

Teacher Education Reform and International Globalization Hegemony: Issues and Challenges in Turkish Teacher Education

Ismail Guven

Abstract—Educational reforms are focused point of different nations. New reform movements generally claim that something is wrong with the current state of affairs, and that the system is deficient in its goals, its accomplishments and it is accused not being adopted into global changes all over the world. It is the same for Turkish education system. It is considered those recent reforms of teacher education in Turkey and the extent to which they reflect a response to global economic pressures. The paper challenges the view that such imposes are inevitable determinants of educational policy and argues that any country will need to develop its own national approach to modernizing teacher education in light of the global context and its particular circumstances. It draws on the idea of reflexive modernization developed by educators and discusses its implications for teacher education policy. The paper deals with four themes teacher education in last decade policy in Turkey; the shift away from the educational disciplines, the shift towards school-based approaches, and the emergence of more centralized forms of accountability of teacher competence.

Keywords— Teacher education, globalization, Turkey.

I. INTRODUCTION

TWO trends in the 1980s and 1990s influenced educational policies all over the World. The first was the appearance of a new set of economic conditions associated with significant increases in the global competition faced by previously relatively well-protected national economies. The directions of these reforms vary, from the widespread development of curriculum and content standards and assessment in the formulation of generic teaching standards by the state education systems in the World. The outcomes of this trend varied and were, of course, partly political. In education, the changes brought on by globalization have been manifested through various channels and mechanisms as reforms of structures, modes of financing, administration and curriculum. In several countries, they were expressed in the adoption of neo-liberal economic policies, they led to attempts to cut public expenditure, and to maximize the economic benefits of educational spending by increasing its efficiency and directing its goals to economic rather than social or cultural ends. Led

by the USA, such policies were taken far further in the UK, Germany, Sweden, Australia and New Zealand and some Latin American countries than in Asia and the countries of continental Europe [1].

The second and more specific trend was a series of fundamental educational reforms; of which changes in the structure and content of teacher education were usually a part. The rigidity and control of teacher education reform policies playing into the hegemonic ideology of globalization might also be a way to create an illusion of organization and certainty in a world that is becoming more uncertain as boundaries open up and disappear.

There was certainly a need for the reform of teacher education in Turkey, the policies developed and increasingly copied in other countries, were less a response to global economic changes and more a reflection of new types of 'new right' ideology. Becoming globally competitive does not reduce the costs of existing education; it entails a fundamentally new approach to the relationships between education and the economy. All these changes are part of the new context; how they are responded to and their implications for policies in education depend on decisions made by governments and non-state actors.

Major international bodies such as World Bank, IMF and OECD and so forth provided loans and donors for consolidation of human rights, democracy and educational conditions in developing countries. Giddens refers them as non-state actors because their activities are not bound the policies of particular states or governments. Many different types of non-state actors live alongside the transnational [2]. According to Giddens, these non-state actors play their role in three different areas. First, they represent an international community of states (like UNESCO and UN). Second, they concern with processes that entail international collaboration or communication such as telecommunication and so forth. Last, they link states or other economic enterprises with mutual international interests (like IMF, EC and so forth). These actors create a world sharing order, which is an international system of production, distribution and consumption of information, capital, and culture. The International bodies have been replacing the nation states in the world and imposing their global hegemony into developing countries that are needed the loans and credits of them since 1970.

I. Guven is with Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Social Studies Teaching, Ankara, Turkey (e-mail: iguven@education.ankara.edu.tr; phone: +90 312 363 33 50; fax: 0090 312 363 61 45).

These bodies systematically impose procedures based on their expectations so that their loans and donors are linked to structural changes in different civic and democratic implementations and conditions and conveyed in a participatory manner that include, for instance, the developing the role of civil society in developing countries. These international institutions place political and economic programmes which appear to exit their own right and expectations and play a role in maintaining or altering those conditions. They exert their influence through stipulating that financial assistance to nation states is conditional upon the dismantling of trade barriers and of their entry into a global system of free markets, which again limits the ability of nation states to firewall their economies. The combination of these forces heavily conditions many nation state activities. Education is one such activity, not only in terms of its financing, but in terms of the uses to which it is actually put. There are, then, intimate connections between political globalization, economic forces, and national domestic policies.[3] School reforms and reforms in teacher education rely on global discourses that move from one country to another. Globalization does not, anyway, mean that national distinctions become erased or that everything becomes identical[4]. Today's world is changing fast both economically and socially. While global competition is not perfect in all ways, for example free trade has not yet equated to fair trade, competition for ideas has never been stronger. Education has been recognized as the basic means of promoting the skills of globalization [5].

In fact, these institutions determine some indispensable measures, which should be reflected into the implementations in different areas of the nation's life. Moreover, the international institutes determine the usage way of loans and donors, the quality assessment schemes, technical skills and providing technical experts besides separating themselves from the ruling governments that is the helped nations becomes a distinct occupation and the new world view of international bodies is born. All these bring about inevitable disharmony between reality of the countries and expectations of national bodies. World has become increasingly interdependent-a process known as globalization. The global economy has also contributed to trend towards educational globalization and cultural investments [6].

