject Area Competency .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>4.4. Interview Results.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.4.1. General subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.4.2. Supporting language skills competency levels of pre-service                 teachers .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>4.4.3. Organizing learning-teaching environment competency levels of                 pre-service teachers .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>4.4.4. Assessment and evaluation competency levels of pre-service                 teachers .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>5.1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>5.2. Perceived Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-service Teachers.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>5.3. Views of Supervisors on the Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-         Service Teachers.....</b>	<b>67</b>

	<u>Page</u>
<b>5.4. Comparison of Pre-service' and Supervisors' Views.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>5.5. Conclusion and Implications.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>5.5. Limitations and Suggestions for further researches .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE</b>	

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Table 2. 1.</b> General teacher competencies (MoNE, 2017a) .....	10
<b>Table 2.2.</b> Subject area competencies for English language teachers (MoNE,2017b) ..	12
<b>Table 2.3.</b> Empirical studies on subject area competency levels of in-service teachers	16
<b>Table 3. 1.</b> Demographic information of pre-service English language teachers .....	29
<b>Table 3. 2.</b> Demographic information of supervisors .....	30
<b>Table 3.3.</b> Research design.....	34
<b>Table 4.1.</b> The criterion levels of the English teacher subject area competency scale ..	36
<b>Table 4.2.</b> Pre-service teachers’ views on their subject area competencies .....	36
<b>Table 4.3.</b> Pre-service teachers’ views of their supporting language skills competency .....	36
<b>Table 4.4.</b> Pre-service teachers’ views of their assessment and evaluation competency .....	38
<b>Table 4.5.</b> Pre-service teachers’ views of their organizing learning-teaching environment competency .....	39
<b>Table 4.8.</b> Supervisors’ views on subject area competencies of pre-service teachers ...	40
<b>Table 4.9.</b> Supervisors’ views of supporting language skills of pre-service teachers....	41
<b>Table 4.10.</b> Supervisors’ views of assessment and evaluation competency of pre- service teachers .....	43
<b>Table 4.11.</b> Supervisors’ views of organizing learning-teaching environment competency of pre-service teachers .....	44
<b>Table 4.12.</b> Mann-Whitney U test results for comparison of pre-service teachers’ and supervisors’ views.....	45
<b>Table 4.16.</b> Mann-Whitney U test results of the items for both versions of the scale. ..	46

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

MoNE : Ministry of National Education

PT : Pre-service Teacher

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1. Background of the Study**

English, as it has become a widespread language worldwide, has become one of the most crucial courses in most of the countries in the world (Aktaş, 2019). In the globalizing world, it is now very significant to be a world citizen, to be integrated with the world, to be aware of the developments in the world at the same time with everyone and therefore to know English. For this reason, students should learn the English language by heart, and there should be a norm for language teaching to ensure the quality of education.

The standard of language teaching activities has been under review for years. In the last decade, the investigation's focus has moved its direction from the quest for the right language teaching approaches to the investigation of best practices for developing teaching as a discipline. Language teaching practices in Turkey have also changed throughout the years. First the English language has become a compulsory course in our country. Foreign language, which was taught in the 1st grade of the secondary school prior to 1997, has begun to be taught in the 4th grade following an increase in compulsory education to 8 years after 1997. With the introduction of the 4+4+4 school framework for the 2012-2013 academic year, foreign language education has become a component of the curriculum since 2nd grade (Bozavlı, 2015). There have been many developments about language teaching in Turkey, as can be seen, which is why it is essential to have qualified teachers to sustain the required successful education.

Teachers are the most significant assets of an education system, and therefore their competence is of paramount significance to the quality of the teaching process (MoNE, 2017). The quality of teachers also corresponds with the academic successes of students (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002) and career progress of the teachers (Bellibaş & Gümüş, 2016). English language teachers are the people accountable for teaching English. Thus, teacher candidates, when graduating from the education faculty, must have the skills required by their field. These skills, which are essential for teachers to acquire, have been described as competencies.

Competency is a concept that can be identified as someone's ability to perform effectively based on knowledge and skills towards the situations (Eurydice, 2002). That implies both requisitions of attainable expertise and skills and being efficient to apply them in certain circumstances (Westera, 2001). In this regard, teacher competencies can

be described as a singular concept that includes implicit and explicit knowledge, consisting of cognitive and practical skills, in addition to units, motivation, beliefs, and emotions (Rychen & Salganik, 2003). At this point, the importance of teacher training programs emerges. The main goal of the teacher training programs is to improve and make student teachers acquire teacher competencies by empowering pre-service teachers to act professionally (Koster & Dengerink, 2008; Tanrıverdi & Apak, 2013). The Ministry of National Education (MoNE), which recognizes the importance of teacher training programs for student teachers to gain teacher competencies, has made work on this subject. Since 1999, MoNE has conducted various studies on teacher competencies to empower teacher education and secure quality. In 2017, MoNE developed a set of competencies named General Teacher Competency (GTC) which all teachers should have, taking into account national and international improvements in technology and sociological advances.

Moreover, in addition to GTC, subject area competencies are established for each field by MoNE. Subject area competencies are the knowledge, skills and attitudes that teachers should have about their field in order to make their profession more effective and useful (MoNE, 2017). While general teacher competencies express the competencies that all teachers should have, the subject area competencies or sometimes referenced as special field competencies refer to the competencies that should be found in the branch teacher of the relevant course. MoNE has drawn up a set of categories regarding the subject area competencies of English language teachers, including five main competencies, 26 sub-competencies and 158 performance indicators.

An English teacher in Turkey should have the competencies set by MoNE (2017b) to teach English adeptly to their students, and teacher training programs are the place that teachers of the future acquire these competencies. Therefore, it is vital to determine to what extent English pre-service teachers have special field competencies and/or subject area competencies before they graduate from their programs. To improve the quality of the teaching programs, first, the current situation should be determined. For this reason, establishing the subject area competence levels of English language teachers is deemed necessary both in terms of the professional development of English language teachers and in terms of increasing the quality of English language teaching.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

The importance of learning English, the lingua franca of contemporary international communication, is growing daily, and an increasing number of people worldwide want to learn English effectively for a variety of purposes. Such a demand necessitates the recruitment of qualified English language teachers and, as a result, the provision of high-quality teacher education in the English language. Karacaoğlu (2008) notes that there is a connection between teacher qualifications and curriculum outcomes. He acknowledges that the three critical factors in achieving educational goals are precisely planned lesson plans, trained instructors, and successful implementation. In this respect, it is expected for English language teachers to possess the necessary skills for creating lesson plans, managing classrooms, maintaining track of students' progress, and administering appropriate assessments. To put it another way, they must acquire the necessary competencies to become an English language teacher during their university education before starting to teach in real classrooms. In order to determine the subject area competencies of ELT pre-service teachers in the Turkish context, several studies were conducted. In these studies, the subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers were found as high (Kömür, 2010; Polat, 2010; Kızılaslan, 2011; Sharbain & Tan, 2012; Balyer, 2017; Yüksel & Sağlam 2018; Dinler, 2019). However, the Ministry of National Education in Turkey established Subject Area Competencies for English language teachers in 2017, therefore, additional studies are required in a variety of contexts nowadays, as subject area competencies evolve and are updated over time and little is known about the extent to which pre-service teachers meet these competencies prior to graduation and becoming teachers (Atmaca, 2017; Atmaca, 2018; Aktaş, 2019).

Additionally, despite the emphasis on language subject area competencies and teacher quality, little is known about the perspectives of other stakeholders, such as supervisors, on pre-service English language teachers' subject area competencies. While supervisors are aware of pre-service teachers' subject area competencies due to their observation during teaching practicum, their perspectives are frequently ignored and under-investigated. Their views may contain information that pre-service teachers are unable to provide. Thus, it is crucial to investigate supervisors' views as well as self-perspectives of pre-service teachers.

Given the paucity of research on the subject area competency levels of pre-service ELT teachers, as well as supervisors' perspectives upon that, there is a need to investigate these concepts in greater depth. This study is guided by these facts and intends to

investigate the subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers studying at a state university in Turkey from the perspectives of pre-service teachers and supervisors, and to compare their perspectives in order to ascertain similarities and differences.

### **1.3. Purpose of the Study**

This research is intended to analyze and compare the views of the pre-service teachers and their supervisors regarding the Subject Area Competency level of pre-service teachers who are taught in accordance to the subject area competencies developed by the MoNE (2017b).

To this end, this study aims to seek answers for the research questions below:

- 1) What are the viewed Subject Area Competency levels of pre-service English language teachers studying at a state university in Turkey?
- 2) What are the views of supervisors on the Subject Area Competency levels of pre-service English language teachers studying at a state university in Turkey?
- 3) Do the views of supervisors and pre-service English language teachers substantially differ regarding pre-service teachers' English language teaching Subject Area Competency levels?

### **1.4. Significance of the Study**

Pre-service teachers' competency levels have the utmost importance, as they will become the teachers of the future. Investigating the pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels can give us some insight into how competent they perceive themselves in compliance with the standards of MoNE (2017b). The review of the literature reveals that some studies on in-service teachers' self-perspectives to ascertain subject area competency levels (Aydođdu, 2007; Cantekin, 2009; Hol & Aktas, 2013; Odabař-Kararmaz, 2013; Temizel-Zengin & Radmard, 2019). Postgraduate education and teaching experience were found to have a significant impact on the competency levels of in-service teachers and lecturers (Hol & Aktas, 2013; Temizel-Zengin & Radmard, 2019). Researchers also examined pre-service ELT teachers' views of their subject area (Polat, 2010; Kmr,2010; Penn-Edwards,2010; Kızılaslan, 2011; Sharbain & Tan, 2012; Yksel, 2014; Balyer, 2017; Yksel & Sađlam 2018; Dinler, 2019). The majority of studies stated that pre-service teachers' self-perspectives of their competencies were high, and that their views of their competencies increased as they progressed from first to last

year at the university. Nonetheless, a few studies examined pre-service teachers' views of their subject area competency levels as measured by MoNE (2017b) standards in the ELT department (Atmaca, 2017; Atmaca, 2018; Aktaş, 2019). This indicates that pre-service teachers' self-perspectives about their subject area competencies has not been investigated much.

Although many inquiries sought to competency growth of pre-service teachers, they have a general propensity to approach this process primarily from the perspective of student-teachers, leaving the other participants in the shadow. For this reason, other stakeholders' views would be a valuable contribution to the literature to give insights about the ELT pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels. This study is unique in that it will provide information about how supervisors perceive pre-service teachers' competencies and enable us to determine differences and similarities between the opinions of supervisors and pre-service teachers in terms of pre-service teachers' Subject Area Competency levels. A supervisor is a university faculty member who is in charge of preparing, implementing, and evaluating a group of student teachers' practice teaching activities in the Faculty of Education. The role of the supervisors at the university is to mentor pre-service teachers throughout their teaching practicum. However, it is evident that the opinions of supervisors are overlooked as the literature is reviewed.

To this end, to fill the gap in the literature, this study analyzed and compared the Subject Area Competency levels of pre-service teachers from the perspectives of pre-service teachers and their supervisors. The findings will be a significant endeavor in informing researchers and practitioners of the current state of subject area competency levels of ELT pre-service teachers and the views of the of their supervisors concerning these competencies. In this sense, the findings of this study may also shed light on pre-service teachers' strengths and areas of need for improvement.

### **1.5. Definitions**

The following are the definitions and abbreviations for the words that underpin the thesis study's key purpose:

Competency: The ability to do something successfully or efficiently.

Teacher Competencies: Combinations of information, abilities, comprehension, beliefs, and attitudes that result in successful behavior in a given environment.

Subject Area Competencies: Subject Area Competencies are the knowledge, skills and attitudes that teachers should have in relation to their fields in order to make their profession more effective and useful (MoNE, 2008).

Supervisor: A supervisor is a university faculty member who is in charge of preparing, implementing, and evaluating a group of student teachers' practice teaching activities in the Faculty of Education.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

In this chapter, the literature related to the current study is examined. It starts with concepts of competence and moves on to the definition of teacher competencies. Then, it gives information regarding teacher competencies and the General Teacher Competencies finalized in 2017 in Turkey. Moreover, the Subject Area Competencies are discussed in greater detail. After the theoretical introduction, research conducted in the domain is provided. A summary of the literature review is presented at the end of the chapter.

### **2.1. Teacher Competencies**

According to Barnett (1994), competency is related to the capacity to adapt to unanticipated events. He describes it as skills for applying hitherto learned expertise to make proper decisions in various circumstances. Bunda and Sanders (1979) also mention two separate notions of competence. The first is defined as a combination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to perform performance, while the second type of qualifications is treated as the standard for fulfilling tasks. Gündüz (2003) stated that competency could be described as awareness, skills, and attitudes to perform an occupation properly. Likewise, Şahin (2004) addresses the idea of competence as characteristics that must be possessed to accomplish a work or a mission effectively. In the same line with these definitions, according to Gupta (1999), the term refers to "knowledge, skills, personalities, principles, motives, and beliefs that people should have to be efficient at work." The definitions show that competency incorporates both attitudes and cognitive ability to use significant knowledge in particular contexts. In other terms, competence can be seen as a precondition for the proper performance of the occupation.

Teacher competencies can be defined as the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that teachers need to perform their professions efficiently and in line with the definition of competency (Aktaş, 2019). Teachers are the most critical part of the educational system, and it is important to continually challenge and develop the skills needed by the teaching profession for them. They are the implementers of the curriculum, and they need to respond to the changes, use the teaching skills in the teaching process effectively. Their ability to achieve the required level of certification also depends on meeting particular criteria, and teacher competencies are one way to reach this norm (Güneş, 2011).

The most effective way for students to increase their success and personal development is for their teachers to have basic qualifications (MoNE, 2017a). Besides, in the 21st century, the competencies that teachers should have are the fundamental elements that determine the quality of schools and education systems. Thus, teachers from their pre-service teacher (PT) training years to their retirement must continuously improve their field knowledge, update their teaching skills, and keep their passion for teaching (Köksal, 2013; Özdemir, 2016; Koçyiğit, Erdem, and Eğmir, 2020).

In the 21st century, students are expected to acquire knowledge, create, synthesize, apply, and analyze inputs from a wide range of sources and have a good sense of analytical thinking with problem-solving abilities (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Teachers need to be well prepared and competent enough to teach these skills to their students. Darling-Hammond (2000) showed that there is a crucial link between teacher quality and students' success, and increasing the quality of teachers would help students gain the qualities required by the 21st century.

With the emergence of teacher competencies in the late 1990s, researchers have sought to standardize what attributes a qualified language teacher should have. Moreover, numerous researchers have made definitions for teacher competencies to determine standards for eligible teachers. Subject area knowledge, knowledge of learners, knowledge of teaching techniques and procedures, knowledge of the training curriculum, educational background, and educational goals were among the qualifications identified by Shulman (1987). In Europe, the European Association for Quality Language Services (EAQUALS) created a framework called The European Profiling Grid (2011) to ensure the quality of language teaching. This framework consists of four fundamental concepts: qualifications, vital competencies, activating skills, and professionalism.

Kovac, Rafajac, and Buchberger (2014) classified the scope of teacher competencies related to learner characteristics and values, competencies related to contributing to the education system and system growth, competencies related to special field knowledge, professional knowledge and training programs, and competencies related to self-assessment and professional development.

Numerous studies were conducted globally to generate and improve general teacher competencies. Likewise, in the Turkish context, much research was conducted to shape and update teaching competencies in the same way. Gündüz (2003) classified teacher competencies into five categories: personal competencies of the teacher, competencies

for pupils, social competencies, competencies in the area of education process and system, and competencies relevant to teaching as an occupation. Selvi (2010) indicated in her research that the changes of the era affect the educational programs; thus, teachers responsible for operating educational systems need to have professional competencies to cope with these changes. In her research, she underlined nine different competencies a teacher should have in his/her profession: Field Competencies, Research Competencies, Curriculum Competencies, Lifelong Learning Competencies, Social-Cultural Competencies, Emotional Competencies, Communication Competencies, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Competencies, and Environmental Competencies. According to Kilimci (2011), teacher competencies should be replaced with competencies relevant to teachers' dynamics rather than experience, skills, and attitudes. Thus, he has divided educational competencies into two categories: personal and social competencies.

Turkish Education Association (TED) (2009) examined examples related to the development of teaching profession standards in the international field and generated the General Competency for Teaching Profession to increase the quality of education. These competencies are as follows: recognize and understand the curriculum and subject area very well in both the teaching and learning process; plan and implement teaching; monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and students' development; manage the teaching process and student behavior; adapt his/her teaching according to needs and characteristics of the students; collaborate with other teachers and stakeholders; use information technologies effectively; provide effective communication in the teaching-learning environment.

In 1999, the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) conducted the first formal research on teacher competencies. The studies have been implemented in 2002 and sent to teacher training institutions asking to train the pre-service teachers within the framework of these competencies. In 2006, in a project to standardize teacher competencies, MoNE published General Teacher Competencies (GTC). The studies were finalized in December 2017 when MoNE published the latest version of GTC. The finalized GTC has introduced three main competencies, 11 sub-competencies, and 65 performance criteria, presented in Table 2.1. (MoNE, 2017a).

**Table 2. 1.** *General teacher competencies (MoNE, 2017a)*

<b>A. Professional Knowledge</b>
A1. Content knowledge
A2. Pedagogical content knowledge
A3. Knowledge on legislation
<b>B. Professional Skills</b>
B1. Instructional Planning
B2. Creating learning environments
B3. Managing the teaching and learning process
B4. Assessment and evaluation
<b>C. Attitudes and Values</b>
C1. National, moral and universal values
C2. Personal and professional development
C3. Communication and cooperation
C4. Personal and professional development

Teacher competency is defined in various ways by various researchers. However, one thing is certain that teaching competencies required for the profession are initially gained throughout the pre-service education process. Thus, teacher training programs play a decisive role in enabling future teachers to gain competencies. Teacher training programs must give priority to such attributes and competencies.

## **2.2. Subject Area Competencies of Teachers**

Teachers are expected to have deep subject knowledge of their fields. To become an effective teacher, the teacher must first have a strong grasp of his/her subject area knowledge. Therefore, a significant part of the teacher's qualifications constitutes field knowledge, and in teacher training courses, it consists of more than half of the teacher training programs (Çeliköz, 2000). While the teacher's field knowledge and related skills are necessary, they are insufficient on their own. Numerous individuals possess advanced technical abilities and domain knowledge. However, these individuals cannot be considered as effective teachers. The teacher's teaching role entails the transmission of knowledge and skills to the student. His or her field knowledge and skills are of limited value if the teacher lacks the skills or patience to assist the student (Miller and Miller, 2002; Hudson and Hudson, 2016). Therefore, must possess subject-matter knowledge, as well as understanding on how to teach the subject and the necessary abilities in practice. Therefore, pre-service teachers must have a high degree of subject area competency and skills to become competent teachers in the future and transfer knowledge to their students. For that, teacher training education has an important place. Practicum provides opportunities for pre-service teachers to improve themselves and realize their deficiencies

in their subject area competencies. Thus, it is important to determine how well pre-service teachers are equipped with subject area competencies after the practicum. In this way, the effectiveness of practicum can be improved.

Effective language teaching requires a high degree of knowledge and skills of language teachers. Teachers are expected to have both field knowledge and knowledge about students and teaching methods. Teachers need to have subject area competencies for teaching a language effectively.

Some educational institutions and researchers set general standards for subject area competencies for foreign language teachers in various countries. For instance, in 2002 American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) lays out the curriculum requirements for foreign language instructors who want to teach English in the US. In compliance with these requirements, foreign language teacher applicants should: possess an advanced degree of linguistic competence and a strong experience in the target community; know the target language's linguistic features and language learning theories; apply expectations in preparation and training; recognize the student variety; pick and produce suitable resources and pass knowledge from other disciplines into foreign language teaching. On the other side, TESOL International Association (2008) defined eight competency domains for ESL/EFL teachers. These competencies include planning lessons to promote the learners' acquisition, encouraging students to improve themselves, providing learners valuable feedback, having a high level of social, business, and academic English, and being committed to pursuing a professional career.

In Turkey, studies on the determination of the competencies in the subject areas started in 2004. Several workshops were held in order to generalize subject area competencies of English language teachers, practices carried out abroad were investigated, and stakeholders' opinions were solicited. With great effort, researchers developed a draft for English language teachers' subject area competencies. The implementation, analysis of the results, reporting, and evaluation of the data were performed, and the draft was edited in line with the suggestions of the stakeholders, and ultimately the standards were generated in 2008 (MoNE, 2008). Final studies were conducted, and subject area competencies of teachers were finalized by MoNE in 2017.

Table 2.2. presents the categories of subject area competencies for English language teachers developed by MoNE (2017b).

