CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS OF UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHER TRAINING

Kenan DEMİR
Assoc, Dr. Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Türkiye, kenandemirkfe@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-1111-209

ABSTRACT

In current research carried out through the cumulative case study, which is one of the qualitative research designs, it was determined how the lecturers teaching in the faculties of education conducted their lessons. The study continued for 2 years (4 semesters) in 2018-2019 and written opinions of 710 prospective teachers were received. Focus group interviews were conducted with 98 volunteer prospective teachers. In the study, where lecturers and courses were handled without changing, the views of pre-service teachers were examined by content analysis. As a result of the analysis made by two independent researchers at the end of the semester, the coding consistency was 0.84-0.91 among the researchers, between the periods, it was determined as 0.87-0.90. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the lecturers in the education faculty taught their courses in 5 different ways. It has been revealed that in 27% of the courses, the lecturers teach the course by speaking, and in 20% of the lectures they teach their own speech by supporting them with audio-visual tools. It has been determined that pre-service teachers are assigned in 34% of the courses and these candidates teach the courses by reading or speaking from the slide. In addition, in 15% of the lessons, the lecturer talks about the lesson or explains the event, situation, game, etc. demonstrated by showing. During the rest of the lesson, the pre-service teachers performed the tasks given by the lecturer. According to this result, it was determined that 96% of the lessons were taught based on the lecturer's explanation and direction, and the learners were not active. In the study, only 4% of the courses were learner-centered; It has been determined that learners take an active role in the planning, implementation and evaluation stages of the course.

Keywords: Teaching styles, teaching styles of lecturers, *teacher training, teacher candidates, student-centered teaching, teacher centered teaching*

INTRODUCTION

Individuals who choose teaching, one of the most challenging professions of our time, are born into an education system that was already arranged for them, like other individuals. For this reason, not only the education faculties but also the whole society has the responsibility in the training of the teachers who will take an active role in this education system, which is planned or not planned by the societies. Therefore, the problem of teacher training is not only the problem of higher education, but primarily the problem of society and the entire education system. Teacher training can be expressed as a training to ensure that all teachers have basic subject knowledge and technical skills in order to bring learning to desired thresholds. This training is an intellectual, cultural and contextual activity that not only trains teachers for the technical aspects of teaching, but also requires making sound decisions about how to impart subject knowledge, how to apply pedagogical skills, and how to develop human relations. Teacher training consists of two components, special content knowledge and practice where they develop teaching skills and abilities. The relationship between these components, defined as theory and practice, reflects the ideal teacher of different times and what a teacher's study orientation should be (Pearson, 2016; Säntti et al., 2018). Many studies show that there is a large gap between theory and practice in teacher education, and this raises serious doubts about the effectiveness of teacher education (Cheng et al., 2010; Korthagen, 2010; Korucuk, 2019; Laursen, 2008; Newman & Latifi, 2021). Despite the efforts made in the last 50 years to solve the teacher training problem, which is conceptualized as an education, the problem as a learning and policy issue, still continues and becomes more and more complex (Abazaoğlu, 2014; Abazoğlu, Yıldırım & Yıldızhan, 2016; Aydın & Baskan, 2005; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Kosnik et al., 2016; Loewenberg Ball & Forzani, 2009; Olakulehin, 2007; Walsh, 2013; Wolhuter, 2006).

Although teacher education differs from country to country, the purpose of teacher training programs is to design social, organizational and intellectual contexts in which prospective teachers can develop the knowledge, skills and tendencies required to become a teacher (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Cortina & Thames, 2013; Craig, 2016; Neupane & Joshi, 2022; Wolhuter, 2006; Bush, 1987; Corrigan, 1985; Darling-Hammond, 2010). Although teacher training in Türkiye has been transformed into a university-oriented structure with the cooperation of the Ministry of National Education and the Council of Higher Education (Abazoğlu et al., 2016), it is clear that teachers are not trained effectively in education faculties (Kaya et al., 2014; Sarıtaş, 2007). There are studies showing that teacher education is not in the expected place academically in Türkiye and that teachers are not trained in the ideal spirit required by the profession (Azar, 2011; Şahin et al., 2013). In addition, it is stated that the theory-based education of prospective teachers in education faculties is a crucial problem in teacher education (Adıgüzel, 2015; Aksoy; 2013:4-9; Azar, 2011; Bozak et al., 2016; Doğan, 2005; Kartal, 2014; Tokkaya et al., 2012; Vermunt, 2007; YÖK, 2018; Yavuz et al., 2015).

In order to find comprehensive and holistic answers to these problems, all components of the teacher training system should be questioned in a continuous evaluation process (Baskan et al., 2006). Good teachers are trained through good teaching and effective teaching-learning process in universities, therefore "Communicating

between students and faculty", "Developing cooperation between all parties", "Promoting active learning", "Giving immediate feedback", "Having high level of expectations" and "Respecting different abilities and ways of learning" are essential for good teaching. Good teaching is an instruction that leads to effective learning, so the teacher or institution must acquire knowledge, skills and values comprehensively and continuously (Felder & Brent, 1999).