The nations do not determine the way of structural changes but the international bodies determine them. The international bodies that defend the global economy and globalization put forward some requirements for developing countries to constitute some strategic plans and procedures for reducing poverty and ensuring educational equality. In other words, the loans and donors are linked to particular conditions namely participatory conditionality [7]. For instance, the Millennium Development Project (2000) paid special attention to another grand intervention by the international AID community into the alleviation of extreme poverty and achievement of sustainable development. The project aimed to increase socio-economical and cultural development of poorest countries however; the developing country such as Turkey, Egypt has been placed in the project. The project reflects broadly an approach and vision for social, political and economic change

and as such represent global hegemony. The international bodies emphasized on education and particularly on formal schooling in broad based reform efforts. Education is not only invoked as a vital means of attaining social and economic reform, but it is also considered a key actor for the realization of social projects such as eroding gender discrimination and providing compulsory education for all[8]. These implementations fail to take up the central questions that need to frame teacher education. Since education is a human undertaking, and educational studies is a normative domain, teacher education must be infused with the kind of critical scrutiny about social purposes, future possibilities, economic realities, and moral directions. This more encompassing perspective on teacher education is in danger of being eclipsed by more bureaucratic tendencies, commonsense appeals, and sometimes smug assertions that we have turned some kind of corner internationally identifying what good teaching consists in [9]. The global requirements identified for education include promoting life-long education; re-emphasizing the quality of pupil's experience; reorganizing subjects into key learning areas so as to develop a broad knowledge-base among pupils as well as the ability to think critically and innovate and fostering of global awareness and outlook, and rising levels of professionalism among teachers [10].

Educators will probably not only experience greater control and direction of their work, but also the increasing complexity and fragmentation of the world around them: and they will be asked to help others make sense of this as well. Turkey has been pushed by international bodies to prepare an agenda for improving the quality of education and delivering compulsory education into mass in short term in 1996. Turkey has been expected to implement aid and achieve development goals through so-called "education for all" The World Bank played a supportive and advisory role during the lending discussions from which the Ministry benefited. Finally, the IMF indicated its acceptance of the Program and did not restrict expenditures on education and health. The World Bank has supported similar reforms in nearby countries, including Hungary and Romania and in doing so has worked closely with EU, which is already involved in two related projects in Turkey. These curriculum reforms are designed to prepare students better for growing knowledge economy and lifelong learning, and reflect similar changes in teacher education programs in many OECD and EU countries such as Germany, Norway, Sweden. The objectives of teacher education reform were claimed as integral parts of the broader economic and social development objectives of Turkey, as well as European Union, which Turkey wishes to join, and are supported by the World Bank Country Assistance Strategy[11].

The guidelines aimed at the education systems of EU members because of the recognition by the EU that economic growth depends on having higher skills in the workforce and that improving education levels is the best way to improve skills of the labor force. The EU has thus called on its member countries to ensure that their school systems set and meet high quality learning standards, increase education opportunities at all levels, allow youth to pursue flexible learning paths, and make sure the education system is meeting the needs of the labor market. Furthermore, as part of the EU's Lisbon Agenda

benchmarks, the EU has established specific educational targets for its member states: by 2010, 85% of young people should have a complete secondary education [12].

II. REFORMING EDUCATION IN COUNTRY LEVEL

Turkish Government's Eighth Five Year Development Plan indicates that the length of compulsory education to 12 years will result in short-term pressure to increase secondary capacity by almost three million additional places by 2007-08, relative to the number of places in 2004-05. Simultaneous with this expansion, the Government of Turkey urges to align the quality of its secondary programs with those of the European Union in preparation for greater integration with Europe and in response to an expected increase in the demand for higher-level skills within Turkey and in Europe. The Government plans to increase secondary education capacity leading to full enrollment. While doing so the Government has two broad alternatives: (a) maintain the status quo of the existing system (i.e., essentially put the old system into the additional facilities); or (b) make substantial changes to the structure and content of the system with the objective of ensuring that youth are better prepared for lifelong learning and the challenge of the developing knowledge economy which is typified by Turkey's move to EU accession. It was critical that the Turkish Government and the Bank shared a common understanding of the need for, and the type of, reforms that were to be undertaken and supported by the project. The skills and knowledge needed by secondary school graduates are different now than 20, or even 10, years ago, the pace of change will increase if Turkey wishes to remain competitive in the global economy, and moves toward EU membership. Several factors indicate what is coming, and its potential impact on secondary education. The economy and labor market are already changing in Turkey and this has an impact on secondary education. For example, employment in agriculture dropped from 47 to 35 percent, services increased from 33 to 41 percent and industry increased from 15 to 18 percent in the past 10 years, and the new economy is requiring different and higher level skills. Recent unemployment among all secondary school graduates in Turkey is 17 percent. Initial information being developed for the knowledge economy assessment being carried by the Bank with the Turkish Government indicates that Turkey currently ranks 33rd (out of 75) on the World Economic Forum Growth Competitiveness Index, but is expected to slip to 54th place in the future and fall behind almost all EU candidate countries. World Bank Institute benchmark data, including data on economic/institutional framework, information communication technology, national innovation systems, and human resource development (education), indicate that Turkey regressed since 1995. The key challenge facing Turkey is the need to expand and reform the system to provide all youth with education system that will address short and long term goals, including providing them with core skills and knowledge as a base for lifelong learning as well as participation in a modern knowledge economy. Again, the proposed project directly supports these reforms, along with enhancing school assessment and planning to monitor the impact of the reforms [13].

III. THE REFORM OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN TURKEY SINCE 1980S

Teacher education policy in Turkey since the early 1980s can be seen as moving from evolutionary to technocratic modernization as successive governments tried to make the system more efficient and cost effective at the same time as attempting to solve such problems as pupil drop out and the low levels of achievement associated with urban schools. However, with its priority of greater control, technocratic modernization has created new problems such as teacher demoralization and a fall in recruitment, especially in shortage subject areas such as physics and technology.