**Table 2.2.** *Subject area competencies for English language teachers (MoNE,2017b)*

<b>A. Planning and Organizing English Teaching Processes</b>
A1. Planning suitable for English teaching
A2. Organizing learning environments suitable for English teaching
A3. Using materials and resources suitable for the English teaching process
A4. Using methods and techniques suitable for the English teaching process
A5. Using technological resources in English teaching
<b>B. Using Language Skills</b>
B1. Helping students develop effective language learning strategies
B2. Enabling students to use English in a correct and understandable way
B3. Improving students' listening/watching skills
B4. Improving students' speaking skills
B5. Improving students' reading skills
B6. Improving students' writing skills
B7. Making applications considering students with special needs and special education.
<b>C. Monitoring and Evaluation of Language Development</b>
C1. Determining the purposes of measurement and evaluation practices regarding English teaching
C2. Using measurement and evaluation tools and methods in English teaching
C3. Interpreting and providing feedback to determine the language development of students
C4. Reflecting the results of measurement and evaluation to determine students' language development
<b>D. Collaborating with School, Family, and Community</b>
D1. To be able to cooperate with families in the development of students' language skills
D2. Cooperating with relevant institutions and organizations, and individuals in understanding the importance of using foreign languages
D3. Ensuring that students realize the meaning and importance of national holidays and ceremonies and actively participate
D4. Managing and Organizing national holidays and ceremonies
D5. Cooperating with the community in making the school a center of culture and learning
D6. Taking social leadership
<b>E. Professional Development in English</b>
E1. Being able to determine professional competencies
E2. Providing personal and professional development in English teaching
E3. Benefiting from scientific research methods and techniques in professional development practices
E4. Reflecting their professional development research on their applications.

Table 2.2. indicates that the Subject Area Competencies for English language teachers consist of five qualification areas: planning and regulation of the teaching process, development of language skills, tracking and evaluation of language development, collaboration with schools, families, and community, and ensuring professional growth in the field.

The first competency area includes the teacher's planning for the course. The teacher selects materials and resources, competes for the use of appropriate teaching technologies. While planning the course, the teacher determines methods and techniques and considers the learners' language development levels, learning styles, interests, and needs. Language skills, the second competency area, includes the ability to improve students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, which are the four dimensions of language. The third competency area is monitoring and evaluation of language

development. This section includes English language teachers' qualifications for identifying, monitoring, and evaluating learners' progress as they learn English as a foreign language. The competence to cooperate with the school, family, and community includes the qualifications for staff, colleague teachers, parents, and social institutions and organizations in the learning-teaching process. The final competence area for ensuring professional development in English is the teacher's awareness of his or her qualifications and shortcomings and openness to self-improvement in this direction.

Subject Area Competencies created by MoNE (2017b) is up-to-date and covers all aspects of English language teaching, considering teaching is a dynamic profession. As society and the world change, inevitably, the duties and responsibilities assigned to teachers will also change, and therefore, it is necessary to make effective practices in pre-service training for teachers to gain the subject area competencies. The more their competencies develop in training, the higher the quality of teaching will be. (Gürten and Demirel, 2010).

### **2.3. Related Research in Literature**

This section discusses relevant international and national research on general teacher competencies of pre-service English language teachers. First, studies on subject area competency of in-service English language teachers are presented. Then, research on pre-service teachers' subject area competencies is provided. Finally, studies on supervisors' views of pre-service teachers' subject area competencies are given.

#### **2.3.2. Research on Subject Area Competency of In-service English Language Teachers**

The views of in-service and pre-service English language teachers on subject area competencies investigated in the literature, and studies involving in-service English language teachers were presented below.

Aydoğdu (2007) conducted a survey design analysis to investigate teachers' views on foreign language competencies. Teachers from primary and secondary schools working at state and private schools (N=123) took part in this analysis and completed a questionnaire developed by the researcher based on the competencies determined by Cambridge ESOL's Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT). According to the findings, teachers

with various educational backgrounds displayed similar views of competence. However, teachers in public schools had a lower degree of perceived self-competence than their colleagues working at private schools. This study found that teachers with more than 11 years of experience prefer to use older ELT methods, whereas teachers with fewer than 5 years of experience have a stronger grasp of current knowledge on theories and practices of ELT. Apart from a few items in the questionnaire, there was no significant difference between male and female participants.

Cantekin (2009) investigated in-service high school English language teachers' subject area competencies and their level of use of these competencies according to certain variables. The scale developed by the researcher to collect data was applied to English language teachers (N = 163). Results showed that the subject area competencies of the teachers working in general high schools were at a high level. According to their view of using competencies, it was determined that their views were also quite high. However, when it comes to using these competencies, the teachers listed some of the obstacles they encounter; they mentioned that their time was limited, the classes were crowded, and there was not enough equipment. The interesting finding in this study is that the communicational competencies of high school English language teachers who graduated from the English language teaching department were lower compared to those who graduated from the English language and literature department and who underwent pedagogical formation. The author indicated that the institute of educational sciences needs to improve PTs' communicational competencies before they graduate and start their career.

Similar to Aydoğdu (2007)'s study, Odabaş-Kararmaz (2013) conducted a study to reveal the views of primary school English language teachers on subject area competencies and determined to what extent this phenomenon is affected by other variables. This study, which used the relational scanning model, included English language teachers (N = 195) who worked in primary schools. The author developed the scale of English language teachers' subject area competencies in line with the competencies determined by MoNE as General Teacher Competencies (GTC) (2008). As a result of the data analysis, it was concluded that teachers' views of competency were quite high. While variables such as in-service training and years of seniority did not cause a significant change in teachers' views of subject competency, female teachers' views were higher in the competency areas of Developing Language Skills and Cooperating

with School, Family, and Society. Additionally, similar to Aydoğdu (2007)'s conclusion, it was found that teachers employed in private institutions were more competent in the area of Language Skills Development competency. This study concluded that teachers who graduated from education faculties had higher views in the field of Language Development Monitoring and Evaluation competency compared to teachers who graduated from other faculties and received formation education.

Temizel-Zengin and Radmard (2019) investigated the professional competencies of English language teachers working at primary and high schools. They implemented the questionnaire called Professional and Communicational Competency Perceptions of English Language Teachers working in General High Schools developed by Cantekin (2009) to gather data from English Language teachers (N=157). The findings indicated that teachers with MA degrees had a higher degree of competencies in acquiring and implementing subject area competencies. When the researchers compared the attainment levels of subject area competence of English language teachers, their ability to use field competencies, and their communication skills in terms of socio-demographic variables, they revealed that variables such as gender and age do not affect teachers' competency levels. Similarly, when the teachers who graduated from the undergraduate program, such as the Primary Education Program of Education Faculties, were evaluated, it was found that it was not important in terms of subject area competence.

In addition to studies with in-service primary, middle and high school English teachers, the subject area proficiency levels of lecturers at Pamukkale University were investigated by Hol and Aktas (2013). According to the competencies identified by the Ministry of Education (MoNE, 2006), the researchers developed a questionnaire called Perception Scale for Turkish Teachers on Special Field Competencies. consisting of 34 Likert-type items about specific field competencies. The lecturers (N = 35) who took part in the study were found to have high levels of competence. The findings revealed that lecturers with a doctorate degree had higher self-perspectives of their competency levels, implying that teachers with higher education levels have higher self-perspectives of their competency levels.

The studies mentioned previously shed light on the subject area competencies of in-service English language teachers. These studies investigated English language teachers working at primary, elementary and high schools. The views of instructors at the universities were also investigated. The studies concluded that English language teachers

were competent in their subject areas and that as they became more educated, such as by earning a doctorate degree, they became more competent. Knowledge in this area reveals opportunities to enhance teacher competencies and thus educational success.

Table 2.3 presents the studies conducted to determine subject area competencies of in-service teachers in Turkey.

**Table 2.3.** *Empirical studies on subject area competency levels of in-service teachers*

Study	Aim(s)	Participant(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Aydođdu (2007)	to investigate teachers' views on teaching competencies in foreign languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 123 ELT teachers working at primary and secondary schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Foreign Language Teaching Competences questionnaire by Aydođdu (2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependence of Teachers' views of teaching competencies on their graduate department.</li> <li>• higher level of competency in some areas for private school teachers</li> <li>• more up-to-date competency for teachers with less than 5-year experience</li> <li>• implementation of older approaches by ELT Teachers with more than 11-year experience</li> </ul>
Cantekin (2009)	to establish English language teachers' professional and communicational competencies levels and their level of implementing these competencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 163 ELT teachers working at high schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "English Professional Competencies Scale " developed by Cantekin (2009)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher Self-perspective levels of participants of communicational and professional competencies</li> <li>• lower self-perspective of teachers from other departments</li> </ul>
Odabaş Kararmaz (2013)	determine the subject area competency levels of elementary school English language teachers and its relationship with some variables (gender, faculty they have graduated, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 195 ELT in-service teachers working at primary schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English language teachers' subject area competencies scale by Odabas-Kararmaz (2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher subject area competency levels of ELT teachers</li> </ul>

**Table 2.3** (Continued) *Empirical studies on subject area competency levels of in-service teachers*

Study	Aim(s)	Participant(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Temizel-Zengin & Radmard (2019)	explore the usage of professional competencies of English language teachers and examine the relationship between some	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>157 ELT teachers working at primary and high schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"English Professional Competencies Scale " developed by Cantekin (2009)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A higher degree of subject area competencies in teachers with MA degrees</li> <li>No impact of variables such as gender, graduation departments on teachers' competency levels</li> </ul>
Hol & Aktas (2013)	give insights on details of the subject area competencies of non-native English instructors at a state university and determine the relationship between these competencies in terms of different variables. (gender, academic level, the department they have graduated)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35 non-native English language lecturers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A competency questionnaire developed according to the subject area competencies set by MoNE (2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher instructors' self-perspectives about their competencies</li> <li>the highest scores for developing language skills and the lowest scores for professional development</li> <li>No difference for gender variable</li> <li>The highest self-perspective for instructors with a Ph.D. degree</li> </ul>

### 2.3.3. Research on Subject Area Competency of Pre-service English Language Teachers

Along with in-service teachers' views of subject area competencies, research was conducted to elucidate pre-service teachers' views.

Kömür (2010) conducted a study to determine the relationship between PTs' teaching knowledge, competencies, and practicum experience. Senior year English language pre-service teachers (N=39) participated in this study. They completed The Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT) by Cambridge English (2005), Teacher Competency Scale, and an open-ended questionnaire. According to the results of the competence questionnaire, the self-perspectives of pre-service teachers on their competencies were high. After data collection, pre-service English language teachers who took the open-

ended questionnaires reported facing difficulties with grammar instruction, classroom management, and language skills instruction during the practicum.

Similar to Kömür (2010), Kızılaslan (2011) conducted a study to examine the competency of teaching language skills of English pre-service teachers (N = 21). However, in this study, where the data were collected through semi-structured interviews, all participants were selected from prospective teachers who were doing an internship at the primary education level. The subject area competencies prepared by the Ministry of National Education (2008) were taken as a basis for the questions to be asked in the interview. The results revealed that although the prospective teachers recognized and emphasized the importance of teaching listening and speaking skills, they were not fully competent in teaching these skills. It was determined that the teacher candidates neither emphasized nor applied an integrated teaching approach in their teachings. However, unlike their ability to teach writing skills, PTs were relatively more competent in teaching reading skills.

Sharbain and Tan (2012) conducted their research to determine the relationship between English language pre-service English language teachers' competency levels and their attitudes toward the teaching profession. The total number of the participants was 41 senior ELT PTs. They implemented an observation card adapted from a questionnaire developed by Barzaq (2007) to determine PTs competencies. The attitude questionnaire was adapted and translated from Üstüner, Demirtaş, and Cömert's (2006) attitude scale. They concluded that the training provided for prospective teachers made them more competent and made their attitude more positive. The development of PTs' abilities resulted in an increase in their attitudes toward teaching. They determined that the more competent a pre-service teacher is, the more optimistic he or she is about pursuing a career in education.

Yüksel (2014) showed how qualified pre-service teachers acknowledge themselves as potential English language teachers. 40 senior year PTs participated in the study, and completed the self-assessment tool for teaching competencies by Fer (2007) and wrote a teaching philosophy paper as a task for practicum. The results unveiled that PTs' teaching competency level was medium which contradicted to other researches that concluded pre-service teachers had high level of competency (Kömür, 2010; Balyer 2017; Yüksel and Sağlam, 2018; Aktaş, 2019). Besides PTs expressed that they need improvement at

classroom management and to learn how to work with a diverse population. Finally, the study yielded that PTs emphasize using technology in classroom teaching.

Balyer (2017) investigated PTs' views of their competencies by applying a survey design. The researcher chose a larger sample group to represent the universe, 993 senior year PTs from different disciplines (English Language Teaching, Mathematics Teaching, Science and Technology Teaching) from 3 state universities completed the Pre-Service Teachers Competence Scale (PTCS) adapted from Foster's "INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers (2001). Subject knowledge, knowledge of the learning and teaching process, ability to implement and develop instructional strategies, and adaptability to development were the subscales. The finding unveiled that pre-service teachers considered themselves competent in all four sub-categories. There was no significant difference in terms of gender in the results. It was concluded that pre-service English language teachers had significantly higher self-perspectives of teacher competency compared to PTs from the departments of Mathematics Teaching and Science and Technology Teaching.

Yüksel and Sağlam (2018) examined the cross-sectional teacher competencies of PTs from different grades in the ELT department. The study with 132 PTs transformed the General Teacher Competencies (GTC) indicators into items, thus implementing the survey method design. The findings yielded comparable research findings as prospective teachers consider themselves competent in most areas of competence. The views of 2<sup>nd</sup> grade PTs were the lowest, and the views of 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students were the highest, indicating that skills develop over the years. Furthermore, skills linked with professional knowledge developed in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, whereas competencies regarding professional skills developed per grade, starting from 2<sup>nd</sup> grade and reaching its highest point in 4<sup>th</sup> grade.

A descriptive study was conducted by Atmaca (2017) to determine the general and special field competencies of in-service and pre-service English language teachers and to reveal the degree to which English Language Teaching programs provide the competencies determined by the MoNE. 366 students studying in the department of English Language Teaching participated in the research from 4 different universities. Also, 84 English language teachers who teach in various parts of the country were among the participants. Observation forms were used as data collection tools, and two different written interview protocols (WIP) were also applied to obtain information from prospective teachers and in-service teachers. According to the findings, half of the

participating English language teachers think related competencies contribute to their professional identity in a positive way, whereas those who have a negative view proposed things like enhancing teacher image, closing the theory-practice gap, improving their competencies, and reopening teacher training programs. The authors suggest that a systematic approach is needed to introduce, improve, and test competencies in pre-service and in-service teacher training programs.

In a later study, Atmaca (2018) used written interview protocols (WIP) to investigate the perspectives of teacher candidates (N = 213) and in-service (N = 38) teachers on general and English-specific teacher competencies and whether they found these competencies realistic and sufficient, and whether there were parallels and contrasts in the perspectives of in-service and pre-service teachers on these competencies. The results showed that most of both groups had a positive view of the teacher competencies determined by the Ministry of National Education; most teacher candidates stated that these competencies would improve language education. The negative opinions did not find related competencies realistic or sufficient.

Polat (2010) investigated and compared the beliefs of pre-service and in-service teachers regarding their self-efficacy and competencies for teaching profession. The beliefs about readiness and competencies questionnaire (BRCQ) and the beliefs about program improvement questionnaire (BPIQ) were completed by both in-service (N=88) and pre-service (N=83) teachers. In-service teachers had a higher level of competency than pre-service teachers, despite both groups indicating high levels of competency, and in-service teachers demonstrated greater confidence than prospective teachers in terms of readiness.

Using the English Teacher Special Field competencies assessment scale developed by Odabaş-Kararmaz (2013) in his research, Aktaş (2019) investigated the relationship between potential self-efficacy and subject area competencies of prospective English language teachers in the beginning of the profession. The participants of this study were the senior year ELT students at the university in Turkey (N = 357). They completed both prospective self-sufficiency scale of teacher candidates by Tatlı-Dalioğlu (2016) and the English Teacher Special Field competencies assessment scale (Odabaş-Kararmaz, 2013). The study concluded that teacher candidates had a very high level of competency in the field similar to Odabaş-Kararmaz (2013). It was concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between gender and subject area competencies. The analysis

revealed that teacher candidates with higher academic achievement felt more competent in their field. Finally, it was concluded that teacher candidates have a medium and positive relationship between subject area competencies and their expected self.

Dinler (2019) inquired about English language PTs' subject area competencies according to the American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards with a cross-sectional study design. PTs (N=331) from four classes in three different universities in Turkey responded to a questionnaire prepared in line with ACTFL standards. The results showed that PTs' overall self-perspectives of the competencies are ranked high, indicating prospective teachers consider themselves competent. Female PTs compared to males were found to be more competent as in line with the results from other researches. When the class variable is examined, it is discovered that freshmen PTs consider themselves competent in professional development. Authors suggest that this could be due to a lack of self-awareness about their competency levels or because they passed the university entrance exam. Finally, this study reveals that self-perspectives were slightly higher in participants who have taken a preparatory class.

Penn-Edwards (2010) investigated the pre-service teachers' perspectives on the competencies that teachers should obtain and what they should do to enhance their sense of competence. The opinions of first-year students (N=419) at the University of Queensland on the English teacher competencies, and then their opinions on how they viewed themselves in these competence fields were obtained on a self-competence scale. As a result of the study, pre-service teachers identified the competencies that should be in the teacher from most necessary to least useful, with grammar, writing, and punctuation competence being the most relevant and competencies relating to the use of information and interactive systems and visuals being the least. Furthermore, it was determined that PTs perceive themselves most effective in writing and punctuation skills and least adequate literary competencies. Authors conclude that pre-service teachers require training regarding literacy skills explicitly.

Table 2.4. lists the studies on English pre-service teachers' teacher competencies, with information on the participants, the scale of the studies, the aims, the instruments, and the results.