As Ünver (2021) stated, the tendencies of the instructors involved in teacher education affect the prospective teachers. Therefore, in education faculties that shape the future of societies through the teachers they train, the instructors are as important as the prospective teachers. How faculty members teach is closely related to how candidates will become teachers and how they will teach. Education faculties are at the center of teacher training, therefore how teachers are trained in these faculties and how the course teaching processes are carried out gain importance. Regardless of the level, the forms of regulation of the teaching-learning process in current education systems take place between two main streams as teacher and student-centered. The teacher-centered or traditional understanding of education refers to one-way transfer of knowledge. In this understanding, knowledge is a set of previously tried, established, objective, reliable facts that are known apart from students' experiences and preferences. The role of the educator is to impart this knowledge with accompanying academic skills and attitudes (Echazarra et al., 2016). This one-way transferred, explanatory, and narrative educational understanding is accepted as the main education flow in the world. In this teaching style, the learner encounters direct instruction and tries to learn as a passive listener and an observer (Jackson, 2016; Lee & Reeves, 2017). Contrary to the mainstream, learning in the social constructivist model encourages collaboration, inquiry and creative problem solving. In this context learning is a social effort that requires meaningful interaction between people. In the freedom-based approach, education is the total opposite of transference, and it mainly focuses on a student's purely self-motivated exploration of all the world that seems relevant to his or her own life. Educators who practice the spiritual developmental model insist on that there is a spiritual dimension to human existence, and they carefully determine what kinds of teaching-learning experiences are appropriate and beneficial at each developmental level. The learning environment in this type of education is often highly structured, with specially trained, self-disciplined and caring teachers who play an active and authoritative role. In this approach, learners try to learn by doing direct and purposeful experiences (Jackson, 2016; Lee & Reeves, 2017). The final understanding acknowledges that the other five orientations in the educational map are also valuable, and all have important points about human nature and the learning process. A holistic educator tries to balance freedom and structure, individuality and social responsibility, spiritual wisdom and spontaneity to be able to respond instantly to each learning situation. This is not a fixed model that is intended to be applied to all individuals, rather than, teaching is carried out in accordance with the purpose and the individual (Echazarra et al., 2016). In the study conducted by Brown & Bakhtar (1988), instructors have five different teaching styles: "oral expression", "supporting oral expression with audio-visual tools", "practice through examples", "uncertain teaching style" and "eclectic". Saroyan & Snell (1997), on the other hand, stated that lecturers look at their course bases from another perspective and they adopt three basic approaches: content-oriented, context-oriented and

pedagogy-oriented. The subject and material of education faculties are people of today and tomorrow, and this subject or material is not a prospective teacher or lecturer. The human resources of the faculty of education are pre-school, primary, secondary, and high school children that the prospective teachers will raise in the future and these children will ensure the continuity of the society. A prospective teacher is a student who is trying to gain the ability to affect the fate of the future children positively. For this reason, while the lecturer trains the prospective teacher, he also raises future generations that he will probably never see. In this context, the lecturer has a great and heavy responsibility to positively influence the future through the present. The learning environment of each course in the faculty of education, whether theoretical or practical, is also a field of practice for prospective teachers. All courses, theoretical or practical, have an important place in the development of teacher identity. Instructors, whether consciously or not, transfer the way they teach the course to prospective teachers.

In this context, this study aims to determine how the instructors teach their lessons, how they organize their teaching-learning processes and how they provide instructional interaction, in short, the characteristics of their teaching styles. In line with this purpose, "What are the characteristics of the teaching processes of the lecturers who teach in the faculties of education?" is determined as a main research question. Within the framework of this question, answers were sought with the following sub-questions.

1. What are the teaching styles of the instructors and their characteristics?

2. What are the characteristics of the communication that takes place during the lesson?

3. What are the characteristics of the activities of the instructors?

4. What kind of activities do the instructors enable the prospective teachers to do?

5. What are the assessment tools used by the instructors in their lessons?

6. In what kind of places do the lecturers teach their lessons?

7. What kind of activities do prospective teachers do as extracurricular activities?

METHOD

Research Design

In this study, a longitudinal and cumulative process were followed in order to reveal the characteristics of the teaching styles of the instructors teaching in the faculties of education. The study lasted for 2 years (4 semesters) and throughout this process, the teaching styles of the lecturers were tried to be explored. In the study, in which the qualitative research process was followed, the written opinions of the prospective teachers studying at the faculty of education based on their classroom observations were taken and focus group interviews were conducted with selected teacher candidates. The "Cumulative Case Study" research design was used to determine the teaching processes of the lecturers by monitoring them over these two years. In the study conducted with the same courses and the same instructors in different years, how the courses in education faculties were taught were examined in depth and longitudinally, data were collected systematically and what happened in the real education environment was examined (Paker, 2015; Davey, 2009).

Study group

This study was conducted before the Covid-19 outbreak (in 2018-2019) and lasted for 2 years (4 terms). Descriptive statistics about the departments and numbers of prospective teachers who voluntarily participated in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Departments and Number of Students in the Study Group

		Education Periods								
		2018-Semesters				2019-Semesters				
		Spring		Fall		**Spring**		Fall		**Total**	
Teaching Departments		**f**	**%**	f	%	**f**	**%**	f	%	**f**	**%**
Primary School Teachers		**42**	**27**	39	26	**37**	**24**	35	23	**153**	**22**
Pre-school Teachers		**42**	**26**	42	26	**40**	**25**	37	23	**161**	**23**
Science Teachers		**26**	**26**	24	24	**25**	**25**	26	26	**101**	**14**
Maths Teachers		**28**	**23**	32	26	**30**	**25**	31	26	**121**	**17**
Guidance and Psychological Counselling Teachers		**41**	**24**	46	26	**42**	**24**	45	26	**174**	**24**
	Total	179	26	183	26	174	24	174	24	710	100
Focus Interview (Number of Prospective Teachers)		**25**	**26**	26	27	**23**	**23**	24	24	**98**	**14**

As seen in Table 1, in the order by years, 179 (26%), 183 (26%), 174 (24%) and 174 (24%) prospective teachers' opinions were taken. Focus group interviews were conducted with 98 (14%) prospective teachers who volunteered among these prospective teachers, whose opinions were sought. In the study, in which the same instructors and the same courses were examined, individual and small group lessons such as observation in schools and community service practices were not included in the scope of the research. There were 26 courses and 22 lecturers who taught these courses in the research.

Necessary explanations were made before filling the written opinion form for the voluntary participation of prospective teachers studying in different departments. Again, after the necessary information was given, the prospective teachers who participated in the focus group interview were provided to participate in the studies voluntarily. Ethical rules were followed in the study and the identities and discourses of teacher candidates were used only as a source for this research. Prospective teachers who did not want to participate in the study and did not want to express their opinions about the teaching of the courses were not forced to participate and the identities of the lecturers were not questioned.