The main change in the higher education system took place in 1981. Before, it was made up of three different units: universities, academies and teacher training institutions, which were both administratively and academically attached to the Ministry of Education. Higher Education Reform in 1981, introduced a "unified" higher education, integrating all academies and teacher training institutions into the universities. Some four-year teacher training institutions and three-year foreign language high schools were transformed into education faculties, while the former high schools, where elementary school teachers were trained, became two-year higher education institutions. These were transformed into four-year faculties in 1989. Two-year undergraduate programmes for pre-school teachers were introduced in 1981 and later they were changed into four-year degree programmes in 1991. The responsibilities and activities of teacher training were transferred from the Ministry of Education to the universities. It was assumed that problems such as the quality of education, the quality and the number of staff, etc. could easily be solved by means of these changes. As a result of this unification and increase in the number of admissions, faculties began to suffer from a lack of physical facilities, equipment, faculty, and so forth. To fill the faculty gap, many faculty members of the colleges of science and letters were transferred to the education faculties [14]

At this moment education faculties train pre-school, elementary school, and secondary/high school teachers employed both by the Ministry of Education and the private schools. Students of faculty of science and letters majoring in one discipline and who follow pedagogical courses and complete their teaching certificate courses after having obtained a bachelor's degree in their field can also become teachers. It is not plausible if the new global hegemony address the structural and institutional challenges of attaining a quality compulsory education, social equity, and gender equality?

In the 1980s teacher education curricula in the Turkey were dominated by the educational disciplines, especially philosophy, psychology and sociology. The assumption was that these disciplines formed:

- a key part of the content of what a professional teacher needed to know;
- the basis on which teachers could continue their studies for higher degrees.

During the past 10 years, reforming teacher education has become acutely politicized. This action was part of a systemic reform to articulate and align high standards for teachers and students. Since the introduction of 8 years compulsory education, teacher education departments in the universities have been reorganized in cooperation with the Ministry of National education and the Higher Education Council. The main aim was to meet the short- and long-term demand for teachers in primary and secondary education. A new system of teacher education has been implemented since 1997. The main principles of new teacher education system are as follows;

1) Training pre-primary and primary school teachers with 4 years Bachelor's degrees

2) Training secondary school teachers who hold either Bachelor's degrees for teaching foreign languages, music, arts, physical education, special education and computer teaching fields. No thesis or final dissertation is required in this case.

Furthermore, in order to employ a teacher in several fields of education, a compulsory second subject has been included into teacher education departments in addition to the main subject. The training program provide opportunities prospective teachers to observe and participate in classroom teaching, to carry out other teaching-related tasks such as attending faculty meetings. Prospective teachers are evaluated periodically by both the supervising faculty and supervising teachers based on both observation of their teaching and lesson plans. 1998 basic education reform in Turkey that was based on the constructivism, the idea was promoted through the new national curriculum guidelines, textbook, math methods courses, professional conferences, and workshops. After a while, all elementary school teachers knew something about this approach and had some teaching materials in their hands based on this approach, though they may not have totally agreed with it. Now with more colleges and universities involved in teacher education, there is more deliberate discussion before new claims are widely implemented [15].

In response to the widely recognized inadequacy of its disciplinary framework, the curriculum of teacher education was reconstructed in the 1980s on the basis of the typical classroom-based problems faced by prospective teachers. Examples of such problems were classroom management and discipline, dealing with pupils with learning difficulties, and coping with classes with pupils from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. However despite the changes in teacher education curricula, student teachers still came back from teaching practice with problems they could not solve. With their focus on 'problems', the university-based courses tended to confirm a 'social pathology' view of schooling; student teachers learned that schools failed either because pupils lacked motivation or ability or because they had "bad" teachers. Though student teachers experienced the problems of school failure as classroom-based, a teacher education curriculum that treats the problems as if their origins lie solely within the classroom will inevitably be inadequate. The new problem-based curricula denied students access to concepts which, by linking their practical experience to the wider context which shaped it, might have helped them improve

their practice. University Education Departments were seen by the government of the time as representing a vested interest of a "liberal" educational establishment opposed to modernization.

This view of the universities was of course partly true; it is arguable that universities are almost inherently "conservative". However, the displacement of a role for "theory" by a focus on making teachers into technically competent practitioners creates its own problems. Such a policy presumes that the core of any teacher education programme should be the experience of trying to teach in school under the guidance of experienced teachers.

IV. IMPROVING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS: CHALLENGES AND REFORMS

The first Turkish teacher training institution, known as the Darulmuallimin, was established in 1848. While many different models of teacher training have been implemented since then, the main change in the Turkish teacher education system took place in 1981 when "the responsibilities and activities of teacher training were transferred from Ministry of National Education (MONE) to the universities" [16]. Before 1981, all teacher education institutions were both academically and administratively under the control of MONE. Higher Education Reform in 1981 changed all 4-year teacher training institutions and 3-year foreign language high schools into 4-year faculties of education. Today, most of the faculties of education in Turkey have programs for training preschool (kindergarten) teachers, elementary teachers (both primary school teachers and subject teachers for middle schools), and secondary teachers who are employed by both MONE and private schools. Yet the faculties of education are not the only providers of teachers. Of those students enrolling in the faculties of science and letters, the ones who complete pedagogical course requirements in the faculties of education after having obtained a bachelor's degree in their fields of study are also eligible to apply for a secondary teaching position. Today, there are 155 (85 public and 30 private) universities in Turkey [17](reference). While two of the public universities are more than 100 years old, 21 of the private universities were founded within the last decade. Out of 75, 43 (one private and 42 public) universities have faculties of education, most of which offer dual (both regular and evening) programs. Although students in the evening programs are required to pay much higher tuition than the ones enrolling in the regular programs, they are admitted to the same courses of study with relatively lower scores than the regular students. According to OSYM's 2002 guide, in 2002 approximately 10,720 (6450 regular and 4270 evening) students were eligible to enroll in overall 86 (51 regular and 35 evening) classroom-teaching programs offered under elementary teacher education departments by 42 public universities. Starting in 1998, all faculties of education in Turkey follow a standardized curriculum prescribed by the Higher Education Council. Preparation for the teaching profession requires the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the three domains, which include "general culture", "special subject training", and "pedagogy". With regard to the classroom teaching program, for example, the pedagogical