**Table 2.4.** *Empirical studies on subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers*

Study	Aim(s)	Participant(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Kömur (2010)	discover the association between pre-service teachers' views on their competency levels and their teaching knowledge.	• 39 senior ELT PTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT)</li> <li>• the Teacher Competency Scale</li> <li>• an open-ended questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High teacher competencies and competence scores of PTs</li> </ul>
Kızılaslan (2011)	determine whether pre-service teachers have teaching language skills competencies required by MoNE.	• 21 senior ELT PTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semi-structured interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasized teaching speaking and listening skills in PTs</li> <li>• Not implemented holistically and overlooked teaching skills in PTs</li> </ul>
Sharbain and Tan (2012)	determine the relationship between English language pre-service teachers' competency levels and their attitudes toward the teaching profession.	• 41 senior ELT PTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• observation card adapted from a questionnaire developed by Barzaq (2007)</li> <li>• The attitude scale by Ustuner, Demirtas, &amp; Comert's (2006)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training made PTs more competent and made their attitude positive</li> <li>• The growth in skills improved PTs' attitudes towards teaching.</li> </ul>
Yüksel (2014)	discover how competent pre-service teachers recognize themselves as future English language teachers.	• 40 senior ELT PTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching Competencies Self-Assessment Tool by Fer (2007)</li> <li>• Participants' teaching philosophy papers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A medium level of teaching competencies in ELT PTs</li> <li>• More competent in content knowledge and student engagement compared to classroom management</li> <li>• They emphasized the role of technology to create an authentic environment and teach the language</li> </ul>
Balyer (2017)	unveil pre-service teachers' perspectives of their readiness to teach and teaching competencies.	• 993 PTs from 5 departments with different study years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-Service Teachers' Competency Scale (PTCS) by the researcher based on Foster (2001)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PTs perceived themselves as competent</li> <li>• No difference in different genders competency levels</li> </ul>

**Table 2.4.** (Continued) Empirical studies on subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers

Study	Aim(s)	Participant(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Yüksel&Sağlam (2018)	reveal the competencies of pre-service teachers with a cross-sectional approach.	• 132 sophomores, junior, senior ELT PTs	• a questionnaire adapted from General Competencies for Teaching Profession by MoNE (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> grade ELT PTs had the lowest views about their competencies though 4<sup>th</sup> graders had the highest</li> <li>• Professional knowledge developed in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, and professional skills started to improve from 2<sup>nd</sup> grade</li> </ul>
Atmaca (2017)	determine and compare pre-service and in-service teachers' perspectives on teacher identity in terms of teacher competencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 366 ELT PTs</li> <li>• 84 in-service ELT teachers</li> </ul>	• the written interview protocol (WIP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sufficient knowledge of English language teachers and PTs about the competencies they should acquire</li> <li>• Generic and English teacher competencies should be included in teacher trainings</li> </ul>
Atmaca (2018)	investigate the perspectives of teacher candidates and in-service teachers on general and English-specific teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 213 ELT PTs</li> <li>• 38 in-service ELT teachers</li> </ul>	• written interview protocols (WIP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A positive view of the teacher competencies for most of both groups</li> <li>• The negative opinions did not find related competencies realistic or sufficient</li> </ul>
Polat (2010)	unveil the similarities and differences between in- and pre-service teachers' beliefs about readiness, self-competency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 83 in-service ELT teachers</li> <li>• 88 senior ELT PTs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The background information questionnaire (BIQ)</li> <li>• The beliefs about readiness and competencies questionnaire (BRCQ)</li> <li>• The beliefs about program improvement questionnaire (BPIQ)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A higher level of competency in in-service teachers even though both groups indicated high levels of competency</li> <li>• More confidence in readiness for in-service teachers</li> </ul>

**Table 2.4.** (Continued) Empirical studies on subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers

Study	Aim(s)	Participant(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Aktaş (2019)	determine English pre-service teachers' self-efficacy levels and their relationship with subject area competency	357 senior ELT PTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• English language teachers' subject area competencies scale by Odabas-Kararmaz (2013)</li><li>• Teacher Candidates Possible Selves Scale by Dalioglu &amp; Adiguzel (2015)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Higher levels of subject area competency in PTs</li><li>• Higher levels of subject area competency in PTs with a higher academic degree</li></ul>
Dinler (2019)	discover English language PTs' views about their competencies and reveal the similarities and differences in terms of variables (gender, educational background, class)	331 freshman sophomore, junior, senior ELT pre-service teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a scale created according to standards set by American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• High PTs views about their subject area competency in six categories</li><li>• A higher degree of self-perspectives in female PTs</li><li>• A slightly higher degree of self-competency students who have undergone preparatory classes</li><li>• A higher degree self-perspectives in Junior and Freshmen PTs</li></ul>
Penn-Edwards (2010)	evaluate pre-service English language teachers' views of the need for school teacher expertise in a variety of literacies, their level of ability in those areas, and their plans to improve those skills during their teacher training process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 415 freshmen ELT pre-service teachers</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a written opinion survey</li><li>• written comments of pre-service teachers on how they intend to improve themselves about competencies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grammar, writing, and punctuation competence being the most relevant and competencies relating to the use of information and interactive systems and visuals being the least in pre-service teachers</li></ul>

The teaching practicum process is vital for pre-service teachers as it provides student teachers with an opportunity to observe a real classroom environment in which a

real curriculum is implemented with real students. Along with providing a framework for connecting theoretical aspects of teacher education to practicum opportunities, practicum also assists student teachers in developing their individual teaching competencies (Beck and Kosnik 2002). In the teaching practicum system, there are three vital components: pre-service teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors; and they should always be in close contact, as mentoring activities necessitate a strong coalition (Hudson & Hudson, 2010). The first component of teaching practicum is cooperating teachers. In the school practice course, the cooperating teacher is a critical member of the school practice triad because they work closely with pre-service teachers throughout the process. Additionally, cooperating teachers represent practical knowledge in the field and serve as a guide for pre-service teachers regarding teaching practice. A supervisor, which is the second component of teaching practicum, is a member of the faculty at a university who is responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating the practice teaching activities of a group of pre-service teachers in the Faculty of Education and is often considered to have the requisite educational competencies (Hacıoğlu & Alkan, 1997; CHE & World Bank, 1998). University supervisors link theory and practice and make the transition from theoretical knowledge to teaching practice more steady by accompanying pre-service teachers throughout their practicum. Supervisors are anticipated to help pre-service teachers develop their teacher competencies by providing psychological and technical support. (Slick, 1998; Wallace, 1991) It is critical to assist and guide pre-service teachers in practice courses before they begin their careers. As supervisors are generally instructors of pre-service teachers and accustomed to their drawbacks and strengths, they can evaluate and improve pre-service teachers' competency level objectively (Andrew, 2007). By observing and guiding pre-service teachers in a teaching environment, supervisors can decide which competence should be improved and help pre-service teachers develop competencies.

Although numerous studies were carried with pre-service teachers to identify their self-perspectives about their subject area competencies, the views of supervisors seem to be neglected. The only study in this area known to the researcher in Turkish context was conducted by Çakır and Alıcı (2009) who assessed pre-service English language teachers' teaching English from the standpoint of supervisors. This study aimed to compare views of the teaching abilities of pre-service English language teachers (N = 39) with that of the supervisors (N = 5) with utilizing the Scale of Teacher's Perception of Professional

Competence (Güven, 2005). The study discovered that PTs have high self-perspectives; however, it was discovered that supervisors' views on prospective teachers' competencies were not as high as that of the pre-service teachers. To summarize, there was a discrepancy between PTs' self-perspectives and those of their supervisor. Also, the supervisor stated during the interviews that the active teaching experience influenced the PTs' self-perspectives. The author concluded that the results showed the importance of teaching practicum on improving pre-service teachers' competency levels.

As supervisors have adequate theoretical knowledge, know the characteristics of pre-service teachers, and ease the teaching practicum, their views on pre-service teachers' subject area competency level will be more neutral and give insight into the English language teaching process and the effect of practicum on pre-service teachers. When the literature was reviewed, it was evident that the researchers had neglected supervisors' views of pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels. Although supervisors are crucial aspects of teaching practicum and have a significant influence on pre-service teachers' growth, their viewpoints on this matter are largely disregarded.

The literature review indicates that researchers have investigated the general teaching competencies of ELT PTs to show how competent pre-service teachers perceive themselves. Studies have shown that pre-service teachers consider themselves to be qualified. The cross-sectional analysis yielded that competence levels of PTs increase with time, getting better with each passing year. However, Kömür (2010) reported that even though pre-service teachers indicated they are adequate when it comes to the questionnaire, they encountered problems in real-life teaching practices. Thus, it is vital to determine pre-service teachers' competency level objectively and improve it. Temizel-Zengin and Radmard (2019) indicated that the researches in the domain conducted to discover English language teachers' subject area competency levels are inadequate to generalize. Thus, new researches with various participants, such as supervisors, are necessary. Sharbain and Tan (2012) suggested that the perspectives of mentors, principals and supervisors should be included for further researches to compare their views of whether there is a discrepancy among the stakeholders.

It can be stated that the subject area competencies of the ELT pre-service teacher were primarily investigated from the perspective of pre-service teachers, even though it is a system in which supervisors also play equal roles. Supervisors and their roles in shaping the competency view were rarely considered despite their invaluable practical

experience, understanding, and reflection about pre-service teachers' competencies. As a result, this research aims to present a complete picture of the subject holistically. Most previous studies collected data using quantitative methods, primarily student surveys. Furthermore, some studies gathered qualitative data from pre-service teachers through interviews and written reports. In this regard, the current study intends to collect quantitative and qualitative data from pre-service teachers and supervisors via two tools: a subject area competency scale by Çelik, Koç, Çelik (2018) and semi-structured interviews.

### **3.METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

This chapter will provide information about the research design, research setting and participants, instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis. This study aimed to determine and compare pre-service teachers' and supervisors' views on Subject Area Competency levels of ELT pre-service teachers. First, the general perspectives of the participants were determined and then, with the help of qualitative data, a more refined and detailed picture was provided. In this regard, the current study implemented the explanatory sequential design as one of the mixed-method research designs. The explanatory sequential mixed-method designs are those in which the researcher attempts to elaborate or draw on the results of one method using another method (Creswell, 2003). It may include starting a qualitative interview for exploration and follow-up by using a quantitative, sample-based survey approach to generalize findings for a population. Alternately, the research may initiate with a quantitative method in which a hypothesis or idea is tested, followed by a qualitative method involving a thorough exploration of a few cases or individuals. In this study, the latter was chosen to elaborate on the participants' responses. Quantitative data collected through English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale addressed and compared the views of the participants in the first phase. A second qualitative phase further explored the information from the first phase. In the second phase, qualitative interviews were used to assess findings from quantitative data by discussing facets of the competency levels of pre-service teachers. The explanation for the follow-up of qualitative inquiry in the second process was to understand and describe quantitative findings better.

#### **3.2. Research Setting and Participants**

The study was carried out in the English Language Teaching (ELT) department of the Faculty of Education at Anadolu University in the Spring 2020-2021 semester. The participants of the study were 51 pre-service teachers. All participants were 4th-year students enrolled in the "Teaching Practicum" course. In the 2020-2021 Fall Term, pre-service teachers enrolled in the "School Experience" course and assigned to public schools. In normal circumstances, students are expected to observe their cooperating teachers and prepare six microteaching lesson plans. Supervisors would

provide feedback on these lesson plans, and students would implement them during their teaching practicum, receiving feedback from supervisors and cooperating teachers. However, due to Covid-19, students only observed their cooperating teachers through Zoom or EBA classes and wrote lesson plans to which they received feedback from their supervisors. They were required to observe at least two online lessons per week. In the 2020-2021 Spring Term, for the “Teaching Practicum”, pre-service teachers were assigned to public schools for six class hours a week. Normally, pre-service teachers observe their cooperating teachers and prepare six macro-teaching level lesson plans lasting 40 minutes each. Supervisors provide feedback on lesson plans, students implement these plans for six lessons during the teaching practicum course and receive feedback from supervisors and cooperating teachers. Due to Covid-19, pre-service teachers had to complete their teaching practicum through the Zoom or EBA classes which lasted approximately 30 minutes. They observed their cooperating teachers and were expected to conduct at least 4 online classes during a 12-week period. Feedback sessions were provided by their supervisors through either Zoom conferences or a Learning Management Systems such as MERGEN assisted by the university.

For the first phase of the study, a scale to obtain insights into their general perspectives on their subject area competencies was offered to approximately 160 pre-service EFL teachers taking Teaching Practicum course; however, only 51 participants responded to the scale. Their ages ranged from 21 to 25. Within sampling methods, convenience sampling (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2012) was selected and those that were easily available and willing to take part were chosen. In the second phase, four volunteer pre-service EFL teachers attending Teaching Practicum participated for interviews and were interviewed to gain broader understanding of their competencies. Table 3.1. provides information about demographic information of pre-service English language teachers.

**Table 3. 1.** *Demographic information of pre-service English language teachers*

		<b>N</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Gender	Female	29	56.8%
	Male	22	43.2%
The internship school	Elementary	3	5.8%
	Secondary	32	62.8%
	High school	16	31.4%

The other participants in the study were supervisors working at Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, ELT Department. 15 out of 24 supervisors agreed to participate in the study. Each supervisor was responsible for up to 8 pre-service teachers to observe and give feedback. In the 2020-2021 Spring Term, the supervisors gave feedback to pre-service teachers' lesson plans and observed and evaluated pre-service teachers' teaching performance thus they were believed to be able to identify if pre-service teachers were competent in their fields.

First, supervisors completed the scale about pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels and for the second phase of the study, 4 of them were interviewed to unveil supervisors' views in detail. Table 3.2. provides information about demographic information of supervisors.

**Table 3. 2.** *Demographic information of supervisors*

		N	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	10	66.7 %
	Male	5	33.3 %
Years of experience in teaching	1-5 years	0	0%
	6-10 years	4	26.7 %
	11-15 years	3	20 %
	16-20 years	2	13.3 %
	21 years and more	6	40 %
Years of experience in supervising	1-5 years	6	40 %
	6-10 years	4	26.7 %
	11-15 years	0	0 %
	16-20 years	3	20 %
	21 years and more	2	13.3 %

### 3.3. Instruments

The main objective of the current study was to have a deeper understanding of pre-service teachers' perceived subject area competency level from the viewpoints of pre-service teachers and their supervisors. With this purpose, there were two different data collection tools to gather the necessary information. Quantitative data were gathered employing a survey developed by Çelik, Koç, Çelik (2018) in regards to subject area competences of English language teachers.

As a second data collection tool, semi-structured interviews were held with both supervisors and pre-service teachers who volunteered for the second phase of the study to elaborate the answers they provided in the scale.

### **3.3.1 English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale**

The first data collection tool was the English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale (ETSACS) developed by Çelik, Koç, Çelik (2018) (Appendix C). This scale was developed in parallel to MoNE's (2008, 2017b) Subject Area Competencies; however, rather than simply implementing these competencies as indicators, they also investigated the literature on subject area competencies and developed the scale with reliability and validity studies. MoNE's (2017b) subject area competency qualification areas were included on the scale, including Planning and Organizing English Teaching Processes Using Language Skills, Monitoring and Evaluation of Language Development, and Monitoring and Evaluation of Language Development. However, the subcategory of Collaborating with School, Family, and Community was not included to the scale based on an examination of the relevant literature and expert opinions.

The scale consisted of 36 items with 3 sub-categories: Supporting Language Skills Competency, Assessment and Evaluation Competency, and Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment Competency. The sub-category Supporting Language Skills had 16 items, Assessment and Evaluation sub-category had 11 items and finally, Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment sub-category had 9 items. The scale was a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'.

The scale was prepared for in-and pre-service teachers, thus, in order to get supervisors' perspectives, the items of the scale were converted to be suitable for supervisors. The subjects of the original scale's items were subtly changed in the supervisor version. While the items in the original scale had first-person singular subjects (i.e., 'I'), the items in the supervisors' version had third-person singular subjects (i.e., 'He/She') (Appendix D). For example, the item "I can assign writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes" were converted into "He/She can assign writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes" in the supervisors' version or the item "I can give feedback to my students according to assessment results" were converted into "He/she can give feedback to his/her students according to assessment results". The original scale was sent to the pre-service teachers to determine their perceived subject area competency levels, and the supervisor version of the scale was administered to the supervisors to uncover their views on pre-service teachers' competency levels.

### **3.3.2. Semi-structured interviews**

Semi-structured interviews with pre-service teachers and supervisors were conducted to enrich the data collected from the scale. Participants were directed questions based on the results of the scale they completed. Semi-structured interview questions were prepared (Appendix E), parallel to the ETSACS, and according to the results of the scale of the participants. For instance, referring to specific scale items on which they perceived themselves as most incompetent, pre-service teachers were asked, “in the scale you indicated you did not consider yourself competent in supporting language skills, why do you think like that?” or “in the scale you indicated you did not consider yourself competent in assessment and evaluation, why do you think like that?” Supervisors were directed similar questions according to their views on PTs’ subject area competency level such as “in the scale you indicated, you did not perceive pre-service teachers competent in managing teaching and learning environment, why do you think like that?”.

### **3.4. Data Collection Procedure**

Data were gathered in the 2020-2021 Spring Academic year as pre-service teachers began their teaching practicum with the observation of cooperating teachers and supervision of university supervisors. When data collection began, pre-service teachers had already prepared at least one lesson plan and taught at least one online session. The data collection in the study was carried out in two phases. For the first phase of the data collection, after obtaining the required permits for the research (Appendix F), the voluntary participation forms (Appendix A, Appendix B) and the scales were sent to the participants via Google Forms, where participation was offered in compliance with the voluntary protocol. Through their supervisors, the scale was distributed to senior year pre-service teachers enrolled in the "School Experience" course. Supervisors and pre-service teachers were first given general details on the subject, then asked to fill out the survey form. Participants were asked to complete the scale entirely and truthfully. Subsequently, participants were informed that the scale would be completed voluntarily and that they could discontinue participation at any time. Additionally, they were assured that their responses would be kept private and that only the researcher would have access to them for the purposes of the study. The former segment of the scale was prepared to gather demographic details from participants, while the latter section contained 36 items to examine the pre-service teachers’ subject area competency levels.

The demographic information part was prepared to collect background information about the participants. For supervisors, gender and years of mentoring experience were the variables; for pre-service teachers the variables were gender, type of school they attended internship, and their previous teaching experiences if they had any. As this research had two phases, to reach specific participants for further investigation, both pre-service teachers and supervisors who volunteered to participate for the second phase were asked to provide their names and e-mail addresses at the beginning of the scale.

Interviews were held with the participants in online platforms such as Zoom and lasted approximately 20 minutes. Turkish was used as the language of communication in the interviews as it is the participants' native tongue, which allows them to express themselves freely and without fear of language barriers or pressure. The interviews were recorded with the permission of the participants and then transcribed by the researcher.

### **3.5. Data Analysis**

The data collected via the scale were analyzed descriptively. First, the reliability of the instrument was calculated. The reliability scores of the original scale obtained by Çelik, Koç, Çelik (2018) was .93 (Cronbach's alpha) which is considered as a high reliability (Dörnyei, 2007), scores for the subscales were .96 for the first subscale, .90 for the second subscale, and .91 for the third. The reliability score of the instrument when applied with the pre-service teachers of this study was found to be .97 (Cronbach's alpha) which was higher than that of Çelik et. al.'s and considered as having a high degree of reliability (Dörnyei, 2007), and reliability scores for the subscales were .93 for the first subscale, .96 for the second subscale, and .91 for the third, also regarded as having a high degree of reliability (Dörnyei, 2007). The reliability score of the instrument for supervisors was found to be .96 viewed as having a high degree of reliability and reliability scores for the subscales were .92 for the first, .94 for the second, and .92 for the third subscales, also considered to have a high degree of reliability (Dörnyei, 2007).

First, in order to check the normality assumption of the quantitative data, the values of Kolmogorov - Smirnov were examined. To assume the data is normally distributed, Kolmogorov - Smirnov values must be higher than 0 .05 (Field, 2009), and it was found that in this study, the data were significantly non-normal,  $D(66) = 0.00$ ,  $p < .05$ . Therefore, nonparametric test named as Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the data. To answer research questions "1) What are the perceived Subject Area Competency

levels of pre-service English language teachers studying at a state university in Turkey?”, and “2) What are the views of supervisors on the Subject Area Competency levels of pre-service English language teachers studying at a state university in Turkey?”, descriptive statistics were run. The mean scores, standard deviations and frequency values were determined to find out the competency levels of pre-service teachers and views of supervisors on pre-service teachers’ competency levels. Finally, to answer research question “3) Do the views of supervisors and pre-service English language teachers substantially differ regarding pre-service teachers’ English language teaching Subject Area Competency levels?”, Mann-Whitney U test was applied to explore whether there were differences between the views of pre-service teachers and supervisors.

Interviews were held with volunteers for the qualitative part of the study. Responses were recorded with the consent of the participants. Following the interviews, the researcher transcribed each one and used content analysis (Creswell, 2012) to analyze the data. Due to the fact that the questions in semi-structured interviews were tailored to the participants' scale scores, thus, the questions were not identical for all participants. Therefore, rather than establishing themes, each response was analyzed separately. Qualitative data were analyzed one more time after 2 weeks to establish Intra-rater reliability which is a measure of an individual's consistency in measuring a constant phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Thereby it was used to validate the qualitative data analysis. The participants' responses to each question were analyzed a second time by the researcher. Table 3.3. below presents the research design of the study.

**Table 3.3.** *Research design*

<b>Mixed-method Research Design</b>	
Setting	A public university in Turkey
Participants	15 supervisors 51 pre-service teachers
Data Collection Instruments	English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale Interviews with 4 pre-service teachers and 4 supervisors
Data Analysis	Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis

## 4. RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of data analysis will be covered. The findings on pre-service teachers' Subject Area Competency levels will be presented first. After that, the results for the scale's subcategories will be added. Next, the findings on supervisors' views on pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels will be provided. The results related to subcategories and will be presented.

Lastly, the results related to the comparison of pre-service teachers and supervisors' perspectives on pre-service teachers' Subject Area Competency level will be mentioned.

### 4.1. Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-Service Teachers

First, as the scale was designed as 5-point Likert scale, a criterion had to be determined to decide how competent pre-service teachers and supervisors considered pre-service teachers in their subject areas. A way of grouping data suggested by Büyüköztürk, Okluk, and Köklü (2011) was implemented in this study to determine the degree of pre-service teachers' competency levels. In this type of grouping, the scores are divided equally by their statistical limits. First, the difference between the highest and lowest scores that can be obtained for an item on the scale is determined to establish the score interval. The scale measurement levels are then determined. To obtain the identical score interval, the difference is divided by the number of levels. Finally, starting with the lowest score that can be obtained for an item on the scale, interval score is added to the other numbers to determine the levels. In this study, this method was applied as follows: The highest score for an item on the scale was 5 and the lowest was 1 indicating  $5-1=4$ . Measurement criterion levels were determined as five by the researcher and 4 was divided by 5.  $4:5=0.8$  showed that the scale interval was 0.8. According to the results, mean scores ranging from 1.00 to 1.80 were labeled as 'Highly Incompetent', 1.81 to 2.60 were labeled as 'Incompetent', 2.61 to 3.40 were labeled as 'Moderately Competent', 3.41 to 4.20 were labeled as 'Competent' and 4.21 to 5.00 were labeled as 'Highly Competent'. Table 4.1. shows measurement criterion levels and their labels.