Data Collection Tools

The opinions of the prospective teachers were taken with an unstructured opinion-taking form (questionnaire) with open-ended questions. Expert opinions were taken in the creation of this form, and the form was piloted with 18 students. In this form, students were first asked to describe how the lessons worked. It was explained to the prospective teachers that clear and realistic situations should be written about how the teaching-learning process took place, and sample situations should be given. Prospective teachers did not write their names and

surnames to introduce themselves and their course instructors' names on data collection tool and did not use any nicknames or introductory signs. After the written opinion form, focus group interviews were held with 3-5 volunteer prospective teachers from each class. Similar questions were included in the written opinion form and focus group interview.

Analyzing of Data

At the end of each semester, the qualitative data obtained from the focus group interviews, which were transferred into the computer environment with a questionnaire, were analyzed lesson by lesson. In written opinions, "word" was accepted as a unit of meaning, and sentence integrity was examined in cases that did not make sense on its own. In the next step, the codes corresponding to the meaning of the paragraph were revealed. The data for each period was coded and themed by two independent coders by making content analysis. The code and theme list of two independent coders were examined together and a single list was created from the codes and themes that matched in these two code lists. This single list was accepted as the unit of measure to be used in comparison, matching and auditing for codes and themes for the next period. The themes that emerged as a result of the analysis of the opinions obtained from the questionnaire and focus group interviews were examined together by 2 researchers and consistency was achieved between them. The themes obtained as a result of this study are listed below.

1. The method of teaching based on lecturer effectiveness (Teacher-centered)
    a. Based on lecturer's only verbal narration
    b. Based on supporting the lecturer's verbal narration with various audio-visual tools
    c. Based on verbal narration of prospective teachers (processing of courses by prospective teachers)
    d. Teaching based on the lecturer's lecture (demonstration) and then the verbal lecture of the prospective teachers
2. Teaching-learning process based on learner (prospective teachers') experiences
3. Communication in the course process
4. Teaching activities of lecturers
5. Learner-centered teaching-learning activities
6. Assessment
7. Learning environment
8. Extracurricular activities

Eight themes were found as a result of content analysis by two separate researchers independently of each other. These themes cover all the variables of the teaching process, as the way the instructors teach, the way they communicate in the lesson, whether they activate the students, the assessment approaches they use, whether they do extracurricular activities, and course materials. In order to determine the consistency between the themes that emerged by examining the qualitative data obtained from the questionnaire and focus interview, the agreement percentages between the themes were determined. The agreement percentages between

researchers for each period, between periods, and between the questionnaire and the focus group interview were found consistent. The obtained compliance percentages are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. The Agreement Percentages between Researchers, Periods, the Questionnaire, and the Focus Group Interview

Analysis Unit Periods (Semesters)	Questionnaire		Focus Group Interview		Questionnaire and Focus Group Interview
	Between Researchers	Between Periods	Between Researchers	Between Periods	Between Researchers
	Cohesion Coefficient Between Codes				
2016 — 1. Spring	0,86	-	0,89	-	0,88
2016 — 2. Fall	0,88	1+2=a (0,88)	0,89	1+2=e (0,90)	0,85
2016 — 3. Spring	0,91	3+a=b (0,91)	0,87	3+e=f (0,87)	0,89
2016 — 4. Fall	0,84	4+b=c (0,87)	0,88	4+f=g (0,87)	0,87

The agreement percentage between the themes that emerged as a result of the content analysis of the qualitative data obtained from the questionnaire and the focus group interview was found using the Miles & Huberman (2015) formula. The agreement percentage between the themes determined by 2 different researchers in each term was found to be between 0.86 and 0.91. In the focus group interview, the agreement percentage was determined between 0.87 and 0.89. Compliance percentages between the periods were found to be between 0.87 and 0.91. The agreement between the themes obtained by examining the questionnaire and the themes obtained from the focus group interview was found to be between 0.85 and 0.89. From different perspectives, it was concluded that the level of agreement between the researchers, the periods and the themes obtained from the questionnaire and focus group interview was at an acceptable level, and the themes obtained were consistent. The quality of teachers determines the quality of education and is linked to the development of the country. With the development of technology, teaching-learning is transforming from a teacher-centered, lecture-based learning environment to a student-centered one (Jan, 2017). In this age, when the quality of teachers determines the quality of education, it has been determined how the lecturers in the faculty of education that train teachers teach their lessons. It has been determined whether the lecturers teach their lessons with the mainstream teacher-centered method or with the teaching method that make the students active.

Since this study was conducted before the establishment of the ethics committee at the university, there is no institutional written or documented ethical approval. However, written permissions were obtained from all pre-service teachers who participated in the research process. For this purpose, necessary explanations were made in the data collection tool and diligence was paid to the voluntary participation of teacher candidates. The findings obtained at the end of the study in which the cumulative research process was put to work based on the opinions of the prospective teachers are given below.

FINDINGS

The findings that emerged from the prospective teachers' opinions about the ways of organizing the teaching process were explained in tables.

Table 3. Forms and features of organizing the teaching-learning process of the courses in the faculty of education