domain consists of 30 credit hours (including the teaching practicum) and constitutes about one fifth of the whole curriculum (consisting of 152 credit hours), while the majority of the courses (such as Turkish teaching, math teaching, science teaching, social studies teaching, or art teaching) are related to the special subject teaching domain (consisting of 109 credit hours). The rest 13 credit hours are related to the general subject matter. Furthermore, the teaching practicum encompasses three sessions of field experience during the 4-year teacher education course one, during the second semester of the first year, and the other two in the first and second semesters of the fourth year. It is the last session in which students are required to do actual teaching [17].

The World Bank expected from Turkish Government to realize expanding basic education coverage in two categories of activities which comprised teacher training, recruitment and deployment and school construction. World Bank stated that there would be no loan financing would be used for these activities however; the Bank addressed the lack of teachers throughout the country. Therefore, the MONE intended to recruit approximately 150,000 teachers and inspectors to accommodate the basic education enrollment increases that were expected under the Basic Education Project. It was a hidden recommendation for changing existing teacher education system [19].

The MONE collaborated closely with the Higher Education Council (HEC) and specific universities to provide the necessary initial teacher training for reducing teacher gap. Under the National Education Development Project (NEDP), the MONE and HEC collaborated to improve the quality of teacher training through redesigned curricula and foreign fellowships, as well as improved conditions at teacher training institutions. After that all the teacher-training institutes have been pushed to adjust their admissions and programs to meet new requirements for new teachers under the Basic Education Program. HEC has adopted a number of initiatives, including introducing new training programs for English teacher, preschool teacher, and diverting secondary prospective teachers.

A. Rational of Turkish Teacher Education Reform

Higher education has its particular problems and promises in Turkey. A student must pass a highly competitive central university examination to enroll in a university and make a list of 18 choices of their desired departments. Teacher training departments do not usually attract talented students. National Advisory Council for Teacher Education, convened in June 1989, advised the MONE to launch a scholarship programme to attract gifted students into the teaching profession. Although a significant increase in university admissions was observed, the quality of students is still a great problem in many departments of the education faculties.

Although the number of academic staff at education faculties has dramatically increased since 1981, one cannot say that the quality of faculty has changed. This area desperately needs further study. And it is obvious that a lack of qualified teachers in education faculties has a negative effect on the quality of education. During the unification in 1981, many faculty members, especially from the

Departments of Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, History and Western Languages, were transferred from the colleges of letters and science, which was amongst the first colleges to be, opened in every university, to the education faculties. Most held a doctorate and obtained an administrative position in education faculties. The new departments or the new posts in education faculties continued to recruit graduates of colleges of letters and science. Unfortunately, this tradition is still alive, though not to the same degree. Although these faculties were and are qualified in their subject, they were accused of not being trained in methodology and pedagogy. Education faculties were graduating students who resembled graduates of colleges of letters and science. They were not graduating students who knew how to teach, but who knew their subject [20].

Therefore, most academic staff in education faculties, except for primary education, educational administration or instructional technology, were not producing research or writing about education. The subject was important for them. And most failed to relate theory to practice and were overspecialized. This situation still prevails; though not on the same extend, in all education faculties. But in departments such as Arts, Physical Education, and Music, the situation differs somewhat. Selection is based on the skills and talent needed by those who will be artists, professional sportsmen, or musicians, and courses are designed accordingly.

For many years, there has been a consensus among teacher trainers that teacher training should include the development of both a knowledge base and skills in the instruction. The knowledge base includes emphasis on such areas as teaching theory, pedagogical methodology, child development, educational research, and subject content. The skill development part of the curriculum consists in practice, including early field experience and student teaching experiences where students must put into practice the knowledge they have gained through their course work. Both these elements were totally neglected in the curriculum of the education faculties. A close analysis shows that it lacked coherence and that the purpose of many courses is outmoded and hazy. There is also a lack of empirical data on the impact of the courses [21].

Recruitment, which was managed by the MONE, was based on expected student numbers in 1997 70,000 new teachers were recruited [22] All teachers had to have university graduation, plus they acquire pedagogical formation through theoretical and practical courses. However, because the program started up immediately without a scale-up phase, many universities graduate teacher candidates could receive only a very short teacher education and training program. Teachers with little pedagogical preparation were sent out to schools. Many of these new teachers were given temporary graduation certificates and were expected to complete training in summertime. Universities launched massive summer courses in order to keep up with the necessities of the situation.

As was mentioned above, in addition to the graduates of education faculties, large numbers of unemployed graduates of the colleges of science and letters apply for positions in secondary schools because they cannot find jobs in their field.

But they lacked pedagogical skills. While educators were discussing this dichotomy, 10,000 university graduates, mainly with teaching certificates, became elementary school teachers in 1995. Moreover, MONE employed some 12,000 graduates, regardless of their graduation subject and subject, as teachers at elementary schools due to teacher shortage. Hence, any university graduate with or without a teaching certificate became a teacher. This proved the old saying in Turkey: "If you cannot be anything you can at least be a teacher!" But teachers in Turkey, as in many countries, also suffer problems such as low salary, heavy demands made upon time, crowded classrooms, outmoded textbooks, less sophisticated physical facilities and a lack of opportunity to improve their professional knowledge and performance. Although MONE has a long tradition of in-service training, it is difficult to verify its effectiveness.