**Table 4.1.** *The criterion levels of the English teacher subject area competency scale*

<b>Score Interval</b>	<b>Scale Evaluation</b>
1.00-1.80	Highly Incompetent
1.81-2.60	Incompetent
2.61-3.40	Moderately Competent
3.41-4.20	Competent
4.21-5.00	Highly Competent

To reveal the subject area competency levels of the PTs the mean scores of the PTs were calculated. Table 4.2. presents the findings on PTs' views on their competency levels.

**Table 4.2.** *Pre-service teachers' views on their subject area competencies*

<b>Sub-Dimensions</b>	<b>Mean</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Supporting Language Skills	4.15	.43	4.25	.39	4.00	.44
Assessment and Evaluation	3.96	.45	4.01	.46	3.83	.39
Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment	4.12	.45	4.21	.45	3.98	.42
Grand Mean	4.08	.41	4.17	.40	3.94	.39

According to the findings, PTs viewed their subject area competency level as competent ( $M = 4.08$ ,  $SD = .41$ ). When the subcategories were examined, it was discovered that pre-service teachers considered themselves competent in all three subcategories: Supporting Language Skills ( $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = .41$ ), Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment ( $M = 4.12$ ,  $SD = .45$ ) and Assessment and Evaluation ( $M = 3.96$ ,  $SD = .45$ ) subcategories.

PTs' views on their competency were examined item by item as well. Table 4.3. presents pre-service teachers' scores in the scale in the supporting language skills subcategory.

**Table 4.3.** *Pre-service teachers' views of their supporting language skills competency*

Supporting Language Skills Items	N	Min	Max	M	SD
18. I can help students to express their predictions based on the visuals.	51	3	5	4,45	0,61
19. I can assign writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	4,45	0,58

**Table 4.4.** (Continued) Pre-service teachers' views of their supporting language skills competency

Supporting Language Skills Items	N	Min	Max	M	SD
17. I can create opportunities for students to match the visuals that are related to what they read.	51	3	5	4,39	0,63
12. I can assign prepared speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	4,35	0,66
16. I can ask 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they read.	51	3	5	4,27	0,72
15. I can find texts that will help improve students' reading skills in line with the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	4,29	0,67
20. I can assign tasks that will enable students to write with or without preparation.	51	3	5	4,25	0,59
11. I can ask 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they listen to.	51	3	5	4,24	0,68
13. I can assign impromptu speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	4,24	0,55
6. I can contribute to the student's determination of an appropriate learning strategy (strategies such as repetition, attention, interpretation, etc.) for himself/herself.	51	3	5	4,02	0,76
9. I can find short speeches and videos suitable for learning outcomes that will help improve students' listening skills.	51	3	5	3,98	0,71
10. I can initiate dialogues that will help improve students' speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	3,98	0,73
36. I can motivate my colleagues in order to organize activities that will provide professional development.	51	3	5	3,98	0,62
7. I can contribute to the students' awareness of their own learning style (visual, auditory, physical).	51	3	5	3,86	0,66
8. I can find texts that will help improve students' listening skills in line with learning outcomes.	51	2	5	3,80	0,72
14. I can ask questions to change the direction of the conversation during the speech of the students.	51	2	5	3,90	0,78

As stated by the findings of the first subcategory of the scale items, which focuses on competence in Supporting Language Skills, pre-service teachers considered themselves competent or highly competent in all the items. They viewed themselves the most competent in helping students to express their predictions based on the visuals (Item 18;  $M = 4,45$   $SD = 0.61$ ) and assigning writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 19;  $M = 4,45$   $SD = 0.58$ ). They expressed that they are highly competent in creating opportunities for students to match the visuals that are related to what they read (Item 17;  $M = 4,39$   $SD = 0.63$ ), assigning prepared speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 12;  $M = 4,35$   $SD = 0.66$ ), finding texts that will help improve students' reading skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 15;  $M = 4,29$   $SD = 0.67$ ), assigning tasks that will enable students to write with or without preparation (Item 20;  $M = 4,25$   $SD = 0.59$ ), asking 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they listen to (Item 11;  $M = 4,24$   $SD = 0.68$ ), and assigning impromptu

speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 13;  $M = 4,24$   $SD = 0.55$ ).

The statistical analysis also unveiled some areas that PTs viewed themselves competent. For example, they expressed that they are competent in contributing to the student's determination of an appropriate learning strategy for himself/herself (Item 6;  $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ), finding short speeches and videos suitable for learning outcomes that will help improve students' listening skills (Item 9;  $M = 3.98$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ), initiating dialogues that will help improve students' speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 10;  $M = 3.98$ ,  $SD = 0.73$ ), motivating their colleagues in order to organize activities that will provide professional development (Item 36;  $M = 3.98$ ,  $SD = 0.62$ ). Besides they provided their lowest scores in items 7 and 8; contributing to the students' awareness of their own learning style (Item 7;  $M = 3.86$ ,  $SD = 0.66$ ), and finding texts that will help improve students' listening skills in line with learning outcomes (Item 8;  $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 0.72$ ).

Later, the views of pre-service teachers regarding their Assessment and Evaluation Competency were investigated. Table 4.4. presents PTs' views on their Assessment and Evaluation Competency.

**Table 4.5.** *Pre-service teachers' views of their assessment and evaluation competency*

Assessment and Evaluation Items	N	Min	Max	M	SD
31. I can use alternative assessment and evaluation methods (student portfolio, performance task, project, diaries, etc.) and approaches.	51	2	5	4,27	0,78
35. I can benefit from the results of assessment and evaluation process to improve teaching.	51	3	5	4,22	0,58
23. I can help students give an impromptu speech.	51	3	5	4,20	0,60
22. I can help students improve their listening-watching skills	51	3	5	4,12	0,65
21. I can identify the language skills that students have difficulty with.	51	3	5	3,96	0,69
28. I can plan assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	3,90	0,64
34. I can give feedback to my students according to assessment results.	51	3	5	3,88	0,65
30. I can write different types of questions in line with the learning outcomes (such as true-false, open-ended, fill-in the blanks, short answer, multiple choice, etc.).	51	2	5	3,82	0,71
29. I can prepare questions to assess the learning outcomes.	51	2	5	3,80	0,72
27. I can use assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes.	51	3	5	3,75	0,72
33. I can interpret assessment results effectively.	51	3	5	3,63	0,63

According to the findings of the second subcategory of the scale, which focuses on Assessment and Evaluation, PTs perceived themselves highly competent in two items: using alternative assessment, evaluation methods, and approaches (Item 31;  $M = 4.27$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ); and benefiting from the results of assessment and evaluation process to improve teaching (Item 35;  $M = 4.22$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ). The analysis also determined that PTs considered themselves competent in some items like in helping students give an impromptu speech (Item 23;  $M = 4.20$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ), helping students improve their listening-watching skills (Item 22;  $M = 4.12$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ), identifying the language skills that students have difficulty with (Item 21;  $M = 3.96$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ), planning assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes (Item 28;  $M = 3.90$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ) and giving feedback to my students according to assessment results (Item 34;  $M = 3.88$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ), writing different types of questions in line with the learning outcomes (Item 30;  $M=3.82$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ), and preparing questions to assess the learning outcomes (Item 29;  $M= 3.80$ ,  $SD = 0.72$ ). The lowest scores for this section were obtained for the following items: using assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes (Item 27), and interpreting assessment results effectively (Item 33) with mean scores of 3.75 ( $SD = 0.72$ ), 3.63 ( $SD = 0.63$ ) respectively.

Finally, PTs' views of their organizing learning-teaching environment competency were analyzed. Table 4.5. shows the results on PTs' views of their organizing learning-teaching environment competency levels.

**Table 4.6.** *Pre-service teachers' views of their organizing learning-teaching environment competency*

Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment	N	Min	Max	M	SD
5. I can keep the students' interest alive by means of the materials.	51	3	5	4,43	0,70
2. I can determine the characteristics that the teaching environment should have.	51	3	5	4,27	0,60
4. When needed, in addition to the textbooks, I can design appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students.	51	3	5	4,25	0,69
1. I can plan instructional activities in line with the level of the students to improve their language skills.	51	3	5	4,22	0,61
3. I can create stimuli (visual, auditory materials etc.) that should be present in the teaching environment.	51	3	5	4,18	0,68
32. I can prepare suitable questions for students with different learning abilities.	51	3	5	4,08	0,69
24. I can effectively use the interactive approach in language.	51	2	5	3,94	0,79
26. I can improve the language skills of students with different learning abilities.	51	3	5	3,88	0,68
25. I can enable students to use English in a correct and comprehensible way	51	2	5	3,84	0,76

PTs regarded themselves as highly competent in terms of Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment in keeping the students' interest alive by means of the materials (Item 5;  $M = 4.43$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ), determining the characteristics that the teaching environment should have (Item 2;  $M = 4.27$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ), designing appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students (Item 4;  $M = 4.25$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ), and planning instructional activities in line with the level of the students to improve their language skills (Item 1;  $M = 4.22$ ,  $SD = 0.61$ ). In addition, they also perceived themselves competent in creating stimuli that should be present in the teaching environment (Item 3;  $M = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ), preparing suitable questions for students with different learning abilities (Item 32;  $M = 4.08$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ), using the interactive approach in language (Item 24;  $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 0.79$ ), improving the language skills of students with different learning abilities (Item 26;  $M = 3.88$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ), enabling students to use English in a correct and comprehensible way (Item 25;  $M = 3.84$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ).

#### 4.2. Supervisors' Perspectives on Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-Service Teachers

All data collected from the scale were entered into IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 for statistical analysis in order to ascertain supervisors' views of PTs' subject area competency. The mean scores of the male and female supervisors were calculated. The views of supervisors on subcategories were then calculated separately. Table 4.8. summarizes the findings related to supervisors' general view on pre-service teachers' subject area competencies.

**Table 4.7.** *Supervisors' views on subject area competencies of pre-service teachers*

Sub-Dimensions	Mean		Female		Male	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Supporting Language Skills	3.47	.58	3.56	.61	3.30	.54
Assessment and Evaluation	3.04	.72	3.15	.82	2.81	.42
Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment	3.55	.45	3.57	.53	3.51	.27
Grand Mean	3.48	.49	3.53	.57	3.37	.26

According to the results, supervisors perceived pre-service teachers *competent* ( $M = 3.48$ ,  $SD = .49$ ) in their subject areas. When the subcategories were examined, it was found that supervisors found PTs competent in Supporting Language Skills ( $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = .58$ ) and Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = .45$ )

subcategories, however; in the Assessment and Evaluation ( $M = 3.04$ ,  $SD = .72$ ) subcategory, they marked PTs as moderately competent.

After that, supervisors' perspectives were examined item by item. Table 4.9. shows supervisors' evaluation of pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels in the supporting language skills subcategory. Supervisors perceive PTs *competent* ( $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = .58$ ) in Supporting Language Skills.

**Table 4.8.** *Supervisors' views of supporting language skills of pre-service teachers*

Supporting Language Skills Items	N	Min	Max	M	SD
16. He/she can ask 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they read.	15	3	5	4	0,65
18. He/she can help students to express their predictions based on the visuals.	15	2	5	3,93	0,79
17. He/she can create opportunities for students to match the visuals that are related to what they read.	15	3	5	3,86	0,63
15. He/she can find texts that will help improve students' reading skills in line with the learning outcomes.	15	3	5	3,80	0,56
11. He/she can ask 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they listen to.	15	2	5	3,66	0,81
12. He/she can assign prepared speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,53	0,83
8. He/she can find texts that will help improve students' listening skills in line with learning outcomes.	15	2	4	3,46	0,63
9. He/she can find short speeches and videos suitable for learning outcomes that will help improve students' listening skills.	15	2	4	3,46	0,63
14. He/she can ask questions to change the direction of the conversation during the speech of the students.	15	3	5	3,46	0,63
19. He/she can assign writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,46	0,74
10. He/she can initiate dialogues that will help improve students' speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,4	0,73
20. He/she can assign tasks that will enable students to write with or without preparation.	15	1	5	3,20	0,94
13. He/she can assign impromptu speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,13	0,83
6. He/she can contribute to the student's determination of an appropriate learning strategy (strategies such as repetition, attention, interpretation, etc.) for himself/herself.	15	2	5	3,13	0,74
7. He/she can contribute to the students' awareness of their own learning style (visual, auditory, physical).	15	2	5	2,93	0,79
36. He/she can motivate his colleagues in order to organize activities that will provide professional development.	15	1	5	2,80	0,86

According to the results of the first subcategory of the scale items, which focuses on competence in supporting language skills, supervisors perceived pre-service teachers most competent in asking 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they read (Item 16;  $M = 4$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ). They stated that pre-service teachers are competent in helping students to express their predictions based on the

visuals (Item 18;  $M = 3.93$ ,  $SD = 0.79$ ). They also expressed that pre-service teachers are competent in creating opportunities for students to match the visuals that are related to what they read (Item 17;  $M = 3.86$ ,  $SD = 0.63$ ), and finding texts that will help improve students' reading skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 15;  $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ). Supervisors perceived pre-service teachers competent with slightly lower mean scores in asking 5WH questions that will help determine what students understand from what they listen to (Item 11;  $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 0.81$ ), assigning prepared speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 12;  $M = 3.53$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ), finding texts that will help improve students' listening skills in line with learning outcomes (Item 8;  $M = 3.46$ ,  $SD = 0.63$ ), finding short speeches and videos suitable for learning outcomes that will help improve students' listening skills (Item 9;  $M = 3.46$ ,  $SD = 0.63$ ), asking questions to change the direction of the conversation during the speech of the students (Item 14;  $M = 3.46$ ,  $SD = 0.63$ ), and assigning writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 19;  $M = 3.46$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ).

The statistical analysis also unveiled some areas that supervisors perceived pre-service teachers moderately competent. For example, they stated that pre-service teachers are moderately competent in initiating dialogues that will help improve students' speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 10;  $M = 3.4$ ,  $SD = 0.73$ ), assigning tasks that will enable students to write with or without preparation (Item 20;  $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ), contributing to the student's determination of an appropriate learning strategy for himself/herself (Item 13;  $M = 3.13$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ), assigning impromptu speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes (Item 6;  $M = 3.13$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ). Besides, they provided their lowest scores for the following; contributing to the students' awareness of their own learning style (Item 7;  $M = 2.93$ ,  $SD = 0.79$ ), and motivating his/her colleagues in order to organize activities that will provide professional development (Item 36;  $M = 2.80$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ).

Table 4.10. provides information about views of supervisors regarding PTs' assessment and evaluation competency. Supervisors perceive PTs to be moderately competent ( $M = 3.04$ ,  $SD = .72$ ) with regards to Assessment and Evaluation.

**Table 4.9.** *Supervisors' views of assessment and evaluation competency of pre-service teachers*

Assessment and Evaluation Items	N	Min	Max	M	SD
22. He/she can help students improve their listening-watching skills	15	2	5	3,40	0,74
21. He/she can identify the language skills that students have difficulty with.	15	1	5	3,27	0,96
29. He/she can prepare questions to assess the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,27	0,80
27. He/she can use assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,20	0,86
28. He/she can plan assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes.	15	2	5	3,20	0,94
30. He/she can write different types of questions in line with the learning outcomes (such as true-false, open-ended, fill-in the blanks, short answer, multiple choice, etc.).	15	2	5	3,20	0,68
34. He/she can give feedback to his/her students according to assessment results.	15	2	5	3,07	0,80
35. He/she can benefit from the results of assessment and evaluation process to improve teaching.	15	2	5	3,07	0,80
23. He/she can help students give an impromptu speech.	15	2	5	3,00	0,93
31. He/she can use alternative assessment and evaluation methods (student portfolio, performance task, project, diaries, etc.) and approaches.	15	2	5	3,00	0,93
33. He/she can interpret assessment results effectively.	15	2	5	3,00	0,85

According to the findings of the second subcategory of the scale, which focuses on Assessment and Evaluation, although supervisors perceived PTs moderately competent, they perceived them the most competent in helping students improve their listening-watching skills (Item 22;  $M = 3.40$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ). The analysis also determined that supervisors stated PTs are moderately competent in identifying the language skills that students have difficulty with (Item 21;  $M = 3.27$ ,  $SD = 0.96$ ), preparing questions to assess the learning outcomes (Item 29;  $M = 3.27$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ), writing different types of questions in line with the learning outcomes (Item 27;  $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ), use assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes (Item 28;  $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ), planning assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes (Item 30;  $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ). PTs are also moderately competent in giving feedback to their students (Item 34;  $M = 3.07$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ), benefiting from the results of assessment and evaluation process to improve teaching (Item 35;  $M = 3.07$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ), according to supervisors. The lowest scores for this section were items 21,31 and 33, helping students give an impromptu speech, using alternative assessment and evaluation methods and approaches, and interpreting assessment results effectively with mean scores of 3.00 ( $SD = 0.93$ ), 3.00 ( $SD = 0.93$ ), 3.00 ( $SD = 0.85$ ) respectively.

Supervisors' views of pre-service teachers' Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment competency are presented in Table 4.11. Supervisors perceive PTs competent ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = .45$ ) in Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment.

**Table 4.10.** *Supervisors' views of organizing learning-teaching environment competency of pre-service teachers*

Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment	N	Min	Max	M	SD
3. He/she can create stimuli (visual, auditory materials etc.) that should be present in the teaching environment.	15	3	5	4,00	0,53
4. When needed, in addition to the textbooks, he/she can design appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students.	15	3	5	3,93	0,70
5. He/she can keep the students' interest alive by means of the materials.	15	3	5	3,80	0,68
1. He/she can plan instructional activities in line with the level of the students to improve their language skills.	15	3	5	3,73	0,80
2. He/she can determine the characteristics that the teaching environment should have.	15	3	5	3,53	0,64
25. He/she can enable students to use English in a correct and comprehensible way	15	3	5	3,40	0,63
24. He/she can effectively use the interactive approach in language.	15	2	5	3,07	0,80
26. He/she can improve the language skills of students with different learning abilities.	15	2	5	2,87	0,92
32. He/she can prepare suitable questions for students with different learning abilities.	15	1	5	2,80	0,86

According to the findings of the scale's third subcategory, Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment, supervisors regarded PTs as the most competent in creating stimuli that should be present in the teaching environment (Item 3;  $M = 4.00$ ,  $SD = 0.53$ ), designing appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students when needed (Item 4;  $M = 3.93$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ), and keeping the students' interest alive by means of the materials (Item 5;  $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ). They also considered PTs competent in planning instructional activities in line with the level of the students to improve their language skills (Item 1;  $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ) and determining the characteristics that the teaching environment should have (Item 2;  $M = 3.53$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ). However, the results yielded some items that supervisors perceived PTs as moderately competent, these items were 25,24, 26 and 32, enabling students to use English in a correct and comprehensible way ( $M= 4.0$ ,  $SD = 0.63$ ), using the interactive approach in language effectively ( $M= 3.07$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ), improving the language skills of students with different learning abilities ( $M=2.87$  ,  $SD = 0.92$ ), and preparing suitable questions for students with different learning abilities effectively ( $M=2.80$  ,  $SD = 0.86$ ).

### 4.3. Comparison of Pre-service Teachers' and Supervisors' Views on Pre-service Teachers' Subject Area Competency

To compare pre-service teachers' and supervisors' perspectives on pre-service teachers' competency levels, Mann Whitney U test was conducted. The results were presented in table 4.15.

**Table 4.12.** Mann-Whitney U test results for comparison of pre-service teachers' and supervisors' views

	Groups	N	Mean rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Z	p
Supporting Language Skills	PTs	51	38,69	1989,50	118,0	-4,055	,000*
	Supervisors	15	15,87	221,50	00		
Assessment and Evaluation	PTs	51	39,36	1983,50	83,50	-4,584	,000*
	Supervisors	15	13,57	227,50	0		
Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment	PTs	51	38,50	1993,50	127,5	-3,913	,000*
	Supervisors	15	16,50	217,50	00		
Total	PTs	51	39,09	1986,00	97,50	-4,363	,000*
	Supervisors	15	14,50	225,00	0		

Note. \*p<.05

The views of the pre-service teachers' on their total subject area competency levels were higher than their supervisors'. A Mann-Whitney U test indicated that this difference was statistically significant  $U (N_{PTs}=51, N_{Supervisors}=15,) = 97,500, z=-4,363, p<.05$ . These results suggest that PTS' perceived competency level is statistically higher than how their supervisors perceive them. This indicates that while supervisors perceive PTs to be competent ( $M = 3.48, SD = .49$ ), PTs perceive themselves to be highly competent ( $M = 4.08, SD = .41$ ). The same can be concluded from all the subcategories. In Supporting Language Skills, supervisors' views were statistically lower compared to PTs' views ( $p < .05$ ). While supervisors perceived PTs to be competent ( $M = 3.47, SD = .58$ ), PTs viewed themselves as highly competent ( $M = 4.15, SD = .43$ ). In assessment and evaluation, pre-service teachers perceived themselves more competent compared to their supervisors' perspectives of their competency ( $p < .05$ ). However, while supervisors perceived PTs moderately competent ( $M = 3.04, SD = .72$ ), PTs perceived themselves as competent ( $M = 3.96, SD = .45$ ). In organizing a learning-teaching environment, PTs' perceived competency level was statistically higher than how their supervisors perceive them ( $p < .05$ ); meaning that supervisors perceived PTs to be competent ( $M = 3.55, SD = .45$ ) while PTs perceived themselves as highly competent ( $M = 4.12, SD = .45$ ).