Theme 1	Theme 2	Theme 3	Theme 4	Theme 5	Theme 6	Theme 7
Ways of Organizing the Teaching-Learning Process (Lessons n=26)	Teaching activities of lecturers	Learner-centered teaching-learning activities	Communication	Assessment	Learning environment	Extracurricular activities
Form of Courses Based on Instructor Activity (Teacher Centered) — 1. Based on lecturer's verbal narration (n = 7 %27) (Monologue Teaching)	**Lecturer (Active)** Using Verbal Symbols (Oral telling, speaking, reading from books, etc., asking questions, taking notes)	**Learner (Passive)** - Listening-Writing (instructor's dictation and note-taking) - Speaking (only answering questions asked) - Silent reading, watching, following from tools such as books, slides (A dependent learner as a viewer and listener)	One-way formal communication - Teacher as an instructional leader or generally monologue communication (but restricted dialogue)	**Results (Level-Success) Oriented Evaluation** - Midterm-Final exam (Multiple choice-written exam) - Assignments (weekly, midterm and final homework) - Scoring assignments with plus (+) and minus (-)	Routinely Classroom- Lab	- Reading textbooks, internet, photocopy etc. - Studying questions-photocopy etc. given by the teacher - Summarizing - Problem solving etc.
2. Based on supporting the lecturer's verbal narration with various audio-visual tools (n=5 %20) (Monologue Teaching)	Using Verbal + Audio-Visual Tools	- Watching-Listening to the show (Dependent learner following the teacher)				
3. Based on verbal narration of prospective teachers (n=9 % 34) (Monologue Teaching)	**Using Verbal+Visual Tools** Teacher: Asking questions- taking notes-making presentations-evaluation Learner: **V**erbal narration by means of reading from books, slides, etc.	**Learner (Passive)** - Lecture by prospective teachers (Lecturing by using slides, movies, etc.) - Making applications (Designing materials, toys, etc.; Explaining experiments; Doing sports, dancing, etc.; Preparing a lesson plan) (Dependent learner following the teacher)			Usually Classroom - Lab Rarely Sports center, dance hall etc.	
4. Teaching Method Based on Lecturer's Lecture-Demonstration and Student's Lecture-Demonstration (n=4 %15) (Monologue-Restricted Dialogue Teaching)	Using Verbal + Visual Symbols and Showing-Making (Teacher who lectures verbally, on slide, film, show-and-make etc.)	**Learner (Mostly Passive + Limited Activity)** - Narration of Prospective teachers (Learners) or Their Demonstration - Teacher Lecture-Demonstration (Experiments, designing materials, making presentations using slides, preparing lesson plans, activities like doing sports, dancing, etc.) (Usually Dependent learner /but sometimes semi-autonomous following the teacher or prospective teachers)		Rarely Self and Peer Evaluation	Often Classroom Sometimes sports, dance, drama hall etc.	- Doing research for homework, - Summarizing - Presentation, game, music, dance, event preparation, etc.

Table 4. Forms and features of organizing the teaching-learning process of the courses in the faculty of education (Continuation of Table 3)

Theme 1 — Ways of Organizing the Teaching-Learning Process (Lessons n=26)	Theme 2 — Teaching activities of lecturers	Theme 3 — Learner-centered teaching-learning activities	Theme 4 — Communication	Theme 5 — Assessment	Theme 6 — Learning environment	Theme 7 — Extracurricular activities
Form of Courses Based on Learner Activity (Learner Centered) 5. Teaching-learning process based on learner experiences (n=1 %4) (Dialogue)	- Instructional design applications based on real life - Use of multiple teaching-learning paths and tools - Combination of teaching-learning strategies, methods, techniques	**Active participant in planning, implementation and evaluation (together with prospective teachers and lecturer)** - Creative drama techniques (Improvisation, role playing, pantomime, gossip ring, station, corridor of consciousness, corridor of knowledge and repetition, etc.) - Cooperative learning exercises (Jigsaw, group research, etc.) - Coding exercises (Rhyme, rhythm, dance, body movements, song, anecdote, proverb, idiom etc.) - Purpose-specific techniques: (Analogy, Loci etc.) - Multiple intelligence activities (Using multiple intelligence areas together in coordination) - Designing Events (Project-Performance studies) (Preparing and presenting; Exhibition, concert, movie, poster, brochure, booklet, slogan, play, etc. Writing; songs, poems, short stories, etc. Learning by drawing; pictures, cartoons, etc.) - The student who takes responsibility for learning as an independent learner	Multi-directional interaction in which all senses are used (dialogical communication and teaching)	**Versatile, Developmental, Individual, and Learning Oriented Assessment** - Multiple choice tests (Readiness, monitoring and achievement tests) - Learner participation - Performance-projects - Self, peer and group assessment - Practice in real schools - Keeping a diary, - written evaluation - observation form – rubrics - Ipsative assessment as formative and summative assessment and iterative assessment	Drama hall- School garden- Corridor- Classroom- Application in Schools- Exhibition area- Real School- Concert- Gym- School canteen- Historical place- Museum etc.	- Coming to class prepared: (Remembering the basic information, examples, experiences, etc. that will form the source of the activities, doing research-analysis-sharing real-life cases and events during the research and teaching process) - Project development-implementation - Formative and ipsative assessment - Study, research or practice in real schools

According to Table 3 and Table 4, where the findings of the study are given, it has been determined that the teaching-learning process of 26 courses in the faculty of education is organized in 5 different ways. It has been revealed that four of these five teaching styles are closer to the teacher-centered teaching approach (mainstream), and that only one lesson's teaching-learning process can represent a learner-centered approach. These findings are summarized and explained below, respectively.

Based on lecturer's verbal narration*: According to the findings given in table 3, it was determined that 7 (27%) of the courses conducted by the instructors mainly included activities based on verbal expression/speech of the instructor in the teaching-learning process. Instructors who organize the teaching-learning process in this way mostly teach by speaking, very rarely by slides, films, etc. It was revealed that they benefited from the tools, that they read the subject from the textbook and other sources and followed it exactly. It has been determined that they rarely ask questions to the prospective teachers during the course teaching process, and they mostly prefer to use one-way formal communication (monologue). This way of teaching is mostly done in the classroom or in the laboratory in accordance with the field, and mostly, studies such as writing on the board, drawing figures and problem solving are carried out. In addition, it was determined that especially the definitions and the information deemed important by the lecturer were dictated by printing. Again, these instructors generally use midterm and final exams including multiple choice and open-ended questions as well as giving homework. Also, it was revealed that they made assessment-evaluation by giving plus-minus to the studies. It has been determined that in the lessons where this type of teaching process is dominant, the prospective teachers are mostly silent, they only watch what the lecturer does and listen to what he says. It has been revealed that in this teaching process, where learners (prospective teachers) remain passive, one-way communication is established and monologue is dominant in the teaching process. It was also revealed that prospective teachers mostly had to take notes and write down the information from the board or on the slides shown in the course teaching process. It was determined that they made preliminary preparations and summarized by using the sources like the students' books, photocopy, etc. in the classrooms where this type of teaching process takes place.