B. Implementation of Reform Efforts in Teacher Education

Aware of the importance of teachers and teacher training, MONE and the Council of Higher Education implemented reforms in teacher training collaboratively. Special National Advisory Council for Teacher Education was convened in June 1989 to advise MONE. As a result, a scholarship programme to attract talented students into the teaching profession was launched and some three-year teacher high schools were transformed into four-year high schools, which students with great ability but a lower income prefer to general high schools because of free accommodation and extra in scores from Central University Examination if they choose to attend education faculties. Other resolutions include: creating sound in-service programmes in in-service training centers near big universities which organize local in-service seminars throughout the country, establishing a teacher education academy to train mentor teachers, and, more recently, the creation of professional development schools in pilot cities.

For improving teacher education reform, with a US\$177.2 million loan (US\$90.2 million from the World Bank and US\$87 million from the Turkish Government), faculty and research fellows from education faculties were sent abroad to attend master, PhD, or Post Doctoral studies. The World Bank loan has been taken provided that Higher Education Council revise and improve pre-service teacher training curricula, textbooks and pedagogical material and to support research projects. The NEDP (National Education Development Project) was implemented with the loan agreement concluded between the Turkish Government and the World Bank in 1990 [23]. It was administered by YOK (Higher Education Council) and the British Council provides technical assistance. The goals of the project were:

1. to improve the quality of primary and secondary education to reach OECD levels;
2. to reach standards that are identical to those in OECD countries so as to upgrade the quality and validity of teacher training; and
3. to ensure more effective and economical resource utilization in the areas of administration and management.

This reform caused task-oriented courses to replace theoretical courses more according to subject area.

Prospective teachers do not have a chance to teach until the end of their course. It is expected from Early Practicum Experiences called "School experience course" in which trainees gain simulated teaching experience at the beginning or in the middle of their undergraduate programme may stimulate the integration of theory and practice. The second year is generally considered the best time. The components of the practicum should be distributed over the four years, with student teaching being the final experience. Prospective teachers would be put in teaching settings to acquire the skills and habit of working in different situations. The teacher education programme has been divided into three areas:

1. A general education area, common for all students, covering key topics such as learning, special pedagogy, socialization, fundamental values, child development, etc., as well as interdisciplinary subject studies (a total of 60 credit points).
2. An education area of orientation covering the subject/subject area the future teacher intends to teach (one or two blocks of at least 40 credit points each and up to 160 credit points depending on the chosen subject and age group). Previous division of subjects is loosened up. The universities are free to establish new integrated courses for subject matter studies.
3. An education area of specialization, deepening or broadening earlier acquired knowledge (at least 20 credit points).

Through this liberalization, teacher education has the same content and layout at different universities or university colleges throughout the country. The students could not to choose between various universities depending on what they have to offer. Within the universities there cannot be a supply of courses for the students to opt for, all of which fit into one of the three educational areas. Students cannot pick up credits until they have fulfilled the full number of credit points in all areas, and there are not many optional courses. This also causes loss of competition within the universities. Lecturers are prepared to teach courses at first hand and, want student to come rushing for their courses.

The other point should be emphasized here is the religious education. After 1997 reform, theology faculties has been organized teacher for the religion and moral subject however, the faculties organized the second subjects such as Turkish and Social Studies teaching. The graduates may work in these fields in practice. The worst thing should be taken into consideration here that the total credit of social studies courses at theology faculties are just 12. Turkish, Writing and Verbal Discourse, Turkish literature, Children literature, Teaching Turkish, Language and Culture were the courses for being a Turkish or Social Studies teaching [24]. Nobody question the quality of the graduates from theology faculties as teachers. There is no response from Teacher Education institutions and even the universities on this point. HEC and Teacher Education Council have undermined some subjects consciously.

C. Quality Rational in Teacher Education: Standardization

Several disturbing aspects of the standards movement require serious criticism. The substantive changes in teacher

education cannot be instituted through processes that are exclusively driven by external standards, claimed to be national in scope, that deny professional judgment and intellectual inquiry for teacher educators at more local levels. There is a superficial and somewhat skewed sense of the social and economic purposes of teacher education as these are being advocated. This is accompanied by a lack of sustained analysis into the causes of those purposes and who benefits, and the avenues through which they might be addressed. In addition the fact that the political underpinnings of the direction being chartered are not always openly discussed, or that there are alternative political perspectives that could be incorporated into approaches to teacher education, creates a vacuum that requires more sustained conceptual analysis, philosophical reflection, and concrete action.

A flattened sense of the nature of teaching, as essentially a technical/rational domain, is not adequate. In addition to being aware of the actual complexities of classroom processes and student activities, as well as how they can be organized, prospective teachers must develop a larger, theoretical and normative framework that allows the development of a theory of education as well as a theory of teaching. However, the new teacher education programmes lack of all three competencies.

Moreover, a national uniformed education for teacher education and the creation of a corollary culture for teacher education institutions undermines the development of alternative forms of teacher education, and novel approaches to curriculum development. The articulation of distinctive, fundamentally different approaches to teacher education might have not only different emphases than standards-driven programmes, but qualitatively different purposes and orientations.

Lastly, the hope that standards-based and uniformed teacher education, increased emphases on student achievement, teacher performances, and new forms of technology will lead to public school graduates having economic security and social stability is simply naive. In making such claims, advocates of the standards movement rely on the assumption that schools are meritocratic institutions, and on the view that the distribution of high status occupations, and the allocation of resources more generally in the United States and other industrialized nations, will be fair and appropriate. But there is little evidence to suppose that assumption is accurate. The reality is that the Turkey now has the largest income disparity between the very wealthy and very poor of any developing country.