When supervisors' and PTs views were investigated item by item with Mann-Whitney U test, it was found that almost in all items there was a statistically significant difference except for the items 3, 4, 8, 16. Table 4.16. shows the findings regarding the issue.

**Table 4.13.** Mann-Whitney U test results of the items for both versions of the scale.

	Groups	U	Z	p		Groups	U	Z	p
1	PTs*	246,500	-2,296	,022***	19	PTs	129,500	-4,217	,000***
	Supervisors**					Supervisors			
2	PTs	169,000	-3,605	,000***	20	PTs	134,500	-4,147	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
3	PTs	324,000	-1,003	,316	21	PTs	223,500	-2,635	,008***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
4	PTs	289,000	-1,562	,118	22	PTs	188,500	-3,244	,001***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
5	PTs	205,000	-2,951	,003***	23	PTs	120,000	-4,372	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
6	PTs	163,500	-3,552	,000***	24	PTs	171,000	-3,423	,001***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
7	PTs	143,500	-3,933	,000***	25	PTs	252,000	-2,156	,031***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
8	PTs	294,500	-1,483	,138	26	PTs	148,500	-3,819	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
9	PTs	247,000	-2,271	,023***	27	PTs	248,500	-2,211	,027***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
10	PTs	230,500	-2,495	,013***	28	PTs	219,500	-2,741	,006***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
11	PTs	237,000	-2,418	,016***	29	PTs	240,000	-2,357	,018***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
12	PTs	179,000	-3,351	,001***	30	PTs	200,000	-3,026	,002***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
13	PTs	114,000	-4,540	,000***	31	PTs	123,000	-4,182	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
14	PTs	259,000	-2,028	,043***	32	PTs	94,000	-4,674	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
15	PTs	232,500	-2,530	,011***	33	PTs	211,000	-2,872	,004***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
16	PTs	298,500	-1,396	,163	34	PTs	167,000	-3,573	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
17	PTs	225,500	-2,648	,008***	35	PTs	101,500	-4,687	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			
18	PTs	243,000	-2,370	,018***	36	PTs	96,500	-4,733	,000***
	Supervisors					Supervisors			

Notes: \* The items and item statistics of the Pre-service Teacher Version of the scale are given in Table 4.3, 4.4, 4.5; \*\* The items and item statistics of the Supervisor Version of the scale are given in Table 4.9, 4.10, 4.11. \*\*\*p<.05

As can be concluded from Table 4.16, there was a statistically significant difference in almost all items. This indicated that supervisors' perspectives differed from PTs

substantially. PTs' perspectives of their perceived competency levels were higher compared to supervisor' views on PTs competency levels in most of the items.

However, PTs and supervisors seemed to agree on 4 items. In Item 3, creating stimuli (visual, auditory materials etc.) that should be present in the teaching environment which was related to Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment, both PTs and supervisors considered PTs as competent. Item 4, when needed, in addition to the textbooks, designing appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students, which was again related to Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment showed similar results with both PTs and supervisors considering PTs as highly competent. Both pre-service teachers and supervisors regarded PTs as competent in Item 8, finding texts that will help improve students' listening skills in line with learning outcomes, of the Supporting Language Skills subcategory. Finally, there was agreement on Item 16, which is about asking 5W1H questions to ascertain what students understand from what they read, in the subcategory Supporting Language Skills, they both regarded PTs as competent. There was no consensus in any item related to Assessment and Evaluation.

There were no items that both pre-service teachers and supervisors consider PTs as incompetent and highly incompetent. Supervisors assessed PTs as moderately competent in all items in the Assessment and Evaluation subcategory, while PTs rated themselves as competent or highly competent in all items of this category. There were no items that supervisors perceived PTs as highly competent, though in all subcategories PTs provided highly competent scores for some items. However, there were items that supervisors perceived PTs as moderately competent while PTs regarded themselves as highly competent. These items were: 13. "I/He/She can assign impromptu speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes" which was related to Supporting Language Skills sub-category; 20. "I/He/She can assign tasks that will enable students to write with or without preparation which was related to Supporting Language Skills sub-category"; 31. "I/He/She can use alternative assessment and evaluation methods (student portfolio, performance task, project, diaries, etc.) and approaches" which was related to Assessment and Evaluation sub-category; 35. "I/He/She can benefit from the results of assessment and evaluation process to improve teaching" which was related to Assessment and Evaluation sub-category.

The quantitative analysis revealed that pre-service teachers viewed themselves to be competent in their subject areas. Additionally, the findings indicated that supervisors

view pre-service teachers as competent. They did, however, express that pre-service teachers possessed a moderate level of competence in Assessment and Evaluation. Finally, there was a statistically significant difference between pre-service teachers' and supervisors' perspectives on pre-service teachers' competency levels, indicating that supervisors' perspectives on pre-service teachers' competency levels were lower than pre-service teachers' self-perspectives.

#### **4.4. Interview Results**

##### **4.4.1. General subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers**

PTs were initially interviewed about their general views of their subject area competency levels and whether the education they received at the university contributed their competency. In general, they identified themselves as competent in subject areas and indicated that their education was sufficient to acquire these competencies. However, PTs had disparate views about how their competencies are manifested. Some stated that they were better at knowing about these competencies, while one of the PTs mentioned that she was better at performing these competencies. For instance, PT A, who worked eight months at a language school, indicated that she was more adept at practice than theory by stating:

PT A: “Actually, to be honest, I think I am a bit better in practice. I have been working at a language institution for eight months. Actually, I have seen that practice was much more important in this period, I can say. You know, if you ask something theoretical at the moment, for example, I cannot give you a full answer in a flash, but I can say that I can use them when I have to put them into practice at some point.”

However, the remaining 3 interviewees with no prior experience besides the Teaching Practicum stated that they were more knowledgeable about theory and considered themselves competent in that area by saying:

“Now, frankly, I am normally a student who takes high grades in classes. I mean, when we look at the theory, yes, I think I find myself competent. But we did not do the internship face-to-face, so maybe theoretically, yes, I am writing very good lesson plans, but I have no idea how successful I am in terms of implementing them (PT B)”.

“Theoretically, we have learned a lot, so I feel like I am competent (PT C)”.

“So I do not think I am perfect, but I think I am qualified (PT D)”.

It can be concluded that PTs with teaching experience in addition to teaching practicum with real students, such as working at language schools prior to graduation,

believe they are more capable of applying their skills in real-world teaching settings than those with only practicum experience.

When asked about their views about whether university education contributed to their subject area competencies, PTs expressed positive sentiments, indicating that it was challenging but that they felt they had mastered the content by the end. These points are exemplified by the following quotations:

“I think that, overall, the education is very high quality. It is more challenging but I feel like, in the end, I am learning the information (PT B)”.

“Of course, this training is basically given to us. We have training on these, whether it is the learning styles or the kind of teaching we can provide to children. So, I think the education is adequate (PT C)”.

On the other hand, they implied that they required additional opportunities for practice in order to improve their competencies and that teaching practicum should not be limited to their senior year. The quotes below illustrate these points:

“I learned very good information, I took lessons from well-equipped teachers. However, we cannot understand this unless we put it into practice. I have been working since the beginning of the senior year, and when I first entered the class, I felt like I did not know anything. In addition, I was shocked to see that I could not apply the lesson plan I prepared carefully during the internship. That is why I think that the practice part in English teaching should not be left to the last year (PT A)”.

“I cannot make a comparison with another university. However, I have learned a lot. Actually, if the internship was longer, I think that I would practice more and improve myself (PT D)”.

Similarly, supervisors were inquired about their views of pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels and the contribution of university education on PTs' competency. As the descriptive results indicated, supervisors generally regarded PTs as competent. They did, however, mention some areas that should be prioritized. Supervisors also believed that the education provided at the university was sufficient for pre-service teachers to obtain the MoNE-defined competencies (2017a). Supervisor A's comments about it as was follows:

“In general, considering the candidate teachers in the institution where I work, I consider them sufficient and I think they are adequate because the contents of the courses they take here, the assignments they do are already prepared to increase the proficiency and competency of the students (Supervisor A)”.

Additionally, Supervisor C stated that PTs had acquired knowledge of subjects pertinent to the subject area; however, they needed to review the courses they had taken during their previous years by saying:

“Actually, I think they have information, but I believe they should revisit some topics. So, let us assume it is a lesson about teaching a foreign language to children, they do not remember what they did, what they could use, and what they learned in this lesson. Because this is a 3<sup>rd</sup>-grade lesson, it has been over a year since then, so I think they should go back and study again (Supervisor C)”.

Finally, Supervisor D's views on whether the education provided at the university contributed to PTs' subject area competence levels were analogous to those of other participants. She also stressed that PTs need to improve themselves and their competencies outside of the classroom, quoted as following:

“I think the students get enough education in their education classes. The only problem is; I think the students do not do anything extra outside of the classroom. In other words, they learn what they learn during the lesson, and do nothing further to improve themselves. We cannot fit everything in the lessons, so students need to improve themselves, but if students learn about subject A during the lesson, they do not research and read the sub-titles of A (Supervisor D)”.

Supervisor B referred to PTs' individual differences, implying that even if they teach the same courses to all PTs, they may not all acquire knowledge in the same way. He stated that they teach every PT the same things and that they come to senior year as having passed all the courses; however, when it comes to practice, various variables influence it. He stated that regardless of the education received by students, the factors affecting subject area competency are numerous. Thus, it is impossible to assert that all PTs have the same and high level of subject area competency by saying:

“If we consider prospective teachers in general, I find them sufficient, but maybe the most important thing I want to say is that there are too many individual differences, so here, we teach things like how to teach grammar, how to teach language skills or classroom management. We teach all students the same things. They go through the same exams. All of them come to the senior year with those lessons passed, but when it comes to practice, many different variables can affect the practice. There are so many reasons for this: Reasons such as previous student experiences and the practices of the teacher in the internship can override the education they receive at the university, and they can think that these are more accurate. Of course, an important reason for this is that it is easier (Supervisor B)”.

#### **4.4.2. Supporting language skills competency levels of pre-service teachers**

The quantitative analysis yielded that pre-service teachers considered themselves competent or highly competent in all of the items regarding supporting language skills; however, some of the interviewed PTs had items in which they considered themselves moderately competent or highly competent. Thus, questions were directed towards those items to gain a deeper understanding. As for the item, which PT C considered herself moderately competent, related to assigning prepared speaking tasks for students to improve their speaking skills in line with the learning outcomes, she argued that she was not fluent in English and thus did not consider herself qualified to assist students with their oral communication skills. Additionally, she mentioned that PTs criticized their peers' accents, which made her hesitant to improve her speaking abilities during the courses. She suggested that PTs and instructors ought to provide constructive feedback to PTs to improve their speaking abilities, and then they could elevate those of their students by saying:

“The area in which I am insufficient the most is speaking. I can't speak much, myself. We are subjected to a lot of criticism in the lessons as well because of our accent. By peers. We are even criticized for just one mistake in lectures on phonetics. We hesitate to talk because there is this obsession. We do not offer constructive criticism to each other. After improving ourselves in the lessons, we can guide the students as well (PT C)”.

While the mean score for the item related to unprompted speaking tasks indicated that PTs regarded themselves as highly competent, PT D rated himself as moderately competent on the scale, and thus was questioned about his views during the interviews. He stated that he had difficulty giving unprompted speaking tasks to his students and, therefore, he thought he should improve himself. PT D also stated that he encountered students who did not speak at all during the lesson and that even when he attempted to elicit responses, he rarely received any; as a result, he considered himself incompetent in that area quoted as in the following:

“I saw the students this year a little bit, they certainly do not speak at all. Even when I ask the simplest question, I rarely get an answer. I hardly get any answers. So, I think I could not do much to prepare a speaking activity (PT D)”.

On the scale, PTs indicated they were competent for the item related to initiating dialogues to help students improve their speaking skills, whereas PT A considered herself as highly competent, thus her reasoning was investigated. PT A stated that her work experience had helped her become more confident in her speaking ability, and she

believed she was capable of capturing the students' attention by initiating dialogues, swiftly transitioning from one subject to the next, and asking questions to redirect the conversation throughout the speech. Furthermore, even though PT B indicated on the scale that she was moderately competent in initiating dialogues, she mentioned in the interview that she had learned how to get students to talk by talking about everyday life or using videos and other materials in her lesson as a result of her teaching practicum experiences. She indicated that she could create a relaxed atmosphere in her classes in which her students could speak freely without fear of making a mistake. The findings are demonstrated by the following quotations:

“I am more comfortable at speaking than others. I can attract students' attention because I switch from topic to topic. I think I have improved myself in speaking since I have speaking classes with students where I work. I feel like I can start a conversation on any topic that will attract students' attention (PT A).”

“In my last internship lesson, I showed students videos about their daily routines and made them talk about their daily routines, then I prepared some cards about it. I think I had a good class using these methods. Their grammar was not very good, but I was able to create an environment eventually where they could speak without the fear of doing it wrong (PT B).”

On the scale, PTs rated themselves as competent in terms of assigning tasks that would allow students to write spontaneously or with minimal preparation, while PT B rated herself as highly competent. However, when her opinions were asked in the interviews, PT B believed herself to be incompetent. She explained this by stating that she had encountered difficulties during her previous teaching experience about teaching writing skills, which altered her views of her own competency. Her perspectives about this as follows:

“We learned these things in school, and never had the chance to practice on real students, and being in front of a student in an internship is a very different thing. It seemed like I could do it, but during the lesson, I realized that it was hard, and I was not able to do it much (PT B).”

PTs stated that they were highly competent in all items in supporting students' reading abilities out of the four basic skills, even though they had items they considered themselves competent or moderately competent in other skills. They stated that they could easily ask comprehension questions and determine which sections of the text their students did not understand. Additionally, they emphasized that they had no difficulty finding reading passages appropriate for the learning outcomes and suitable for their students. The following quotes exemplify this:

“What I am best at is reading. I think I am good enough because there is more reading in the lessons we take (PT C)”.

“In the reading part, I totally agree that I can ask WH questions that students can understand when they read. I'm pretty good at this (PT D)”.

“I can find suitable reading texts for students on many websites, so I did not have much trouble doing reading activities in classes (PT B)”.

“I ask students comprehension questions, with specific questions like when it happened, who it is, etc. so I can ask them questions that can measure whether they understand or not (PT A)”.

On the scale, the mean score of the item related to identifying suitable listening passages for the learning outcomes and students' levels indicated PTs were competent, however, all of the interviewed PTs indicated that they were moderately competent on the scale. During the interviews, it was revealed that they experienced difficulties in finding listening passages that correspond to the learning outcomes, their students' language level, or the vocabulary presented in the course books. These findings are exemplified by the following quotations:

“The students' level does not match the texts I found. Even in the same class, it is very difficult to catch this because the level of the student may change (PT D)”.

“About this, it is difficult to find a perfect listening text that completely matches the needs and level of the student. Necessarily we need to make a change (PT C).”

“I prepared a listening plan this term, and it was really difficult to find the necessary resources for me. Because we had written a listening plan only once in the method lesson, and our teacher had already given us the listening piece. We were given the subject and did not investigate the listening ourselves. I do not think I am very talented as I have not done much research for this (PT B)”.

“I did not want to use the listenings in the book for students. When I do research about this on the Internet, the words do not match in the texts that I find, it is too far from the example in the book, so I remain limited on this subject (PT A)”.

Even though PTs rated themselves competent on the scale, PT B considered herself moderately competent in determining appropriate learning strategies for the learners, and in the interviews, she indicated that she encountered difficulties during practicum and she was unable to deduce appropriate learning strategies for the learners by saying:

“I think the classes were too crowded for this (determining appropriate learning strategies for the learners). In any case, most students do not even actively participate in the lesson, so I do not consider myself enough (PT B)”.

All interviewees were asked about planning professional development activities because they all rated themselves as moderately competent on the scale, whereas the scale's mean scores indicated that PTs perceived themselves as competent. PTs stated that they would rather participate in those activities than organize them by saying:

“I attend these kinds of events, but I do not think I can do very well in organizing for now (PT A)”.

“I attend all kinds of events, after all, it is important to improve yourself. But I am not sure I can plan it (PT C)”.

Some PTs asserted that even if they did plan professional development activities, they doubted that their peers would attend and assert:

“I try to do things like this, but I do not think other teachers will participate (PT D)”.

“I feel like I can plan events that can improve myself, but I do not think there will be unity because every teacher has different ideas (PT B)”.

When the results of the supervisors were examined, on the scale, supervisors considered PTs as competent in assigning activities to enhance students' speaking skills in line with learning outcomes, however, Supervisor A, who rated PTs as highly competent, was interviewed to discover her reasoning. She mentioned that during the teaching practicum, PTs could assign tasks that help students improve their speaking abilities, and they could also initiate dialogues even when students were averse to participating in the activities. The following quotation exemplifies this:

“Students are really good at this. Even if the students do not attend the activities in the internship, our guys can find a way, and do a good speaking activity (Supervisor A)”.

In a similar vein to PTs, supervisors viewed PTs as capable of enhancing students' reading abilities. Supervisor A perceived PTs as highly competent in improving students reading skills on the scale, whereas the mean scores of the item revealed Supervisors perceived PTs as competent. He stated that PTs were capable of conducting a lesson using efficient reading passages and had no difficulty determining what students understood from what they read. The following quote illustrate this finding:

“They do not face that many problems in reading activities, and I have observed that they use very nice texts actually. They were also able to ask comprehension questions very well indeed (Supervisor A)”.

On the scale, supervisors perceived PTs competent in finding appropriate reading passages for their students, however, Supervisor C, who rated PTs as moderately competent, stated that PTs were using the same kinds of reading passages and were unable to think creatively when planning reading activities. She also expected them to do simple reading activities like ordering paragraphs or making up stories, but PTs preferred to ask their students to read the text and answer the comprehension questions.

“Students cannot diversify in finding reading texts. They use somewhat monotonous texts. The subjects are always the same, so they cannot think creatively. What I expect from the prospective teachers is to find texts that reflect them, and their interests rather than any other text in the textbook, but I do not see too many different texts in the lesson plans and online lessons. For example, I have not observed anyone using a simple activity like creating a story or sequencing a story (Supervisor C)”.

While supervisors indicated on the scale that PTs were competent in finding listening passages that are appropriate for the outcomes, Supervisor D indicated that PTs were moderately competent, thus, was interviewed about that item. She stated in the interviews that PTs had difficulty finding comprehensible listening passages with correct intonation, and as a result, PTs were hesitant to do listening activities in the classroom. She also mentioned the difficulties of conducting a listening activity in online lessons, emphasizing the importance of guiding and assisting PTs in their practicum. The following quotation illustrates this:

“It is difficult for students to find texts that are fully suitable for the given unit and are properly pronounced, so students may be reluctant to do listening activities. I still think that if the students are guided and helped on this issue, they can overcome these problems (Supervisor D)”.

In a similar vein to Supervisor D, Supervisor C mentioned PTs' reluctance to conduct listening activities in the classroom due to technical difficulties and that the Methodology course has not covered the topics related to problems they may face while teaching online, as seen below:

“They have difficulty doing the activity on the Zoom platform and hence they hesitate to do it. I noticed that. Students have not yet developed the ability to produce solutions when problems arise in listening, for example, when the sound is distorted or there are technical problems. I do not think that there is any training given in Method lessons on how to deal with these issues, such as converting youtube videos to mp3. Because students are not used to it, they may not know such things (Supervisor C)”.

Though supervisors perceived PTs as competent on average; Supervisor A perceived PTs as highly competent in helping students develop effective language

learning strategies. She indicated that pre-service teachers were adept at observing their students, and capable of identifying appropriate teaching skills for their students, as during the internship students made diligent observations in the first semester and put their observations into practice during the second semester. She indicated that PTs will perform better in the future as teachers as they will have more time to observe their students:

“When pre-service teachers go to internship, they observe very well in the first semester, and they can put it into practice in the second semester. S/he, more or less, tries to grasp the style of the student even while in the internship and adapts right away. And I think that they can do this better (finding the right learning strategy for the student) when they become teachers as they will have a greater chance of observing their students (Supervisor A)”.