Based on supporting the* lecturer's *verbal narration with various audio-visual tools: Although this arrangement of teaching-learning process is largely similar to the previous arrangement, it has been determined that the instructors try to enrich the teaching-learning process of their courses by using visual aids such as slides and films. According to the opinions of the prospective teachers given in table 3, it was revealed that the teaching-learning process in 5 (20%) of the courses is organized in this way. It was determined that the instructors mostly lectured by speaking in one way, but they communicated with the students by question-answer when necessary. In this type of teaching-learning process, students generally listen to the lesson. It was revealed that they followed the presentations made by the lecturer, read the information on the slides and took notes in the lesson. In this teaching-learning process, which is similar to the previous teaching style, learners are again seen as passive recipients. In this teaching-learning process, lessons are taught with emphasis on one-way communication and monologue. It has been determined that the lecturer has an unfailing authority in this way of teaching, in which

the lecturer spends most of the course talking. It has been determined that the instructors who support their lecturing by using various tools and materials assess learning solely by making midterms and finals, and for this assessment they use known assessment tools such as multiple choice or written exams. In this process, where teaching-learning activities are carried out in the classroom or in the laboratory, it has been determined that the lecturer wants the prospective teachers to come to the lesson prepared, and that the prospective teachers read from various sources, make summaries or solve questions. In addition, it was revealed that the instructors scored plus (+), minus (-) what the prospective teachers did, they rarely contacted the prospective teachers outside of the classroom, and they limitedly included extra-curricular activities.

Based on verbal narration of prospective teachers: When the findings in table 3 were examined, the lecturer of 9 courses (34%) had the prospective teachers teach the course. For this, it was determined that they gave course topics to prospective teachers at the beginning of the semester, at the beginning of the week and at any time of the semester, prospective teachers prepared slides and materials for their own subjects, and they taught the lesson by lecturing based on the slide. It has been revealed that in this process, in which the prospective teachers teach like a teacher, they interact with their peers by using activities such as one-way question-answer, dramatization, and conversation. It has been determined that in this way of teaching, which the instructors expressed as student-centered, the prospective teachers gave the lesson by making presentations in general as their instructors wanted. In this teaching-learning process, it has been determined that the instructors divide the prospective teachers into groups and distribute the course content (topics) to the groups. It was determined that the prospective teachers who took their own subjects shared the subject by dividing it into parts, and each prospective teacher prepared a slide for their own subject and told them verbally (by reading) from the slide in turn.

It has been determined that while the prospective teachers are teaching, the lecturer does not participate in the student activities and remains more as spectators, gives the feedback, and makes corrections mostly with verbal explanations. In the teaching-learning process, it has been revealed that traditional tools such as multiple-choice tests and written exams are used within the scope of midterm and final exams. Again, the students stated that the materials such as presentations and games that they prepared for their lectures were evaluated verbally by the lecturer and their friends during the lesson. It has also been revealed that such teaching-learning process activities are carried out in places such as classrooms, drama halls and laboratories. It has been determined that the students carry out research outside the classroom, make summaries, and make other preparations for the presentation so that they can share their knowledge with their peers.

Teaching Method Based on Lecturer's Lecture-Demonstration and Student's Lecture-Demonstration: As given in table 3-4 (15%) of the courses were taught by the lecturer himself to a certain stage in the teaching-learning process. Afterwards, the prospective teachers did the work described or shown to them. For example; In this process, the education staff made toys, experiments, etc. explained the activities, showed how they were done, and then asked the prospective teachers to do what they showed. It was revealed that the prospective teachers

repeated the work told or shown by the instructor in a similar way. In such teaching-learning environments, the instructor first explains the work to be done, shows it, and then asks the students to do it. For this reason, it has been determined that the show-make method is used more intensively in such teaching-learning environments. It was also revealed that in this teaching-learning process, achievement was evaluated as a whole, and midterm and final exams were organized for this purpose, and traditional assessment tools such as multiple choice and written exams were used in these exams. In addition, it was determined that the instructors who organized this type of teaching-learning environment scored the students' homework with plus (+) or minus (-) and included peer assessment, albeit limited. It has been revealed that such teaching-learning process activities are organized in classrooms, laboratories, sports and dance halls specific to the field.

In the first teaching style that emerged in the study, it was determined that the lecturers had a say and the lessons were based on verbal expression and speech. The second teaching style is almost similar to the previous one, but the lecturer who teaches here supports the teaching process with audio-visual materials. The third teaching style is similar to the first two teaching styles, but the teacher candidates do the same job instead of the instructor. In this teaching process where only the roles change, the lecturer brings prospective teachers to the stage as a lecturer. It has been revealed that teacher candidates, like their own teachers, teach the lessons by speaking and reading from the slide. In this teaching process, it was determined that the lecturer gave his role to the prospective teachers and asked the prospective teachers to present the lesson by preparing slides. Fourth, in the teaching style explained, it was revealed that up to a point in the lesson, the lecturer again talked about the work to be done, showed how to do it, and then asked the prospective teachers to do what they showed. In this teaching process, it was determined that the lecturer tried to make the prospective teachers active by giving them tasks.

In these four teaching styles explained, there is basically a teacher or leader who conveys or explains the lesson by speaking. Apart from this teaching process, the fifth teaching style, which is eclectically designed to activate the students, is explained below.