The main critics on new teacher education programs focused on these points

- (1) unclear content and objectives of this course,
- (2) the lack of faculty members whose research interests or teaching specialty lie in teaching such a course,
- (3) the perceived need of such a course, and
- (4) the limited resources.

The mechanistic performances students were expected to achieve without having developed an overall normative view of humans, education, and social and political contexts. The

technocratic modernization of teacher education implies a view of learning associated with the development of specific skills by teachers whose responsibility is increasingly limited to monitoring students and preparing them for external tests and examinations. This is increasingly at odds with the complex and diverse roles that teachers have to play, not only as subject specialists but also as assessors and curriculum counselors as well as contributing to the wider goals of their school as a whole.

The main characteristic of new teacher education reform in Turkey was “to change the teacher education system from pluralized and diversified to and a centralized and a monopolized one.” The new structure meant that all future teachers would have a common basic competence, combined with a chosen orientation towards particular subjects/subject areas and/or age groups and an area of specialization. The new teaching degree comprises a programme containing minimum of 120 credit points (equal to three years of full-time studies) and a maximum of 220 points, depending on the student’s choice of area and education level. Higher Education Council and Teacher Education Commission undermined both the ideas of autonomy and professionalism. Government constituted the overall guidelines for the courses and their credits requirement and leave the teacher education departments to determine the specific requirement of these courses. Since 1997, 52 educational faculties change into education centers to prepare K-8 teachers in all levels and areas. The rapidly increased number of students has overloaded the teacher education system and some educators wondered about the overall impact on the quality of teacher preparation. And many of the new ideas promoted by the Higher Education Council, such as curricular innovations as well as closely supervised 1-year student teaching experience, were not fully realized because of financial and personnel constraints. The architecture of the reform policies rests on visible teaching performances and their impact on student outcomes as criteria for licensing teachers and accrediting teacher education programs. The liberalization reform has caused many problems, and a reform in teacher education was needed as a response to the new situation. The teacher education reform is, among other things, intended to strengthen the professionalism of teachers as educators and not only as subject specialists (they still specialize in subject matters to the same extent as before but the general educational parts have increased). It is also obvious that the new teacher education is in line with the general trend of liberalization. It stands for a shift in the ‘agency’ of education. First, the central body governed teacher education. Thereafter the universities within the frames set by government governed it. In this present phase, teacher education is still governed by the universities within the frames set by government, but a greater part of it is transferred directly to the students themselves.

Young pointed out that the disciplinary basis of the teacher education curriculum collapsed in the 1980s for two reasons. The first was practical; the disciplines did not provide an adequate basis for student teachers to understand the problems that they faced in the classroom. Furthermore, the disciplines were abstracted from any real life situations and were

insulated from each other. Students were somehow expected to bring the various disciplinary knowledge together and make them relevant to improving their practice. The second reason was political. The disciplines, especially sociology, were seen by the government of the time as critical rather than constructive; they identified systemic problems, but did not point to pedagogic solutions. All these are almost as the same as in Turkey [25]

V. DISCUSSION

There is no simple or single answer to how globalization has affected education reform policies with regard to teaching, learning, and curricula. Since 1997, Turkey has participated in international assessments with the International Education Association and the OECD, invited external scrutiny with studies on education quality (by the OECD) and educational effectiveness and efficiency (by the World Bank), [26] and international conferences held in Turkey on curriculum reform and higher education reform. The aims of major structural changes in Turkey's education system were intended to meet the challenges of European integration and globalization and to bring higher quality to Turkish education and to bring better educational and employment opportunities for all students in Turkey by World Bank representatives [27]. Global experience shows that the single largest factor in education quality is the quality of teachers. Simply put, better teachers mean better students, better skills and better employment. The current education system in Turkey does not adequately support teachers or raise teacher quality to the levels needed to produce better students. Research shows that teachers need intensive training and continuous support to change their teaching practices in line with updated curriculum and learning expectations. Initial teacher education, in particular, would need to be redesigned to support the new expectations and requirements of teachers. But initial teacher education is one area over which the Ministry of National Education has very little influence. One of the contradictory aspects of the Turkish education system is that while MONE has comprehensive authority over most of the determinants of teaching and learning (i.e., curriculum, educational materials, teacher assignment, school facilities, equipment, and oversight), it does not control the most critical input in the system: human resources [28]. Specifically, MONE does not control the selection of individuals into teacher education programs at the university (the OSYM does), their academic preparation (YOK/HEC and the university does), or their entrance into the profession (the Civil Service examination does).

As actors in this reform, however, it is important for us to understand the role we play in this context and how reform policies and practices might result from and feed into globalization and the global economic ideology. Conversations about educational reform have transcended local and state boundaries and now need to be interpreted at the national and transnational levels. This global ideology is multi-layered and can be examined from historical, political, and socio-cultural perspectives. Global drivers then exist, and they do attempt to steer nation states in particular economic and political directions, but little is inevitable. Nation state

governments, underpinned by different cultural attitudes and values, will attempt to adopt different approaches and strategies, which may well result in different impacts upon different citizen groups. These attempts at reform are motivated by various forces, but appear to reflect an international convergence toward uniformity, conformity, and compliance. The global and the European challenge is to create a stronger education system which produces higher skills among graduates who can function in an increasingly complex and competitive labor market. This is obviously the same challenge that Turkey faces. Standards and assessments have been defined by international organizations at many different levels and in most academic subjects: curriculum and assessment standards for elementary and secondary school students, professional teaching standards and assessment for the certification of experienced teachers, professional teaching standards and assessment for new teachers, and program standards for the review and accreditation of teacher education programs.