However, Supervisor B, who perceived PTs as moderately competent in helping students develop effective language learning strategies, stated that pre-service teachers were inept in that area not because they were unable to identify appropriate teaching skills in general, but because they only observed students once or twice a week throughout their practicum, which was insufficient for PTs to determine appropriate teaching skills for their students. The following quotation highlights this result:

“... teacher candidates in the internship only see students there for one semester, and for only one hour or two hours of the classes in the semester. Consequently, they find it difficult, in terms of distinguishing and recognizing students' individual characteristics, to find opportunities that will allow students to develop those teaching strategies based on their individual characteristics (Supervisor B)”.

Supervisor C, who rated PTs as incompetent on the scale emphasized the external factors affecting PTs' competency in a teaching practicum, such as students' participation and willingness to participate, and mentioned that only 5 out of every 20 students participated in online lessons, and those who did, participated without turning on their microphones and cameras. Thus, PTs were unable to assess students' learning abilities by saying:

“In other words, the student participation is very low, the number of students attending the class is very low, 5-6 people or a maximum of 10 people, maybe maximum, and those 10 people, unfortunately, do not attend the lesson very much, and they do not turn on their microphones at all. How would they determine anything in such a situation? (Supervisor C)”.

Supervisors identified PTs as moderately competent on the scale in planning activities that will help them develop professionally; however, Supervisors B and C indicated that PTs were competent. When questioned about it, they stated that, while they

believed PTs were competent and capable of organizing these activities, they believed PTs were unmotivated. While PTs were perceived to be adept at planning professional development activities, Supervisor B expressed, they were unwilling to do so. Furthermore, they indicated that, as a result of the current situation, PTs lack opportunities to interact with their cooperating teachers and other English language teachers at their practicum schools, and thus are unable to learn what kind of activities can be planned to develop themselves professionally. The following quotations illustrate these findings:

“Now they are not in the real environment, everything is very virtual, they always meet with the national education teachers on Zoom, too. Of course, they may share something, but in the real environment, they have the chance to meet with their class or other teachers or to speak in the teachers' room or attend a conference, but they do not have any of these environments right now (Supervisor C)”.

“Can they do it? Yes, they can but do they do it? No, because they have no desire on this matter (Supervisor B)”.

#### **4.4.3. Organizing learning-teaching environment competency levels of pre-service teachers**

In the Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment subcategory, PT B was asked about designing learning materials suitable for learners' needs when needed in addition to textbooks as she rated herself as moderately competent on the scale. In the interviews, she expressed that designing materials were challenging and costly for each lesson as she will be teaching different classes of varying grades and levels. PT A, who also identified herself as moderately competent, indicated that while she did not use materials such as puppets during practicum, she was proficient at utilizing Web 2.0 tools and materials to maintain students' interest. She stated that PTs should focus on online materials such as interactive slides. The findings are illustrated by the following quotations:

“Designing a material is a very difficult thing. I think it is both difficult and costly to prepare for each course. Since I will be in many classes, it is very difficult to prepare materials because each class has different levels. Of course, I will prepare, but I do not think I can always do it (PT B)”.

“In online lessons, we have never made a model by hand. We took material and design lessons online as well. That is why I personally do not trust myself to make puppets or anything. But I like, and try to use, different applications on the internet. In the new generation, things shift to online a little, so I think that is why hand-made items such as models are out of date now. That is why I consider myself adequate because I like doing it

too. Generally, I make use of activities such as matching, and Google forms and Google slides at the introduction of the course (PT A)”.

On the scale, PT D indicated that he is moderately capable of assisting students in using English correctly and understandably, while the mean score of the item indicated PTs as competent. When questioned about his reasoning, he stated that he does not want to force his students to use the language correctly, but rather that he wants them to make mistakes. He said making mistakes indicates that the students are attempting to associate through the words, adding that he does not wish to correct them explicitly but would utilize various error-correcting approaches. The following quotation illustrates the findings:

“I certainly do not want to pressure students into doing this, I do not want to say when a mistake occurs, look look, you made that mistake, and do not do it again. On the contrary, I want students to make mistakes. It shows that they communicate with the language. But I am going to do something to fix it. I am not going to make the correction explicitly, I am going to repeat it in my own way, or I am going to do eliciting or something (PT D)”.

On the contrary, PT B stated that she wanted her students to use the language correctly since errors could result in fossilization later, even though she admitted she was not competent to do so and rated herself as moderately competent on the scale and said:

“I want my students to use the language properly. Because these are high school students, and that is why their mistakes become fossilized later. But in reality, I realize that I cannot do it in the internship (PT B)”.

While PTs indicated they were competent regarding incorporating an interactive approach into their teaching on the scale, PT A rated herself as moderately competent, and PT B as highly competent. Their views were elicited during the interviews. PT A indicated that she was having difficulty recalling what an interactive approach was and needed to refresh her memory:

“Actually, as I said, I thought I was incompetent at this point because I needed to refresh my theoretical knowledge, not because I thought this approach was wrong or because I did not agree with the approach, but I had to refresh this information just a bit more. That is why I stated that I am incompetent because I cannot use something I do not know (PT A)”.

PT B considered herself highly competent in determining the characteristics that the teaching environment should possess, as she creates a theme for each lesson plan and each step should adhere to the theme. The following quotation provides context for this finding:

“So, I think I am good because I try to do all these by thinking about whether they have a context, whether they give the child a purpose, or whether I activate the child's schemata. All

of my activities are student-focused, and I try to plan every step in the lesson, so I think I am sufficient (PT B)”.

When it comes to supervisors’ views, they rated PTs as competent in enabling students to use English in a correct and comprehensible way in Organizing the Learning-Teaching Environment on the scale, though Supervisor A perceived PTs as highly competent. Supervisor A reported that PTs’ English proficiency was very high, and they were also capable of assisting students in using English in a comprehensible manner. She also noted that she found that PTs would use various error-correcting techniques to help students recognize their errors. The following quotation reveals the findings:

“I think our students have very good English proficiency, and in the internship, they can make their students use the language well. Even if students say the wrong thing, instead of saying it directly, they can use implicit error correction, such as repetition (Supervisor A)”.

#### **4.4.4. Assessment and evaluation competency levels of pre-service teachers**

In the Assessment and Evaluation subcategory, PTs rated themselves as competent or highly competent for all items. While PTs rated themselves as highly competent in implementing alternative assessment and evaluation tools to assess students on the scale, PT C rated herself as moderately competent in that item. She stated that she had never used alternative assessment and evaluation tools and had no idea how to use them in real-world situations:

“So I have never used things like student files, so I am not sure if I can do it, and frankly, I do not know exactly how to use them (PT C)”.

PT A also considered herself moderately competent on items; preparing questions to assess the learning outcomes and interpreting assessment results effectively which were related to assessment. She stated she feared evaluating students improperly, and could only prepare questions assessing students’ knowledge level learning outcomes. As she was preparing assessment tools at her workplace, she realized she was having difficulty writing questions for students with varying learning abilities:

“At the institution where I work now, I realized I was having a hard time with it. Because I have to prepare an exam, and I had the opportunity to test myself on it, and I found it difficult. Because when I started writing questions, I realized that I could actually only prepare questions to measure students’ knowledge-level achievements. That’s why I am afraid I am going to miscalculate the students (PT A)”.

PT B, who perceived herself as moderately competent in implementing assessment tools, stated that rather than just learning the reliability and validity of assessment tools, the content of the Language Testing and Evaluation course could be enhanced with tasks specific to practice. That would help them to gain practicality. She indicated that because they were taking the Assessment course this semester, her competency might improve gradually, as revealed in the following quotation:

“Especially in these courses there are a lot of statistics and memorizations, for example, the teacher explained validity reliability, etc. in the course, but these remain theoretical. We did not do anything to implement it. I think the content of the course can be enriched with activities such as exam preparation. We are taking the testing course in this term, or so maybe my proficiency may increase after taking the testing course, but I'm not so sure now (PT B)”.

Supervisors perceived PTs as moderately competent related to the sub-category Assessment and Evaluation on the scale. They stated that as pre-service teachers did not implement any assessment tasks in their teaching practicum, there was no way for them to evaluate their competency. However, they held a variety of opinions. Supervisor A who perceived PTs as highly competent in using assessment methods, techniques and approaches to assess the learning outcomes; and planing assessment methods, techniques and approaches to measure the learning outcomes on the scale indicated that PTs were competent hypothetically in assessment and evaluation. However, Supervisor B and C perceived PTs as incompetent in planing assessment methods, techniques and approaches to measure the learning outcomes on the scale. Supervisor C indicated that this year PTs completed their practicum through online means away from real-life classroom settings, which reduced the likeness of PTs to prepare and implement assessment tools during the teaching practicum. Supervisor B emphasized that because PTs were taking assessment courses concurrently, PTs may not acquire and apply everything they learned in the course and that preparing exams for students in teaching practicum was not in their job descriptions. Their comments on this are as follows:

“Since students do not work on assessment and evaluation during the internship, or because we do not tell students to take an exam and evaluate it, I generally assume that students are sufficient in this regard, because the education they receive at the university is sufficient to form these competencies of the students. In addition, the new generation teacher candidates research more, they are more digitally-oriented, and they find what they want, and improve themselves. I think they can find the solution by researching even if they have a problem (Supervisor A)”.

“They can't do the evaluation part at all, and they are pretty incompetent when they are preparing questions in class or doing exams in the internship. Additionally, doing exams is not in the job descriptions of prospective teachers. And they are studying an assessment course now, so they may not be able to pass on what they have learned right away (Supervisor B)”.

“Normally, I asked students to prepare an exam in the internship, but now they cannot prepare exams in distance education anyway... Students are incompetent in preparing and implementing exams (Supervisor C)”.

The interviews elicited additional details about pre-service teachers' and supervisors' perspectives on the subject area competency levels of PTs. As evidenced by the quotes above, in the interviews, PTs mentioned some subject areas in which they were competent, such as teaching reading skills and developing appropriate materials; some areas in which they needed to improve, such as finding appropriate listening passages, utilizing assessment tools, and planning professional development activities. The impact of teaching practicum and teaching experiences on PTs' competency levels was evident. They indicated that teaching experiences aided them in applying their competencies to practice, thereby improving them.

Supervisors emphasized that the education provided at the university contributed to the development of subject area competencies in PTs; however, they indicated that PTs needed to review the courses they had taken during their previous years and try to learn topics in addition to what was taught at the university. Additionally, supervisors also mentioned several areas, including PTs' lack of motivation to plan professional development activities and PTs' competency in reading skills.

## **5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

### **5.1. Introduction**

The following chapter will discuss the study's quantitative and qualitative findings in the same order as the research questions:

1) What are the viewed Subject Area Competency levels of pre-service English language teachers studying at a state university in Turkey?

2) What are the views of supervisors on the Subject Area Competency levels of pre-service English language teachers studying at a state university in Turkey?

3) Do the views of supervisors and pre-service English language teachers substantially differ regarding pre-service teachers' English language teaching Subject Area Competency levels?

Following the detailed discussion, an overall conclusion of the study will be presented. The chapter will conclude with implications and recommendations for further research.

### **5.2. Perceived Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-service Teachers**

When the subject area competency levels of pre-service teachers were examined, it was discovered that they considered themselves competent. The findings showed that pre-service English language teachers believed they were knowledgeable in their subject areas of expertise. The result corroborated with other researches in the field (Cantekin, 2009; Polat, 2010; Kömür, 2010; Sharbain & Tan, 2012; Balyer, 2017; Yüksel & Sağlam, 2018, Aktaş, 2019; Dinler, 2019; Temizel-Zengin & Radmard, 2019). However, the findings differed from those of Yüksel (2014), who concluded that PTs had a moderate level of subject area competency. Table 4.2. (see p. 36) summarized overall self-perspectives of PTs of three categories and revealed that they perceived themselves competent in all categories. The highest-ranked category was Supporting Language Skills, and the lowest-ranked category was Assessment and Evaluation. The findings revealed that, although the PTs perceive themselves to be competent in all categories, they believed they were more competent in Supporting Language Skills and Assessment and Evaluation. The results could imply the theoretical education PTs received at university contributed to their subject area competencies as they stated in the interviews:

“I took lessons from well-equipped teachers”; “I have learned a lot”; and “The education is of very high quality.”

Additionally, interview findings indicated that PTs believed they were competent and possessed sufficient theoretical knowledge. However, it was discovered that having teaching experience besides teaching as a requirement of the practicum course enhanced PTs' ability to apply subject area competencies in real life, as opposed to other PTs who had no experience other than teaching during the practicum. The result indicated that teaching experience affects the competency of pre-service teachers. While PTs acquired competencies through courses, they could apply them in real-world situations through practice and experience. In their cross-sectional study, Yüksel & Sağlam (2018) concluded that senior year ELT pre-service teachers perceived themselves to be more competent than sophomore year PTs, indicating that as PTs receive education, they become more competent, demonstrating the value of education. Polat (2010) reached the conclusion that in-service teachers had higher self-perspectives than pre-service teachers and discovered the importance of experience in enhancing subject area competencies. Hol & Aktas (2013) and Temizel-Zengin & Radmard (2019) concluded that teachers with a master's or doctorate degree had significantly higher self- perspectives of subject area competence. All of these studies indicate that as students progress through their education and gain experience, their subject area competencies improve. Thus, it is critical for PTs to develop themselves throughout their university years, participate in professional development or pursue graduate studies in order to enhance their competencies suggested by Bellibaş & Gümüş, (2016).

Initially, pre-service teachers' views were investigated in terms of categories of the scale. Pre-service teachers considered themselves competent the most in Supporting Language Skills. The results echoed the results of former studies which unveiled PTs were competent in Supporting Language Skills (Penn-Edwards, 2010; Hol & Aktas, 2013; Odabas-Kararmaz, 2013; Balyer, 2017; Aktaş, 2019; Dinler, 2019). PTs considered themselves competent or highly competent, indicating that they could adequately support learners' language skills. The results in Table 4.3. (see p. 36) revealed that PTs had the highest self- perspectives in Item 18- “helping students to express their predictions based on the visuals” (M=4,45) indicating they could aid the students in conveying their predictions in the context of the visuals; and Item 19- “assigning writing tasks to students to improve their writing skills in line with the learning outcomes” (M=4,45) indicating

that pre-service teachers considered themselves sufficient to help students improve the students writing skills through writing tasks. Having no item as moderately competent, incompetent, and highly incompetent revealed that PTs believed they were adept at every part of the category.

PTs did, however, identify several areas for improvement during their interviews. For example, they mentioned that they needed to improve their English proficiency in order to assist students with their language abilities and support their language skills. It is crucial to improve the language abilities of English language teachers to enhance the language skills of the students (Aktaş, 2019), which is why pre-service teachers need to improve their language abilities throughout their university years. A study conducted by Dinler (2019) concluded that PTs, who had a high level of English proficiency, could teach the language effectively by using the target language.

The impact of teaching experience was also evident here, as PTs discovered during their teaching practicum that some areas were challenging. PTs stated that it was difficult to find listening passages that corresponded to the outcomes and levels of the students, and they needed to adjust the listening passages to make them appropriate for learners. Additionally, they stated that they wrote listening lesson plans during their methodology course; however, their lecturers provided the listening passages. As a result, they struggled to choose suitable listening texts during their teaching practicum, as they were left to their own devices. The findings corroborated Kömür's (2010) conclusion that PTs struggled to teach listening skills due to a lack of materials, classroom management problems, and the slowness of the learners in following listening texts. In comparison to difficulties encountered when teaching listening skills, PTs experienced fewer difficulties when teaching reading skills, and considered finding reading passages for students and asking comprehension questions were relatively straightforward tasks. Similar findings were also reported by Kömür (2010).

Finally, PTs were hesitant to organize activities that would help them develop professionally, preferring to attend if such events were organized by others. It can be deduced that PTs were still open to professional development despite their lack of knowledge about how to plan professional development organizations. Aktaş (2019) also concluded that PTs would follow the developments in the English field after starting the profession, and could reflect the things they have learned from the professional development programs to their students. To provide a high-quality English education, it

is critical to have teachers who are constantly improving their professional skills. Thus, the competency of PTs in terms of professional development should be enhanced.

Pre-service teachers perceived themselves competent in the Assessment and Evaluation subcategory. The findings corroborated previous researches (Kızılaslan, 2011; Hol & Aktas, 2013; Odabaş-Kararmaz, 2013; Yüksel, 2014; Yüksel & Sağlam, 2018; Aktaş, 2019; Dinler, 2019). Even though PTs considered themselves competent, the Assessment and Evaluation subcategory received the lowest scores compared to the other categories, which was consistent with the research conducted by Hol & Aktas (2013), which discovered that while views of lecturers of their competencies were high, Assessment and Evaluation category received the lowest scores. The result showed that even in-service teachers seem to need further support in the area of Assessment and Evaluation. This indicates that more opportunities should be provided to pre-service teachers to prepare and implement various forms of assessment during their training. In addition, they should be made aware that continuous professional development is needed in this field. The results in Table 4.4. (p. 36) indicated that pre-service teachers had the highest self- perspectives in Assessment and Evaluation in Item 31- “using alternative assessment and evaluation methods (student portfolio, performance task, project, diaries, etc.) and approaches” (M=4,27), indicating that pre-service teachers considered themselves competent in implementing alternative assessment tools to evaluate their students. This result unveiled that PTs could utilize different assessment techniques appropriate for their learners which was corroborated Dinler’s (2019) assertion. The absence of items on the scale indicating moderately competent, incompetent, and highly incompetent indicated that PTs considered themselves adept at Assessment and Evaluation.

The interviews, however, revealed that some PTs were unadapt using alternative assessment tools in real-world settings and had no notion how to implement them. Aydoğdu (2007) concluded that English language teachers used formal assessments more frequently than they implemented alternative assessment because teachers recalled how they were evaluated when they were students and implemented the same approaches to assess their students. The results indicated that PTs might be familiar with alternative assessment tools, as they were introduced to them during assessment courses but perhaps did not have the opportunity to apply these tools in real classroom settings. Some PTs claimed it was challenging to write exam questions based on learning outcomes because

they could only evaluate knowledge-level learning outcomes. PTs stated that, in addition to learning the theoretical aspects of assessment, they needed to learn how to apply them in real-world teaching circumstances. Giraldo & Murcia (2018) also concluded that PTs wished to enroll in an evaluation course that covers practical aspects of language assessment, such as item writing, as well as assessment types and purposes. They indicated that the evaluation course should increase pre-service teachers' overall awareness of the meaning and implications of language assessment. Despite the importance of having a practice-based assessment course, Ölmezer-Öztürk and Aydın (2019) revealed that in ELT pre-service education, PTs received an insufficient number of courses on testing and assessment, and were taught theoretical concepts such as validity or reliability, resulting in ELT teachers having a low level of knowledge on assessment. As can be determined from the researches above, the content of the assessment course affects PTs' literacy on assessment. Finally, PTs stated in interviews that because they were currently enrolled in the testing course, their assessment competency would improve over time. This finding was consistent with the findings of Xu and He (2019), who concluded that PTs' assessment competency increased and became more comprehensive during practicum. They concluded that as teaching practicum provides excellent opportunities for PTs to develop their assessment competency, PTs require more time in practicum to be fully involved in assessment practice.

PTs perceived themselves to be competent in the Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment category, which was consistent with previous research in the field (Kızılaslan, 2011; Hol & Aktas, 2013; Odabaş-Kararmaz, 2013; Yüksel, 2014; Yüksel & Sağlam, 2018; Aktas, 2019; Dinler, 2019). In this category, PTs regarded themselves as either highly competent or competent, indicating that they were adept at organizing the learning and teaching environment. Table 4.4. (see p. 38) revealed that PTs had the highest self-perspectives in Supporting Language Skills in Item 5, “keeping the students' interest alive by means of the materials” ( $M= 4,43$ ), implying that PTs can use materials to engage students throughout the course. The absence of items labeled as moderately competent, incompetent, or highly incompetent suggested that the university courses and teaching practicum provide sufficient theoretical and practical opportunities for PTs to develop their competencies.

The interview results concerning PTs Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment competency revealed that PTs regarded designing materials for each lesson and subject

as costly. They did, however, conclude that they were capable of designing materials. They emphasized the use of Web 2.0 tools as it is time for the digital era, and handcrafted materials are now out of date. PTs had to observe and conduct online lessons; therefore, they seem to have observed the importance of organizing learning-teaching environments in accordance with online teaching.

PTs indicated that they could use various error correction techniques to assist their students in using English correctly and that making errors was a sign that students were actively engaged with the language. Additionally, they desired that students be free to express themselves without fear of making a mistake. Even though the current study concluded that PTs could employ different error correction techniques in the classroom, Aydoğdu (2007) concluded that English language teachers did not implement various error correction techniques for diverse learners, despite their views of errors as a natural byproduct of the learning process. The PTs in the current study had limited opportunities to teach and therefore to correct errors. Thus, it can be inferred that PTs in this study may be aware of error correction techniques and feel confident in using them but when it comes to using them their perceptions and applications might change.