Teaching-Learning Process Based on Learner Experiences: It has been determined that this teaching-learning process, in which activities are organized that allow prospective teachers to experience and actively learn, was adopted by only 1 (4%) of 26 lecturers. It has emerged from students' opinions that teaching and learning strategies, methods and techniques are used in harmony in this teaching-learning process, which is organized entirely with student-centered teaching-learning activities. This teaching-learning process is organized based on student experiences, creative drama method (improvisation, role-playing etc.), cooperative learning (jigsaw, group research techniques, etc.), coding activities, multiple intelligence activities, subject-specific teaching-learning techniques and projects. It has been determined that many teaching-learning activities such as learning and performance-based studies are used together in coordination. It has been determined that in this type of teaching-learning process, assessment is made throughout the process and holistic and cumulative ipsative assessment are included at every stage of the process. It has been revealed that this teaching-learning process begins with a multiple-choice entrance test in order to determine the readiness of the students for the course. In the teaching-

learning process, it was determined that many assessment activities such as keeping a diary, making observations, writing an evaluation paper, and solving questions were carried out together with multiple-choice tests within the scope of follow-up tests. According to the students' opinions, it was revealed that midterm and final exams were performed with performance tasks in this teaching-learning process. In addition, it was determined that the students exhibited these performance tasks, practiced in real schools, and presented them to the whole school by organizing events such as concerts. In this process, each student participated in the ipsative assessment process according to their own performance. Also, the studies were scored with rubrics in a way that allows self and peer assessment. According to the students' opinions, the readiness in the beginning was repeated at the end, and the achievement scores and the scores obtained from the performance tasks were considered together. It has also been revealed that multiple tools and ways are used in deciding students' achievement.

When the findings obtained in the study are summarized, as given in table 3 and table 4, it has been determined that the teaching-learning process of the lessons is organized in two different methods as teacher and student-centered. It was determined that the teacher-centered teaching method was adopted in 96% of the courses. In 27% of these courses, it was determined that the lecturers taught lessons verbally, and in 20% of them, they supported their lectures with visual and auditory tools. It was determined that prospective teachers lecture in 34% of the courses, and that in 15% of the courses, prospective teachers participated in the activities after the teacher's lecturing.

It was determined that the lecturers who adopted the teacher-centered teaching method mostly followed the monology-based teaching-learning process in their lessons. It was determined that these instructors used traditional assessment tools in the assessment process, and they only measure the success. It was determined that these lessons were carried out in familiar places and that the prospective teachers did ordinary activities based on repetition of the lessons, such as making summaries and reading from photocopies outside the classroom.

It has been determined that only 4% of the lecturers adopt the learner-centered teaching method and that dialogue is dominant in all stages of the teaching-learning process. It has been revealed that prospective teachers are active participants in the learner-centered teaching process and approaches such as creative drama, collaboration and project-based learning are used for this. In this teaching style, it was determined that prospective teachers made assessments with active participation, lessons were taught everywhere as well as in the classroom, and many studies were carried out outside the classroom.

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

As a result of this study, it was determined that 96% of the courses in the education faculty were taught through teacher-centered and 4% student-centered teaching methods. It has been revealed that 27% of the lecturers only teach by verbal expression. Again, it was determined that 20% of these instructors taught lessons by supporting their oral expressions with various audio-visual tools. It has been revealed that 34% of the instructors assign prospective and they teach the lessons by speaking and orally narrating from the slide. It has been

determined that the prospective teachers teach the lesson just like their own teachers, convey the lesson verbally with a teacher-centered understanding. Again, although it is teacher-centered, 15% of the instructors started the lesson and afterwards, they had the Prospective teachers do what they said or showed verbally (activities such as continuing to make toys, dancing, reading, dramatization) under their own control.

In terms of philosophical and educational understanding of education faculties, it is surprising that only 4% of instructors use learner-centered teaching methods and teacher-centered teaching methods are used predominantly in education faculties. Results of this study supports many studies that reveal that courses in education faculties are taught using teacher-centered teaching methods, which are seen as mainstream (Echazarra et al., 2016; Arslantaş, 2011; Baştürk, 2011; Demir, 2015; Demir et al., 2020; İncik & Tanrıseven, 2012; Kaya et al., 2017; Şahin, 2014; Yüksel, 2015; Şad & Göktaş, 2013; Şen & Erişen, 2002; Tosuntaş, 2013; Yeler; 2014).

In addition, these results contradict the views of Chickering and Gamson (1987), who state that learning is not a sport with spectators, that students cannot learn much by sitting in the classroom listening to the teachers, memorizing pre-prepared assignments and answering them. Again, these results do not support the view that a good undergraduate education can only be possible with communication between all parties, cooperation, active teaching-learning, giving instant feedback, keeping expectations high, using different skills and learning ways. As in the literature (Aydoğdu, 2012; Gökyer, 2012), in this study, it was revealed that the education faculty courses did not provide a good undergraduate education in terms of teaching.

In this study, it is possible to say that the teaching style that tells the lesson verbally, supports the narration with audio-visual tools, shows the example situations and makes the students practice, is in accordance with the teaching style determined by Brown & Bakhtar (1988). The similarity between the last teaching style and the eclectic teaching style in this study is clearly visible. However, unlike Brown & Bakhtar's (1988) teaching styles, in this study, a different teaching style was determined as making teacher candidates teach. Although prospective teachers teach the course in this way of teaching, it is possible to equate it with the lecture style based on verbal expression, given that this process is predominantly based on speech. Considering the basis of teaching styles (Saroyan & Snell, 1997), it is possible to say that the teaching style of the first four lessons in this study is content-oriented. It has been determined that the learner-centered teaching style, which is the last course teaching style, is predominantly context-oriented.

At the end of the study, the use of lectures based on lectures and direct teacher talk by lecturers is a situation contrary to the nature of learning and teaching. Considering that learning is an active mental process, how individuals learn information and how they solve problems; how information is kept in mind, how it is remembered and forgotten becomes important. This situation can be discussed as a reflection of the behaviorist approach that the instructors almost do not give a role to the students in the learning process and they constantly listen to them. However, according to the constructivist approach accepted today, it is essential for the student

to be active in the teaching-learning process, to explore, to realize self-directed learning and to create interactive environments for this purpose. It is surprising that education faculties, and therefore lecturers, who are candidates for teaching and learning professionally prefer the opposite path. In other words, it is difficult to explain why lecturers do not apply all the knowledge they teach in the lessons or the advice they give about good teaching and being a good teacher in their own lessons.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Education faculties also have the function of being an application laboratory that exemplifies the teaching-learning process. In other words, the teaching styles of the lecturers are an exemplary practice for prospective teachers. For this reason, every application made by the instructors also sets an example for the prospective teachers' practice in the future. In this context, instructors should primarily demonstrate the features that provide a good teaching such as student-centered practices, active learning, cooperation, dialogic teaching, student-participatory assessment, and immediate feedback and corrections in their own courses or practices. In current study, it was determined that almost all of the lecturers who implemented five different teaching processes preferred teaching approaches that made students passive. However, it seems that it may be incomplete to reach this conclusion only with the opinions of prospective teachers. In particular, it may be useful to monitor the teaching-learning process of the courses in the education faculties one-to-one.