In short, teaching and the preparation of teachers is again being positioned as something like a science, now to be generated by an adherence to content and developmental standards and evaluation practices that guarantee results, and are underwritten by accreditation agencies such as the National Commission Teacher Education. Powerful institutions and groups, buttressed by fears about our economic and social futures, support this direction for teacher education. Among the most disheartening of the emerging results of this direction is a narrowing of what counts as quality and accountability in teacher education, and an equally problematic perspective concerning the means that will accomplish the ends being promoted. It was hoped that these reforms would guarantee particular classroom outcomes related to what is termed "learning".

The disciplinary basis of the teacher education curriculum collapsed in the 1980s for two reasons. The first was practical; the disciplines did not provide an adequate basis for student teachers to understand the problems that they faced in the classroom. Furthermore, the disciplines were abstracted from any real life situations and were insulated from each other. Students were somehow expected to bring the various disciplinary knowledge's together and make them relevant to improving their practice. The second reason was political. The disciplines, especially sociology, were seen by the government of the time as critical rather than constructive; they identified systemic problems, but did not point to pedagogic solutions.

One of the most detrimental results of this perspective on teaching and teacher education is that it distances prospective teachers from the political nature of teaching as well as from the social, cultural, and ideological roles that schools and school systems play in the larger social arena. To the extent that teacher education is aloof from contested issues, ideas, and ideals, or adopts an uncritical stance toward conventional social and political movements, it is becoming easier to suspend critical inquiry into realities that surround the preparation of professionals. A virtual suspension of such critical inquiry-especially when the search is for 'the one best system' of teacher education-threatens to develop a narrow perspective on what counts as quality in teacher education.

The standards movement also undermines the value of intellectual growth for prospective teachers through higher education, even as it forecloses on alternative modes of understanding and action in schools and novel programmatic initiatives in universities.

Teacher educators in the Turkey now lack historical, philosophical and sociological perspectives that are central to the field. For example, an earlier reform initiative in teacher Education-“competency-based/performance-based teacher education”-mirrors many of the facets of the current standards direction. Still earlier efforts based in a social efficiency orientation and supported by behavioral regularities and empirical research have a long history. Well before the competency-based movement in the 1980s and 1990s, a number of efforts were being made to generate foolproof systems that would effectively enhance learning, as part of a scientific-rationalized orientation to teacher education. This orientation involved a faith in the power of the scientific study of teaching to provide the basis for building a teacher education curriculum.

Efforts to create a new professionalism through the articulation and uniform adoption of international trends, reinforced by state licensure requirements, performance assessments tied to initial and continuing licensure, and allegedly more demanding expectations, are in some ways understandable. Teachers, teacher educators, students, parents, and the public in general want schools to develop the best possible educational activities. Universities, and teacher education as one central part of a educational faculties' mission, also have responsibilities to the state. That responsibility, obviously, cannot be realized unless we create programmes that are high in quality, for the best possible prospective teachers we can recruit. Educational activities and programs must also be responsive to the imperative of helping create a better future, both for individual students and adults, as well as for the society generally. In short, the desires to elevate educational quality, hold teachers at all levels to rigorous requirements regarding teaching and programme quality, and so on, are critically important reminders of the fundamental importance of education.

Teacher training changed into a technical competency field in organizational level due to strict programs and course schedule in Turkey after 1997. Teacher education departments have been changed into high schools in essence by HEC and National Teacher Education Committee. The members of this committee have been appointed by HEC and World Bank, EU and OECD initiatives Turkish teacher education tradition has been colonized under the directions of international globalization bodies. The worst thing should be emphasized is the textbooks that were prepared some experts under patronage of HEC and World Bank and so on were delivered to teacher education faculties for course usage. The staff from HEC and World Bank inspected their usage and designed some sanctions for the academic staff who were not willing to use these textbooks in teacher education departments. Teacher education departments have no power to change a course name or content of a course without taking HEC's permissions. HEC and National Teacher Education Board eroded the autonomy of teacher education departments. The

president of teacher education committee in HEC also organized some meetings for informing about the reform to public however he has just only spoke and misbehaved and reacted to all critics in these meetings. Teacher education institutions have been pushed to leave their theoretical bases such as educational history, educational sociology. The educational sciences (in pedagogical meaning) have been reduced into teacher training as a technical competency by HEC. All teacher education departments have been uniformed in terms of courses, subjects and credits. Moreover, some subjects have been undermined and organized in theology faculties as a teaching subject. However, some staff from some education faculties had no reactions on these new implementations. There appeared new books and textbooks relating to new courses that were placed in the new teacher education programs in short period. The quality of textbooks has never been questioned and some authors who were not educated in the field for teacher education departments have prepared teamwork textbooks. The textbooks have been commercialized.