### **5.3. Views of Supervisors on the Subject Area Competency Levels of Pre-Service Teachers**

The quantitative results unveiled that supervisors' views of subject area competency of pre-service teachers were high. These results indicated that supervisors believed PTs had sufficient theoretical knowledge and practiced enough in the school practicum during pre-service education. Qualitative analysis also yielded that supervisors believed PTs' subject area competencies were adequate. They indicated that the education provided at the ELT department where this study was conducted and the tasks that PTs completed at the courses were all designed for PTs to gain the competencies thus PTs were equipped well in terms of these competencies and ready for the profession.

Similar to the findings regarding the PTs, supervisors viewed PTs as competent in the Supporting Language Skills Competency sub-category, and there were no items that supervisors considered PTs as highly incompetent or incompetent. These results demonstrated that supervisors believed that PTs could adequately support the language skills of their students. However, supervisors regarded PTs as either competent or moderately competent and given the absence of an item assessing supervisors' views of

PTs as highly competent, supervisors might believe that there was a room for PTs to improve their competence to support the language skills of the students.

They perceived PTs to be most competent in Item 16- “asking 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they read” (M=4,00). The other two items with high means were also related to supporting the reading skills of the students, indicating that competency levels of pre-service teachers in supporting the reading skills of the students were adequate. Additionally, interview results showed that PTs were effective at assisting students with reading skills, though it was implied that PTs might incorporate various reading activities into their lesson plans to increase student engagement.

Supervisors also indicated that PTs were competent in assisting students with their speaking skills and planning activities that aligned with learning outcomes. Despite their view of PTs as moderately competent in initiating dialogues and improving the speaking skills of the students, they mentioned in interviews that PTs attempted to start a conversation during teaching practicum even when students did not participate. This finding indicated that supervisors' views of PTs' subject area competency levels may change after they observe PTs during their teaching practicum. Supervisors may believe PTs are moderately competent in some areas based on their prior experiences, but when given the opportunity to observe PTs, they may discover PTs are actually competent in those areas.

Supervisors rated PTs as moderately competent in determining appropriate learning approaches for their students, implying in interviews the current state of the practicum and the PTs' limited time to observe the students. They said that PTs were unable to determine learning approaches because they could observe students only once or twice a week and only through online lessons; however, supervisors stated that when PTs become teachers, they will be able to determine the appropriate approaches for their students, as they will have more time observing their students. The finding indicates that, while PTs were competent in some areas, they were inadequate to demonstrate their actual performances due to the constraints of the teaching practicum. Teaching practicum provided limited opportunities for PTs to teach, and supervisors had limited time to observe them. Therefore, there might be some competencies in which PTs were truly competent, but lacked the opportunity to demonstrate them in teaching practicum due to time constraints. However, supervisors, who have the opportunity to observe PTs

throughout their education other than during their teaching practicum, may make assumptions and assert that PTs will perform better in the future because they are aware of the subject areas in which PTs are competent or incompetent. Thus, supervisors might be able to determine PTs competency level without being restricted to the teaching practicum observation.

Supervisors perceived PTs as competent in the sub-category of Organizing the Learning-Teaching Environment. Supervisors rated all items on the scale as competent or moderately competent, indicating that while PTs were competent in this category, certain aspects could be improved. Additionally, the absence of any items classified as highly incompetent or incompetent indicated that PTs are capable of organizing a learning-teaching environment adequately. Supervisors perceived PTs to be most competent Items 3 and 4- “creating stimuli (visual, auditory materials etc.) that should be present in the teaching environment” (M=4,00); and “when needed, in addition to the textbooks, designing appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students” (M=3,93), demonstrating that PTs could establish a proper teaching environment and develop appropriate materials for their learners despite conducting lessons online via zoom. They also perceived PTs were competent in keeping students' interests alive through materials, indicating that PTs could both create materials for their students and capture their attention with them. They did mention, however, that PTs were moderately competent in enabling students to use English correctly and comprehensively; this could indicate that either PTs were unaware of the mistakes students had made in the lessons, or as one of the PTs stated, that they did not want to correct them but solely wanted them to attend the lessons. They also indicated that pre-service teachers were moderately competent in using the interactive approach. That could be because they did not have the opportunity to implement the approach as they taught the lessons online. Supervisors stated that PTs were moderately competent in improving language skills and developing appropriate questions for students with varying learning abilities. This result indicated that PTs had difficulty developing language skills of students who had different learning ability levels. Supervisors may argue that because PTs encountered few students in teaching practicum.

Of all the sub-categories, it was found that supervisors perceived PTs the least competent in Assessment and Evaluation sub-category. That is while supervisors perceived PTs as competent in Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment and

Supporting Language Skills, they perceived PTs as having a moderate level of competence in the Assessment and Evaluation Competence sub-category. Also, contrary to PTs who rated themselves as competent, supervisors rated them as moderately competent. It is critical to emphasize that no item in this category indicated that supervisors view PTs as competent or highly competent. The results yielded that PTs' assessment and evaluation competencies need to be improved.

The results of the interviews revealed similar conclusions. It was determined that no Assessment and Evaluation applications could be made during the practicum process. The results demonstrated that, despite the availability of theoretical courses in Assessment and Evaluation, no opportunities for implementation existed. This may explain why supervisors identified PTs with a moderate level of competence. However, supervisors indicated during the interviews that even when there were no opportunities for implementation, they thought PTs were adequate to overcome obstacles such as writing appropriate exam questions and implementing suitable assessment types for the learners, etc. It was stated that the testing course was concurrent with the teaching practicum, thereby PTs' assessment and evaluation competency levels might improve over time.

#### **5.4. Comparison of Pre-service' and Supervisors' Views**

To answer the third research question, pre-service teachers' and supervisors' views were compared with each other. The findings indicated a statistically significant difference in the Subject Area Competencies of pre-service teachers between PTs and supervisors. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test indicated both groups of participants had high views on PTs' subject area competency, yet compared to supervisors, pre-service teachers perceived themselves as more competent, which is consistent with the study conducted by Çakır & Alici (2009). Thus, it might be concluded that PTs perceived themselves as more competent in subject area than supervisors' views of PTs' competency level. It is possible that PTs made more favorable judgments about themselves than supervisors did because they believed that they received an adequate level of theoretical education at the program where the study was conducted and, thus, considered themselves competent in subject areas. However, the majority of them taught only one or two lessons during their internship, thereby they may be unaware of their actual competence in practice. Thus, it is important to keep in mind that PTs' views of

their subject area competencies may change throughout the teaching practicum, either positively or negatively. Supervisors, on the other hand, throughout PTs' university education, did everything possible to help them; they closely monitored them; and they were familiar with each PT's unique capacities, weaknesses, and strengths. As a result, they can make more accurate assessments of PTs' competencies and avoid exaggerating or underestimating their abilities.

Views of supervisors and PTs competencies differed in all the subcategories; Supporting Language Skills, Organizing Learning-Teaching Environment, and Assessment and Evaluation. This could be because as PTs complete their teaching practicum course and receive positive feedback from their cooperating teachers and students, they may become motivated and feel more competent. Supervisors, on the other hand, observe the deficiencies of PTs during the teaching practicum and identify the competencies that PTs should develop. This may explain why supervisors' views of PTs' subject area competencies were lower than views of PTs' as PTs may be unaware of competencies that need to be improved.

On the scale, supervisors' and pre-service teachers' views of PT subject area competencies differed almost in every item, implying that pre-service teachers' self-views were higher than supervisors' views of PT subject area competencies. However, in four items, their perspectives were aligned. Both pre-service teachers and supervisors viewed PTs as competent in Item 3, "creating stimuli (visual, auditory materials, etc.) that should be present in the teaching environment", indicating that PTs could organize the teaching environment by creating necessary stimuli. This may indicate that during their teaching practicums, PTs were capable of organizing classroom environments and providing necessary stimuli; additionally, supervisors may have observed that PTs were adept at this. Their views were aligned in Item 4, "designing appropriate learning material in line with the level of the students" resulting in the conclusion that PTs are capable of designing appropriate materials for their learners. This could indicate that during their teaching practicums, PTs believed they were adept at designing materials appropriate for the learners' levels, and supervisors shared these views. It also indicates that both pre-service teachers and supervisors believe the material designing course provides adequate education in terms of developing materials that are appropriate for the students' levels. In Item 8, "finding texts that will help improve students' listening skills in line with learning outcomes" both pre-service teachers and supervisors rated PTs as competent, implying

that PTs are skilled at improving students' listening skills align with learning outcomes. This finding may imply that supervisors observed PTs during their teaching practicum and concluded that PTs could improve their learners' listening abilities, and that PTs shared similar beliefs about their ability to do so. Finally, in Item 16, "asking 5W1H questions that will help determine what students understand from what they read", both participants regarded PTs as competent, indicating that PTs are good at determining what their students understand from what they read. While supervisors and PTs had divergent views on PTs' overall competencies, as demonstrated above, there were some areas in which they agreed.

### **5.5. Conclusion and Implications**

The current study was conducted to determine ELT pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels from the viewpoints of PTs and their supervisors and compare their views to unveil any possible differences.

The results yielded that both pre-service teachers and supervisors perceived PTs as competent in the subject area in general. Yet, differences in competencies were revealed in relation to the sub-categories. Both PTs and supervisors reported that PTs were the most competent in the Supporting Language Skills category, but the least competent in the Assessment and Evaluation subcategory. Implying that pre-service teachers should receive a more comprehensive education in assessment, both theoretically and practically. This shows that PTs should be prompted to develop and plan assessment tools on a more frequent basis and should receive constructive feedback on their efforts in this area. Additionally, PTs should be given more opportunities to practice continuous assessment during their practicum as a way of preparing for teaching in real-world settings.

PTs and supervisors also stated that the education PTs received at the university where the study was conducted and university methodology courses are sufficient for PTs to gain subject area competencies in general; however; the content of methodology courses should be enriched, as PTs may teach lessons online in the future. Therefore, methodology courses should cover what can be done in an online classroom when a problem arises or how to improve the quality of online education. Besides supervisors indicated in interviews that pre-service teachers needed to review certain subjects to avoid forgetting them later.

PTs suggested that the duration of the teaching practicum be extended. Several types of research have highlighted the importance of teaching practicum in developing competencies (Kömür, 2010; Yüksel, 2014; Dinler, 2019; Aktaş, 2019). According to Kömür (2010), the teaching practicum is the first opportunity for PTs to gain practical experience in their teaching careers, and it provides them with opportunities to improve their competencies. Thus, PTs should be given opportunities to broaden their skills through experience. Providing opportunities for them to interact with learners for extended periods is the most efficient and reliable method of assisting them in acquiring skills and competencies. Teaching practicum, which is more challenging now as it is conducted online, needs to be longer and more comprehensive for PTs to improve their competencies.

Furthermore, with the assistance of the teaching practicum, PTs identified the subject area competencies in which they needed to improve. PTs stated that they needed to improve their English proficiency to provide better education to their students. They also mentioned it was challenging to find appropriate listening passages for their students. As they were taking the assessment course when the data were gathered, they expressed their competency would improve over time, though they needed more practice to learn how to implement assessment tools better in real teaching situations. Supervisors stated that PTs were capable of performing well in assessment even when confronted with difficulties such as writing exam questions or choosing appropriate assessment types for the learners. PTs mentioned that they would attend the programs to further their professional development, though supervisors indicated PTs were unmotivated to plan and attend professional development programs. PTs mentioned that they could organize the learning-teaching environment, and create interactive materials with web 2.0 tools as they had to conduct lesson online. Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) such as Web 2.0 tools have gained further importance in teaching as the lessons are conducted online due to Covid-19 and it has become more apparent that ICT should be integrated within the curriculum as an essential tool. Thus to enable 21<sup>st</sup>-century learning, which necessitates the instant incorporation and implementation of ICT, PTs' competencies regarding implementing their skills into online teaching environments should be enhanced.

Due to the changing era, pre-service teachers need to possess competencies in the 21<sup>st</sup> century skills in addition to subject-area competencies. OECD (2018) in their Future

of Education and Skills 2030 project determined three types of skills that teachers need to possess as 21<sup>st</sup> century skills. The first is related to cognitive and meta-cognitive skills such as critical thinking, creative thinking, learning-to-learn, and self-regulation. The second skill is empathy, self-efficacy, responsibility, and cooperation, all of which are social and emotional skills. The final skills are concerned with practical and physical skills, as well as the ability to use modern information and communication technology tools. Pre-service teachers should not only be competent in their subject areas but should also have the above mentioned skills in order to adequately support their learners'

It was established that supervisors and PTs viewed PTs to be competent in their subject areas in general. However, when the views of supervisors and Pts were compared across all categories, supervisors' viewed PTs as being less competent compared to how PTs viewed their own competencies. self-perspectives. Although supervisors' views of pre-service teachers were lower than pre-service teachers' self-perspectives, supervisors viewed pre-service teachers as competent. This concludes that the university education and teaching practicum program provide sufficient opportunities for pre-service teachers to acquire necessary competencies. The reason why pre-service teachers consider themselves more competent compared to their supervisors can be because they may be unaware of their deficiencies and believe themselves to be more competent than they actually are and may not be aware of the subject area competencies set by MoNE (2017b). Thus, it may be beneficial for PTs to be informed about teacher competencies before beginning their teaching practicum or even in the initial years of their training. Awareness of MoNE's competencies, which are revised regularly, may aid student teachers in developing successful teaching behaviors. Additionally, this awareness may aid them in identifying and prioritizing their professional development requirements. Thus for teacher education systems to enable all pre-service teachers to acquire and develop the subject area competencies set by MoNE (2017b), coherent and relevant learning and implementation opportunities for all pre-service teachers.

### **5.5. Limitations and Suggestions for further researches**

This study has several limitations. The results are confined to the university and department concerned and other universities and departments with similar features and conditions. The study does not aim at generalization, however, it provides a perspective

on language teacher competencies indicating a need for further studies to understand the situation more clearly.

Furthermore, it is critical to remember that practicum teaching is a three-tiered system comprised of pre-service teachers, supervisors, and cooperating teachers from practicum schools. Thus, it may be beneficial to discover cooperating teachers' views on PTs subject area competency levels.

Future studies should be conducted to overcome the limitations of the current study and provide for a more comprehensive picture of the subject area competency of ELT pre-service teachers. Further research could reveal pre-service teachers' subject area competency levels in a variety of research settings and with a variety of participants.

It would be ideal to conduct studies combining self-reports and actual observation of pre-service teachers to determine whether PTs' self-perceived subject area competence correlates with their actual performance on teaching practicum.

The teaching practicum is critical for pre-service teachers to develop their subject area competency. That is why, in order to determine the effect of teaching practicum on the subject area competency levels of PTs, a pre- and post-practicum comparison study can be conducted.

Furthermore, after participants begin teaching in real-world settings, they can be observed to see if their views regarding their subject area competency change. A comparison of pre-service and in-service teachers' self-perspectives of teacher competencies would reveal the degree of alignment between their own education and the education they provide. This may help in the process of bridging the gap between theory and practice.

This study only investigated the MoNE (2017b) generated subject area competencies of ELT pre-service teachers. General teacher competencies of ELT pre-service teachers might be investigated in order to determine whether PTs are ready for becoming English language teachers more holistically.

PTs assigned to various grades can be observed throughout the teaching practicum to determine whether and how the internship school affects the PTs' subject area competency levels.

## REFERENCES

- Aktaş, K. (2019). *İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının meslekteki ilk yıllarına yönelik olası benlikleri ile özel alan yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki* (MA Thesis). Retrieved from Council of Higher Education (CHE) Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 586889).
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2002). *ACTFL/NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep> (11.09.2020)
- Andrew, L. (2007). A new university supervisor: Their experiences and enrichment. *Essays in Education*, 22, 12-27.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2017). English teachers' perspectives about teacher competencies in terms of professional identity. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(4), 1641–1669.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2018). Are generic and English teacher competencies sufficient and realistic enough? *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(2), 44-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v0i0.1600>
- Aydoğdu, E. (2007). *EFL teachers' perceptions of foreign language teaching competences* (MA Thesis). Retrieved from Council of Higher Education (CHE) Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 240920).
- Balyer, A. (2017). Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of their Competency for the Teaching Profession. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 6(2), 230–248. <https://doi.org/10.30703/cije.334295>
- Barnett, R. (1994). *The limits of competence: Knowledge, higher education and society*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Beck, C. & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29 (2), 81-98.
- Bellibaş, M. & Gümüş, E. (2016). Teachers' perceptions of the quantity and quality of professional development activities in Turkey. *Cogent Education*, 3, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1172950>
- Bozavlı, E. (2015). Yabancı dil öğrenme/öğretim sorunsalı çözüm eylemsel (actional) yaklaşım mı? *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, 2, 31-42.
- Bunda, M. A. & Sanders, J. R. (eds.) (1979). *Practices and problems in competency-based education*. UMI: A Bell and Howell Company
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çokluk, Ö. & Köklü, N. (2011). *Sosyal bilimler için istatistik*. (20th ed.) Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

- Cantekin, Ö. F. (2009). *Genel liselerde görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin mesleki ve iletişimsel yeterlilikleri* (PhD Thesis). Retrieved from Council of Higher Education (CHE) Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 278394).
- Özen, E. N., Alpaslan, İ. B., Çağlı, A., Özdoğan, İ., Sancak, M., Dizman, A. O. & Vale, D. (2013). Turkey national needs assessment of state school English language teaching. *British Council & TEPAV, ArkaikArt Media Design, Ankara, Turkey*.
- Council of Higher Education, Turkey (CHE) & World Bank. (1998). *School-Faculty Partnership*, Ankara: YÖK.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. US: Sage publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Çelik, S., Koç, G., & Çelik, K. (2018). İngilizce öğretmeni özel alan yeterliliği ölçeği: Bir ölçek geliştirmeye çalışması. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 22(1), 277-298.
- Çeliköz, N. (2000). Bir meslek olarak öğretmenlik ve etiği. Ozdemir, C., (Ed.) (331-388). *Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Giriş*. Ankara: Asil.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-Century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300-314
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining “highly qualified teachers”: What does “scientifically-based research” actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31, 13-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031009013>.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Dinler, A. (2019). *EFL trainee teachers' self-perceived competencies* (MA Thesis). Retrieved from Council of Higher Education (CHE) Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 583928).
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Eaquals. (2021). *The European Profiling Grid* Retrieved from <https://www.eaquals.org/our-expertise/teacher-development/the-european-profiling-grid> (09.12.2020)
- Eurydice. (2002). *The teaching profession in Europe: profile, trends, and concerns. Teacher supply and demand at general lower secondary level. Key topics in education in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Giraldo, F. & Murcia, D. (2018). Language assessment literacy for pre-service teachers: Course expectations from different stakeholders. *GIST – Education and Learning Research Journal*, (16), 56-77. <https://doi.org/10.26817/16925777.425>
- Gupta, K. (1999). *A practical guide for need assessment*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.
- Gündüz, H. B. (2003). Bir meslek olarak öğretmenlik. *Öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş*. Karşlı, M. D. (Ed.) (29-48). Ankara: Öğreti
- Güneş, S. (2011). *Kimya öğretmen adaylarının özel alan yeterliklerinin araştırılması*. Gazi Üniversitesi: (MA Thesis). Retrieved from Council of Higher Education (CHE) Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 586889).
- Gürten, E. & Demirel, Ö. (2010). *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye'deki öğretmen yeterliklerin karşılaştırmalı incelenmesi*. Uluslar arası Öğretmen Yetiştirme Politikaları ve Sorunları Sempozyumu II
- Hacıoğlu, F. & Alkan C. (1997). *Öğretmenlik uygulamaları – öğretim teknolojisi*. Ankara: Alkım Yayınevi
- Hol, D. & Aktas, S. (2013). An evaluation of competency perceptions of non-native English instructors. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70(258), 1163–1173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.172>
- Hudson, P. & Hudson, S. (2010). Mentor educators' understandings of mentoring pre-service primary teachers. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(2), 157-170.
- Hudson, S. M., Hudson, P., Weatherby-Fell, N. L., & Shipway, B. (2016). Graduate standards for teachers: Final-year preservice teachers potentially identify the gaps. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(9), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n9.8>
- Karacaoğlu, Ö.M. (2008). Determining the teacher competencies required in Turkey in the European Union Harmonization Process. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 4, 86-94.
- Kızılaslan, I. (2011). ELT Student teachers' competence for teaching language skills: A qualitative exploration. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity*

*Studies*, 3 (1), 161-169. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ijsshs/issue/26221/276147> (26.02.2021)

- Kilimci, S. (2011). *Türkiye’de öğretmen yetiştirme*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Koçyiğit, M., Erdem, C. & Eğmir, E. (2020). Öğretmenlerin ve öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleği genel yeterliklerine ilişkin öz değerlendirmeleri. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 9(3), 774-799. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30703/cije.651639>
- Koster, B., & 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.
- Kovac, V., Rafajac, B. & Buchberger, V. (2014). Croatian teacher competencies related to the creation and implementation of education policy. *CEPS Journal* 4, 51-73.
- Köksal, N. (2013). Competencies in teacher education: Preservice teachers’ perceptions about competencies and their attitudes. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(6), 270–276
- Kömür, Ş. (2010). Teaching knowledge and teacher competencies: A case study of Turkish preservice English teachers. *Teaching Education*, 21(3), 279–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2010.498579>
- Miller, W. R. & Miller, M. F. (2002). *Instructors and their jobs*. Homewood: American Technical Publishers
- Ministry of National Education (MONE). (2006). Öğretmen yeterlilikleri. *Tebliğler Dergisi*. 69 (2590), 1491-1540.
- Ministry of National Education (MONE), (2008). *Öğretmen yeterlilikleri, öğretmenlik mesleği genel ve özel alan yeterlilikleri*. Retrieved from <http://otmg.meb.gov.tr/alaningilizce.html> (18.10.2020)
- Ministry of National Education (MONE). (2017a). *Generic teaching competence. Head Office of Teacher Training and Development. Ankara*. Retrieved from [oygm.meb.gov.tr/www/ogretmenlik-meslegi-genel-yeterlikleri/icerik/39](http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/www/ogretmenlik-meslegi-genel-yeterlikleri/icerik/39) (17.10.2020)
- Ministry of National Education (MONE). (2017b). *İlköğretim özel alan yeterlikleri* Retrieved from [https://oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2017\\_11/06160113\\_2-YYretmen\\_Yeterlikleri\\_KitabY\\_ingilizce\\_YYretmeni\\_Yzel\\_alan\\_yeterlikleri\\_ilk\\_YYretim\\_parYa\\_5.pdf](https://oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_11/06160113_2-YYretmen_Yeterlikleri_KitabY_ingilizce_YYretmeni_Yzel_alan_yeterlikleri_ilk_YYretim_parYa_5.pdf). (18.10.2020)
- Odabaş-Kararmaz (2013). *İlköğretim İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öğretmenlik mesleği özel alan yeterliliklerine ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi* (MA Thesis). Retrieved from Council of Higher Education (CHE) Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 345338).