In addition, education faculties direct the course of society by training teachers for schools that raise children. In this context, it is important to reveal and compare the education understanding of the lecturers and the teacher candidates they train. Improving in-service studies and applied research that will help instructors be aware of their teaching understandings is necessary. The teaching styles revealed in this study should be examined comparatively with the teaching styles of high school, secondary school and, if necessary, primary school teachers. In line with these results and suggestions, practices that improve the teaching-learning process should be included, especially in education faculties. In this context, the curricula applied in education faculties should be renewed, and application-research centers should be established for this purpose.

Ethics Text

"This article complies with journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics, and journal ethics. Responsibility for any violations that may arise regarding the article belongs to the author. The data of this study, which was conducted on the basis of a cumulative case study, were collected during 5 periods between 2018-2019.

Author's Contribution Statement: The author's contribution rate to this article is 100%

REFERENCES

Abazaoğlu, İ. (2014). Dünyada öğretmen yetiştirme programları ve öğretmenlere yönelik mesleki gelişim uygulamaları. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, *9*(5).

Abazoğlu, İ., Yıldırım, O., & Yıldızhan, Y. (2016). Geçmişten günümüze Türk eğitim sisteminde öğretmen yetiştirme. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *2016*(6), 143-160.

Adıgüzel, A. (2015). *Eğitim fakültelerinde öğretmen eğitimi program standartlarının gerçekleşme düzeyi* [Doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University]. Türkiye.

Aksoy, E. (2013). A.D.D (New York), *Finlandiya, Singapur ve Türkiye'de öğretmen eğitimindeki dönüşümler* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University]. Türkiye.

Arslantaş, H. İ. (2011). Öğretim elemanlarının öğretim stratejileri-yöntem ve teknikleri, iletişim ve ölçme değerlendirme yeterliklerine yönelik öğrenci görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *8*(15), 487-506.

Aydın, A., & Baskan, G. A. (2005). The problem of teacher training in Turkey. *Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment*, *19*(2), 191-197.

Aydoğdu, S. (2012). *Üniversite öğretim elemanlarının Chickering ve Gamson öğrenme ilkelerini kullanma düzeyleri* [Unpublished Master's thesis, Atatürk University]. Türkiye.

Azar, A. (2011). Türkiye'deki Öğretmen Eğitimi Üzerine Bir Söylem: Nitelik mi, Nicelik mi? *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, 1*(1), 36-38.

Baştürk, S. (2011). Matematik öğretmen adaylarının eğitim fakültesindeki eğitim-öğretim sürecini değerlendirmeleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 8*(1).

Bozak, A., Özdemir, T., & Serarslan, D. (2016). Mesleğe Yeni Başlayan Öğretmenlerin Eğitim Fakültelerinde Almış Oldukları Öğretmenlik Eğitimine İlişkin Görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 13*(36), 100-113.

Brown, G., & Bakhtar, M. (1988). Styles of lecturing: a study and its implications. *Research Papers in Education*, *3*(2), 131-153.

Bush, R. N. (1987). Teacher education reform: Lessons from the past half century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(3), 13-19.

Cheng, M. M., Cheng, A. Y., & Tang, S. Y. (2010). Closing the gap between the theory and practice of teaching: Implications for teacher education programmes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *36*(1), 91-104.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). *Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education.* American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, 3-7.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). The problem of teacher education. *Journal of teacher education*, *55*(4), 295-299.

Corrigan, D. (1985). Politics and teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(1), 8-11.

Cortina, K. S., & Thames, M. H. (2013). Teacher education in Germany. *Cognitive activation in the mathematics classroom and professional competence of teachers: Results from the COACTIV project*, 49-62.

Craig, C. J. (2016). Structure of teacher education. *International Handbook of Teacher Education: Volume 1*, 69-135.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of teacher education*, *61*(1-2), 35-47.

Davey, L. (2009). The application of case study evaluations. (Çev: Tuba Gökçek). *Elementary Educatıon Online, 8*(2), 1-3.

Demir, K. (2015, June 8-10). *The way ınstructors organize their teaching and learning processes and the satisfaction levels of the students.* [Conference presentation]. 2nd International Eurasian Educational Research Congress, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Türkiye.

Demir, K., Savaş, B. & Türkel, A. (2020). Öğretmen adaylarının bakış açısıyla öğretim elemanları. Onur Zahal (Ed.), Eğitim Bilimlerinde Teori ve Araştırmalar. (pp. 578-605). Gece Kitaplığı.

Doğan, C. (2005). Türkiyede sınıf öğretmeni yetiştirme politikaları ve sorunları. *Bilig (Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi)*, *35*, 133-149.

Echazarra, A., Salinas, D., Méndez, I., Denis, V., & Rech, G. (2016). How teachers teach and students learn: Successful strategies for school.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (1999). How to Improve Teaching Quality**. *Quality Management Journal, 6*(2),9-21. Retrieved 18 September, 2022 from http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/TQM.htm

Gökyer, N. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının hizmet öncesi eğitimleri sürecinde derslerin işlenişine ilişkin görüşleri. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, *42*(196), 124-141.

İncik, E. Y., & Tanrıseven, I. (2012). Eğitim fakültesi öğretim elemanlarının ve öğretmen adaylarının öğrenci merkezli eğitime ilişkin görüşleri (Mersin Üniversitesi örneği). *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(3), 172-184.

Jackson, J. (2016). Myths of active learning: Edgar Dale and the cone of experience. *Journal of the Human Anatomy and Physiology Society*, *20*(2), 51-53.