In the pre-service program, instruction in the interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education should reflect and serve the rationale and goals of the professional teacher preparation program. No particular organization or format is specified. Learning may be structured around aspects of the school-society relationship, issues in educational policy, or particular disciplines, e.g., the history, philosophy, and sociology of education. Field experiences designed and supervised in collaboration with educational practitioners are appropriate components of foundational studies when those experiences contribute to students' abilities to interpret and communicate the content and context of educational thought and practice. This change recognizes the importance of such areas of study as educational psychology, curriculum and instruction, educational administration, and pedagogical methods within professional teacher preparation programs. However, instruction in these areas is not an acceptable substitute for humanistic and social foundational studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Young, “Rethinking Teacher Education for a Global Future: lessons from the English”, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, Vol. 24,(1), 1998 „G. Linde, . “The Meaning of a Teacher Education Reform: national story-telling and global trends in Sweden”, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 26, (1),2003,, P. Viehahn, “Teacher Education in Germany”. *European Journal of Teacher Education*,Vol. 26 (1), 2003,,, G. Delandshere, & A. Petrosky, “Political rationales and ideological stances of the standards-based reform of teacher education in the US”*Teaching and Teacher Education* I,Vol.20 (1) , 2004, pp. 1-15,,, E.Terhart, “Teacher-Training Reform” *European Education*, Vol. 36,(1), 2004, pp. 29–49.
- [2] Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology*, 4th Ed. London: Blackwell.
- [3] M. Bottery, “Education and globalization: redefining the role of the educational professional” *Educational Review* Vol. 58, No. 1, 2006, pp. 95–113.
- [4] T. S. Popkewitz, *Educational Knowledge. Changing Relationships between State, Civil Society and the Educational Community*. New York State University of New York Press, 2000.
- [5] S. Marginson, “After globalization: Emerging politics of Education”, *Journal of education Policy* 14(1), 1999,19-31.
- [6] H. Ertl, & D. Phillips, “Standardization in EU education and training policy: findings from a European research network”, *Comparative Education* Vol. 42 (1) , 2006, pp. 77–91, M. Bottery, “Education and

- globalization: redefining the role of the educational professional” Educational Review Vol. 58, No. 1, 2006, pp. 95–113.
- [7] Noman, 2005, p. 235.
- [8] S. P. Heyneman, “The history and problems in the making of education policy at the World Bank 1960–2000”, International Journal of Educational Development. Vol. 23, 2003, pp. 315–337.
- [9] Zeichner, K. (2003) The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare and retain the best teachers for all the students, Teacher College Record, Vol.105 (3), pp.490-51.
- [10] W.W. Law, “Educational reform in Hong-Kong and Taiwan”, International Review of Education, Vol. 50(5-6), 2004, pp.497-524.
- [11] World Bank, Turkey: Rapid Coverage for Compulsory Education- The 1997 Basic Education Program, Washington DC. (Report by İlhan Dulger), 1997.
- [12] MEB, National Education at Glance Beginning 2004, Ankara: 2004.
- [13] YOK ,Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi, [Reorganization of the Teacher Training Programs of Education Faculties] Ankara: 1998.
- [14] OECD. (2005). Education at a Glance 2005, Paris., EURYBASE Summary Sheets On Education Systems In Europe Turkey <http://www.eurydice.org>, 15.11.2005).
- [15] World Bank, Turkey: Rapid Coverage for Compulsory Education- The 1997 Basic Education Program, Washington DC. (Report by İlhan Dulger),1997.
- [16] Y. Akyuz, Turk Eğitim Tarihi (Baslangictan 2004’e). 9th Ed. [History of Turkish Education: From Beginning to 2004]. Ankara, Ani Yayinlari, 2004.
- [17] YOK, 9 Aralık 2003-9 Aralık 2007 Erdogan Tezic Baskanligi Dönemi Yuksek Öğretim Kurulu Faaliyet Raporu Özeti, [The summary of the Higher Education Activities during Erdogan Tezic Period] Ankara. 2007.
- [18] YOK, Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi, [Reorganization of the Teacher Training Programs of Education Faculties] Ankara: 1998.
- [19] YOK, Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi, [Reorganization of the Teacher Training Programs of Education Faculties] Ankara: 1998.
- [20] MEB,National Education at Glance Beginning 2004. Ankara:2004.
- [21] Z. Altan, “A call for change and pedagogy: A critical analysis of teacher education in Turkey”, European Journal of Education, Vol. 33 (4), 1998, pp.407-418.
- [22] YOK, Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi, [Reorganization of the Teacher Training Programs of Education Faculties] Ankara: 1998.
- [23] YOK, Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi, [Reorganization of the Teacher Training Programs of Education Faculties] Ankara: 1998.
- [24] G. Karagözoglu, “Teacher education reform in Turkey”, Action in Teacher Education, Vol.13, 1991.
- [25] Young, M. (1998) Rethinking Teacher Education for a Global Future: lessons from the English Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol. 24,(1)
- [26] YOK (1998). Eğitim Fakülteleri Öğretmen Yetistirme Programlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi, [Reorganization of the Teacher Training Programs of Education Faculties] Ankara. , C. Kavcar, “ İlahiyat Fakültelerinde Öğretmen Yetistirme”, [Teacher Training in Theology Faculties] Ulkemizde Laik Eğitim Sosyal Bilim Olarak Din Öğretim Kurultayı, Bildiri Kitabı, 7-9 Nisan 2005. Malatya.2005, pp.500-508.
- [27] World Bank, (2005). Secondary Education Project,(Turkey) Project Information Document Concept Stage, Washington DC.
- [28] A. Vorkink, Remarks of Mr. Andrew Vorkink, Country Director for Turkey, on Education Reform in Turkey delivered at Hacettepe University <http://www.worldbank.org.tr/2006,WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/ECAEXT/TURKEYEXTN/0,contentMDK:20766475~menuPK:361718~pagePK:141137~piPK:141127~theSitePK:361712,00.html>, retrieved 14.02.2006.
- [29] World Bank, (2002). ICT at a Glance (Turkey) ICT infrasturture and access. ITU and UNESCO, Computers and the Internet, ICT expenditures, World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness Report 2002, Washington, DC.

I. Guven was born in Erzurum, Turkey, in 1967. He studied in Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences and had BA in 1989 at Department of Curriculum and Instruction. He held his MA in 1992 on History of Education and had PhD in 1998 by his thesis on Ideology and Education in Social Sciences Institute in Ankara University in Turkey. He is working as Associate Prof. in Department of Social Studies Teaching in Faculty of Educational Sciences in Ankara University. His main interest fields are social studies teaching, and history of education.