- OECD (2018). The Future of education and skills: Education 2030. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/teaching-and-learning/> (02.07.2021)
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Aydın, B. (2019). Voices of EFL teachers as assessors: Their opinions and needs regarding language assessment. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi - Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 7(1), 373-390.
- Özdemir, S.M. (2016). Öğretmen niteliğinin bir göstergesi olarak sürekli gelişim, *Gazi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 233 – 244
- Penn-Edwards, S. (2010). The competencies of an English teacher: Beginning student teachers' perceptions. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(2), 49-66
- Polat, N. (2010). A comparative analysis of pre-and in-service teacher beliefs about readiness and self-competency: Revisiting teacher education for ELLs. *System*, 38(2), 228–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.004>
- Rychen, D.S. & Salganik, L.H. (2003). *Key competencies for a successful life and a well-functioning society*. Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students* (6th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- Selvi, K. (2010). Teachers' competencies. *CULTURA*, 7(1), 167-175.
- Sharbain, I. H. A., & Tan, K. (2012). Pre-service teachers' level of competence and their attitudes towards the teaching profession. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 1(3), 14–22.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review* 57(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r5645541>
- Slick, S. K. (1998). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14, 821-834.
- Şahin, A. E. (2004). Öğretmen yeterliklerinin belirlenmesi. *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim Dergisi*, 58. Retrieved from <http://yayim.meb.gov.tr/dergiler/sayi58/sahin.htm> (23.12.2020)
- Tanrıverdi, B., & Apak, Ö. (2013). Evaluating teacher education curricula in terms of facilitating teacher competencies. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 46(2), 297-318.
- TESOL International Association (2008). *Efl Professional teaching standards*. Alexandria:VA Retrieved from: <https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/papers-and-briefs/tesol-guidelines-for-developing-efl-professional-teaching-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=6> (24.12.2020)

- Turkish Education Association (TED). (2009). *Öğretmen yeterlikleri*. Ankara: Türk Eğitim Derneği
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Westera, W. (2001). Competences in education: A confusion of tongues. *Curriculum Studies*, 33(1), 75-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270120625>
- Xu, Y. & He, L. (2019) How pre-service teachers' conceptions of assessment change over practicum: Implications for teacher assessment literacy. *Frontiers in Education* 4:145. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00145>
- Yüksel, İ. & Saglam S. (2018). Are preservice teachers competent enough? A cross-sectional analysis of ELT pre-service teachers' perceived teacher competencies. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 4(11) 205–228. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1324283>
- Yüksel, H. G. (2014). Teachers of the future: Perceived teaching competences and visions of pre-service English language teachers. *International Journal of Human Sciences./ Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v11i2.2920>
- Zengin, D. Ö. T. & Radmard, S. (2019). İlköğretim kurumlarında görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin mesleki ve iletişim yeterliliklerine yönelik algılarının analizi. *Academy Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 42-63. <https://doi.org/10.31805/acjes.567605>

## APPENDIX - A Consent Form for Pre-Service Teachers

### Gönüllü Katılım formu

Değerli öğretmen adayı;

Bu çalışma, Öğretmen Adaylarının ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması dersi öğretim üyelerinin İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Konu Alanı Yeterlilik Düzeylerine İlişkin Görüşleri başlıklı bir araştırma çalışması olup İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının özel alan yeterliliklerini belirleme amacını taşımaktadır. Çalışma, Yüksek Lisans tezi kapsamında Elmas SÜNTAR tarafından yürütülmektedir.

Veri toplama sürecinde/süreçlerinde size rahatsızlık verebilecek herhangi bir soru/talep olmayacaktır. Yine de katılımınız sırasında herhangi bir sebepten rahatsızlık hissederseniz çalışmadan istediğiniz zamanda ayrılabilirsiniz. Çalışmadan ayrılmanız durumunda sizden toplanan veriler çalışmadan çıkarılacak ve imha edilecektir.

İsminiz ve mail adresiniz araştırmanın bir sonraki adımı olan görüşmelere katılmaya gönüllü olan katılımcılara ulaşmak için kullanılacaktır. Elde edilen veriler bir bilimsel araştırmada kullanılacaktır. Başka herhangi bir amaçla kullanılmayacaktır.

İstemeniz halinde sizden toplanan verileri inceleme hakkınız bulunmaktadır.

Bu ölçek İngilizce öğretmenlerinin özel alan yeterliliklerini belirlemek için hazırlanmıştır. Ölçek iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölümde size ait bazı bilgilerle ilgili sorular bulunmaktadır. İkinci bölümde ise “İngilizce Öğretmeni Özel Alan Yeterlilikleri” ile ilgili ifadeler yer almaktadır. Sizden beklenen, aşağıdaki ifadeleri okumanız, kendinizi bir İngilizce öğretmeni düşünerek bu ifadelerde “kesinlikle katılmıyorum”, “katılmıyorum”, “kısmen katılıyorum”, “katılıyorum” ve “kesinlikle katılıyorum” seçeneklerinden uygun gördüğünüzü işaretlemenizdir.

Çalışma hakkındaki sorularınızı araştırmacılara yöneltebilirsiniz. Katılımınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Elmas SÜNTAR  
İngilizce Öğretmeni  
elmassuntar@anadolu.edu.tr

Dr. Öğr. Üy. HÜLYA İPEK  
Anadolu Üniversitesi Öğretim Üyesi  
hipek@anadolu.edu.tr

**Bu çalışmaya tamamen kendi rızamla, istediğim takdirde çalışmadan ayrılabileceğimi bilerek verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.**

## APPENDIX - B Consent Form for Supervisors

### Gönüllü Katılım formu

Değerli Öğretim Üyesi;

Bu çalışma, "Öğretmen Adaylarının ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması dersi öğretim üyelerinin İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Konu Alanı Yeterlilik Düzeylerine İlişkin Görüşler"i başlıklı bir araştırma çalışması olup İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının alan yeterliliklerini belirleme amacını taşımaktadır. Çalışma, Yüksek Lisans tezi kapsamında Elmas SÜNTAR tarafından yürütülmektedir.

Veri toplama sürecinde/süreçlerinde size rahatsızlık verebilecek herhangi bir soru/talep olmayacaktır. Yine de katılımınız sırasında herhangi bir sebepten rahatsızlık hissederseniz çalışmadan istediğiniz zamanda ayrılabilirsiniz. Çalışmadan ayrılmanız durumunda sizden toplanan veriler çalışmadan çıkarılacak ve imha edilecektir.

İsminiz araştırmanın bir sonraki adımı olan görüşmelere katılmaya gönüllü iseniz size ulaşmak için kullanılacaktır. Elde edilen veriler bir bilimsel araştırmada kullanılacaktır. Başka herhangi bir amaçla kullanılmayacaktır.

İstemeniz halinde sizden toplanan verileri inceleme hakkınız bulunmaktadır.

Bu ölçek İngilizce öğretmenlerinin özel alan yeterliklerini belirlemek için hazırlanmıştır. Ölçek iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölümde size ait bazı bilgilerle ilgili sorular bulunmaktadır. İkinci bölümde ise "İngilizce Öğretmeni Özel Alan Yeterlikleri" ile ilgili ifadeler yer almaktadır. Sizden beklenen, aşağıdaki ifadeleri okumanız ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması kapsamında staj danışmanı bulunduğunuz son sınıf aday öğretmenleri düşünerek bu ifadelerde "kesinlikle katılmıyorum", "katılmıyorum", "kısmen katılıyorum", "katılıyorum" ve "kesinlikle katılıyorum" seçeneklerinden uygun gördüğünüzü işaretlemenizdir.

Çalışma hakkındaki sorularınızı araştırmacılara yöneltebilirsiniz. Katılımınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Elmas SÜNTAR  
İngilizce Öğretmeni  
elmassuntar@anadolu.edu.tr

Dr. Öğr. Üy. HÜLYA İPEK  
Anadolu Üniversitesi Öğretim Üyesi  
hipek@anadolu.edu.tr

**Bu çalışmaya tamamen kendi rızamla, istediğim takdirde çalışmadan ayrılabileceğimi bilerek verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.**

APPENDIX – C English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale (Pre-service Teachers  
Version)

**I. BÖLÜM**

Adınız:

Cinsiyetiniz nedir?

( ) Kadın ( ) Erkek

Staj yaptığınız kademe hangisidir?

( ) İlkokul ( ) Ortaokul  
( ) Lise ( ) Üniversite

Hazırlık okudunuz mu?

( ) Evet ( ) Hayır

Daha öncesinde öğretmenlik deneyiminiz var mı?(Varsa nerede ve ne kadar süredir)

( ) Evet ( ) Hayır

.....

APPENDIX – C (Continued) English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale (Pre-service Teachers Version)

II. BÖLÜM

Sıra	Yeterlikler	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
<b>İngilizce öğretmenleri;</b>						
1	Öğrencilerin dil becerilerini geliştirecek öğrenci seviyesine uygun öğretim etkinliklerini planlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	Öğretim ortamının sahip olması gereken özellikleri belirleyebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	Öğretim ortamında bulunması gereken uyaranları (görsel, işitsel materyaller gibi) oluşturabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	İhtiyaç olduğunda ders kitabı dışında öğrenci seviyesine uygun materyal tasarlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	Materyallerle öğrencilerinin ilgisini canlı tutabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	Öğrencinin kendisine uygun bir öğrenme stratejisi (tekrar, dikkat, anlamlandırma vb. stratejiler) belirlemesine katkı sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	Öğrencinin kendi öğrenme stili (görsel, işitsel, bedensel) hakkında farkındalığının oluşmasına katkı sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	Öğrencilerinin dinleme becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun metinler bulabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	Öğrencilerinin dinleme becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun kısa konuşmalar ve video kayıtları bulabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	Öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun diyalogları başlatabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	Öğrencilerinin dinlediklerinden anladıklarını belirleyebilecek 5N1K soruları sorabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	Öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun hazırlıklı konuşma görevleri verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
13	Öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun hazırlıksız konuşma görevleri verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
14	Öğrencilerinin konuşması sırasında konuşmayı yönlendirecek sorular sorabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
15	Öğrencilerinin okuma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun metinler bulabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
16	Öğrencilerinin okuduklarından anladıklarını belirleyebilecek 5N1K soruları sorabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
17	Öğrencilerinin okuduklarıyla ilgili görselleri eşleştirmesine olanak yaratabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
18	Görsellerden yola çıkarak öğrencilerinin tahminleri ortaya koymalarını sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
19	Öğrencilerinin yazma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun yazma görevleri verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
20	Öğrencilerinin hazırlıklı ya da hazırlıksız yazmalarını sağlayacak görevler verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
21	Öğrencilerinin zorluk çektiği dil becerilerini belirleyebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
22	Öğrencilerin dinleme-izleme becerilerini geliştirmelerine yardımcı olabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
23	Öğrencilerinin hazırlıksız konuşma yapmalarına yardımcı olabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
24	Dilde etkileşimli yaklaşımı etkin şekilde kullanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
25	Öğrencilerin İngilizceyi doğru, anlaşılır bir şekilde kullanmalarını sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
26	Farklı öğrenme gücüne sahip öğrencilerinin dil becerilerini geliştirebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
27	Kazanımları ölçebilecek ölçme yöntem, teknik ve yaklaşımlarını kullanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
28	Kazanımları ölçmeye dönük ölçme yöntem Teknik ve yaklaşımlarını planlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
29	Kazanımları ölçmeye dönük sorular hazırlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
30	Farklı soru tiplerinde (doğru-yanlış, açık uçlu, tamamlama, kısa cevaplı, çoktan seçmeli gibi) kazanıma uygun soru yazabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
31	Alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme (öğrenci ürün dosyası, performans görevi, proje, günlükler vb.) yöntem ve yaklaşımlarını kullanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
32	Farklı öğrenme gücüne sahip öğrencilerine uygun soru hazırlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
33	Ölçme sonuçlarını etkili bir biçimde yorumlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
34	Ölçme sonuçlarına göre öğrencilerine dönüt verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
35	Ölçme ve değerlendirme işlemi sonuçlarından öğretimi geliştirecek şekilde yararlanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
36	Mesleki gelişimi sağlayacak etkinlikler düzenleyebilmek amacıyla zümresini harekete geçirebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤



APPENDIX – D (Continued) English Teacher Subject Area Competency Scale  
(Supervisor Version)

II. BÖLÜM

Sıra	Yeterlikler	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
<b>İngilizce aday öğretmenleri;</b>						
1	Öğrencilerin dil becerilerini geliştirecek öğrenci seviyesine uygun öğretim etkinliklerini planlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	Öğretim ortamının sahip olması gereken özellikleri belirleyebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	Öğretim ortamında bulunması gereken uyarıları (görsel, işitsel materyaller gibi) oluşturabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	İhtiyaç olduğunda ders kitabı dışında öğrenci seviyesine uygun materyal tasarlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	Materyallerle öğrencilerinin ilgisini canlı tutabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	Öğrencinin kendisine uygun bir öğrenme stratejisi (tekrar, dikkat, anlamlandırma vb. stratejiler) belirlemesine katkı sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	Öğrencinin kendi öğrenme stili (görsel, işitsel, bedensel) hakkında farkındalığının oluşmasına katkı sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	Öğrencilerinin dinleme becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun metinler bulabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	Öğrencilerinin dinleme becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun kısa konuşmalar ve video kayıtları bulabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	Öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun diyalogları başlatabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	Öğrencilerinin dinlediklerinden anladıklarını belirleyebilecek 5NİK soruları sorabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	Öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun hazırlıklı konuşma görevleri verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
13	Öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun hazırlıksız konuşma görevleri verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
14	Öğrencilerinin konuşması sırasında konuşmayı yönlendirecek sorular sorabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
15	Öğrencilerinin okuma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun metinler bulabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
16	Öğrencilerinin okuduklarından anladıklarını belirleyebilecek 5NİK soruları sorabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
17	Öğrencilerinin okuduklarıyla ilgili görselleri eşleştirmesine olanak yaratabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
18	Görsellerden yola çıkarak öğrencilerinin tahminleri ortaya koymalarını sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
19	Öğrencilerinin yazma becerilerini geliştirecek kazanımlara uygun yazma görevleri verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
20	Öğrencilerinin hazırlıklı ya da hazırlıksız yazmalarını sağlayacak görevler verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
21	Öğrencilerinin zorluk çektiği dil becerilerini belirleyebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
22	Öğrencilerin dinleme-izleme becerilerini geliştirmelerine yardımcı olabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
23	Öğrencilerinin hazırlıksız konuşma yapmalarına yardımcı olabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
24	Dilde etkileşimli yaklaşımı etkin şekilde kullanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
25	Öğrencilerin İngilizceyi doğru, anlaşılır bir şekilde kullanmalarını sağlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
26	Farklı öğrenme gücüne sahip öğrencilerinin dil becerilerini geliştirebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
27	Kazanımları ölçebilecek ölçme yöntem, teknik ve yaklaşımlarını kullanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
28	Kazanımları ölçmeye dönük ölçme yöntem Teknik ve yaklaşımlarını planlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
29	Kazanımları ölçmeye dönük sorular hazırlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
30	Farklı soru tiplerinde (doğru-yanlış, açık uçlu, tamamlama, kısa cevaplı, çoktan seçmeli gibi) kazanıma uygun soru yazabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
31	Alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme (öğrenci ürün dosyası, performans görevi, proje, günlükler vb.) yöntem ve yaklaşımlarını kullanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
32	Farklı öğrenme gücüne sahip öğrencilerine uygun soru hazırlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
33	Ölçme sonuçlarını etkili bir biçimde yorumlayabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
34	Ölçme sonuçlarına göre öğrencilerine dönüt verebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
35	Ölçme ve değerlendirme işlemi sonuçlarından öğretimi geliştirecek şekilde yararlanabilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤
36	Mesleki gelişimi sağlayacak etkinlikler düzenleyebilmek amacıyla zümresini harekete geçirebilir.	①	②	③	④	⑤

## APPENDIX – E Sample Interview Questions

### **Sample Interview Questions for Pre-service Teachers**

Genel olarak alan yeterlilikleriniz hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?

Üniversitede verilen eğitim alan yeterliliklerinizi artırma konusunda yeterli mi?

Farklı soru tiplerinde soru hazırlama maddesine katılmıyorum demişiniz, neden?

Öğretim ortamını düzenleme maddesine tamamen katıldığınızı belirtmişsiniz, neden?

### **Sample Interview Questions for Supervisors**

Genel olarak aday öğretmenlerin alan yeterlilikleri hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz ve üniversitede verilen aday öğretmenlerin eğitim alan yeterliliklerini artırma konusunda yeterli mi?

Öğrencilerine uygun bir öğrenme stratejisi belirleyebilir maddesine tamamen katıldığınızı belirtmişsiniz, neden?

Mesleki gelişimlerini düzenleyecek etkinlikler düzenleyebilir maddesine katılmadığınızı belirtmişsiniz, nedeni nedir?

## APPENDIX-F Ethical Committee Approval

Evra'ın Kayıt Tarihi: 15.02.2021 Protokol No: 8294

Tarih: 29.02.2021



ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMA VE YAYIN ETİĞİ KURULU  
KARAR BELGESİ

ÇALIŞMANIN TÜRÜ:	Yüksek Lisans Tez Çalışması
KONU:	Eğitim Bilimleri
BAŞLIK:	Öğrencen Adaylarının ve Danışmanların İngilizce Öğrencen Adaylarının Konu Alanı Yeterlilik Düzeylerine İlişkin Görüşleri
PROJE/TEZ YÜRÜTÜCÜSÜ:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hülya İPEK
TEZ YAZARI:	Emas SÜNİ AR
ALT KOMİSYON GÖRÜŞÜ:	-
KARAR:	Olumlu
<b>Prof. Dr. Saim ÖNCE</b> (Başkan-İkt. ve İdari Bil. Fak.)	
<b>Prof. Dr. Gülsiyâ KURUBACAK</b> (Felsefe Fak.)	<b>Prof. Dr. Fatime GÜNEŞ</b> (Edebiyat Fak.)
<b>Prof. Hayri İSMEK</b> (Gözet. Sağanak Fak.)	<b>Prof. Dr. M. Ertan ÜYÜMEZ</b> (İkt. ve İktisat Bil. Fak.)
<b>Prof. Dr. Bahrihan DEVECİ</b> (Eğitim Fak.)	<b>KATILMADI</b> <b>Prof. Dr. Oktay Cem ADIGÜZEL</b> (Eğitim Fak.)