Jan, H. (2017). Teacher of 21st century: Characteristics and development. *Research on Humanities and Social sciences*, *7*(9), 50-54.

Kartal, M. (2014). Türkiye'de Öğretmen Eğitiminin Yeniden Yapılandırılması: Etkin öğretmen Yetiştirme Modeli. Retrieved 24 September, 2022 from http://kisi.deu.edu.tr//mehmet.kartal/turkiyede-ogretmen-egitiminin-yeniden-yapilandirilmasi-etkin-ogretmen-yetistirme-modeli.pdf

Kaya, V. H., Polat, D., & Karamüftüoğlu, İ. O. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen yetiştirme ile ilgili görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies, 30*(1), 569-584.

Kaya, M. F., Sungurtekin, D., & Deniz, S. (2017). Üniversitelerde öğretim görevlisi kaynaklı iletişim sorunları. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *7*(1).

Korthagen, F. (2010). The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education. *International encyclopedia of education*, *7*(1), 669-675.

Korucuk, M. (2019). Farklı ülkelerde öğretmenlik eğitimi veren okulların değerlendirilmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 7*(89), 477-498.

Kosnik, C., Beck, C., & Goodwin, A. L. (2016). Reform efforts in teacher education. *International Handbook of Teacher Education: Volume 1*, 267-308.

Laursen, P. F. (2008). Student teachers' conceptions of theory and practice in teacher education. *In Totems and Taboos* (pp. 171-182). Brill.

Lee, S. J., & Reeves, T. C. (2017). Edgar dale and the cone of experience. *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*. Retrieved 14 December 2022 from https://pressbooks.pub/lidtfoundations/chapter/edgar-dale-and-the-cone-of-experience/

Loewenberg Ball, D., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of teacher education*, *60*(5), 497-511.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2015). Genişletilmiş bir kaynak kitap: Nitel veri analizi. (S. Akbaba Altun & A. Ersoy, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Neupane, B. P., & Joshi, D. N. (2022). Perspectives on Teacher Education in South Asia: A Comparative Review. *The Harvest*, *1*(1), 1-14.

Newman, S., & Latifi, A. (2021). Vygotsky, education, and teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *47*(1), 4-17.

Olakulehin, F. K. (2007). Information and communication technologies in teacher training and professional development in Nigeria. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *8*(1), 133-142.

Paker, T. (2015). Durum Çalışması. N. F. Seggie & Y. Bayyurt (Ed.), Nitel araştırma. Yöntem, teknik, analiz ve yaklaşımları. (pp. 119-134). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Pearson, A. T. (2016). *The teacher: Theory and practice in teacher education*. Routledge.

Saroyan, A., & Snell, L. S. (1997). Variations in lecturing styles. *Higher education*, *33*(1), 85-104.

Säntti, J., Puustinen, M., & Salminen, J. (2018). Theory and practice in Finnish teacher education: a rhetorical analysis of changing values from the 1960s to the present day. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(1), 5-21.

Sarıtaş, M. (2007). Okul Deneyimi-I Uygulamasının Aday Öğretmenlere Sağladığı Yararlar Konusundaki Görüşlerin Değerlendirilmesi, *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, 20*(1), 121-143.

Şad, S. N., & Göktaş, Ö. (2013). Öğretim elemanlarının geleneksel ve çağdaş ölçme değerlendirme yaklaşımlarının incelenmesi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, *14*(2), 79-105.

Şahin, İ. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının nasıl yetiştirildiklerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, *22*(1), 241-258.

Şahin, M., Çetinoğlu, A., & Ayvaz, S. (2013). Türkiye'de öğretmen eğitiminin tarihçesi ile ilgili tezler üzerine bir değerlendirme, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 6*(27).

Şen, H. Ş., & Erişen, Y. (2002). Öğretmen yetiştiren kurumlarda öğretim elemanlarının etkili öğretmenlik özellikleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *22*(1).

Tokkaya, Y., Tokcan, H., & Kara, C. (2012). Öğretmenlik uygulaması dersi hakkında sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri, *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies International Journal of Social Science, 5*(7), 663-678.

Tosuntaş, Ş. B. (2013). *Eğitim bilimleri bölümü öğretim elemanlarının derslerinde kullandıkları öğretim yöntemlerinin değerlendirilmesi* [master's thesis, Uludağ University]. Türkiye.

Ünver, G. (2021). Program çalışmaları için öğretmen eğitimi. *Öğretmen Eğitimi ve Öğretim*, *2*(2), 30-55.

Vermunt, J. D. (2007). 6 The power of teaching-learning environments to influence student learning. In *BJEP Monograph Series II, Number 4-Student Learning and University Teaching* (Vol. 72, No. 89, pp. 72-89). British Psychological Society.

Walsh, K. (2013). 21st-century teacher education: Ed schools don't give teachers the tools they need. *Education Next*, *13*(3), 18-25.

Wolhuter, C. C. (2006). Teacher training in South Africa: past, present and future. *Education Research and Perspectives*, *33*(2), 124-139.

Yavuz, M., Özkaral, T., & Yıldız, D. (2015). Uluslararası raporlarda öğretmen yeterlikleri ve öğretmen eğitimi. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, *2*(2), 60-71.

Yeler, M. (2014). Öğretim elemanlarının öğretme-öğrenme sürecini düzenleme biçimlerinin öğrenci görüşlerine göre belirlenmesi. [Unpublished master's thesis, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University]. Türkiye.

Yüksel, S. (2015). Öğretmen yetiştirme politikalarında dönüşüm: 21. yy öğretmenini yetiştirme. *Türkiye Özel Okullar Birliği Dergisi*, *32*, 23-28.

YÖK. (2018). Programların Güncelleme Gerekçeleri, Getirdiği Yenilikler ve Uygulama Esasları. Retrieved 16 October, 2022 from https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Kurumsal/egitim_ogretim_dairesi/Yeni-Ogretmen-Yetistirme-Lisans-Programlari/AA_Sunus_%20Onsoz_Uygulama_Yonergesi.pdf