

## The Opinions of Teacher Candidates Receiving Pedagogical Formation Training on Their Perception of Instructors

**Author:** Hikmet Zelyurt

**Institution:** İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

**City:** Malatya

**Country:** Turkey

**Corresponding Author:** Hikmet Zelyurt

**Email:** hikmet.zelyurt@inonu.edu.tr

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-5243-6496

**Author Contribution:** The author was solely responsible for the conception and design of the study, data collection, data analysis, interpretation of the results, and manuscript preparation.

### Statements and Declarations

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for profit sectors.

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

**Ethical Approval Statement:** Research ethics approval was obtained by the Institutional Review Board of İnönü University.

**Data Availability:** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request

### Abstract

*At every level of education, it is important how teachers are perceived by their students. It is seen that students' positive or negative perception of their teachers affects their attitudes towards school or their success. In this context, it was tried to examine the perception levels of the teaching staff of the teacher candidates who came to the faculty of education and received pedagogical formation training. As a data collection tool in the research. The Perceived Instructor Behaviors Scale was applied to 271 pre-service teachers who received pedagogical formation training at İnönü University on how they evaluated the attitudes of their instructors. When the results of the research are examined, it is seen that female pre-service teachers are more positive than male pre-service teachers according to the understanding sub-dimension of their perceptions on faculty members. When the relationship between the attitude scores of the*

*teacher candidates towards the teaching profession and the age of the teacher candidate was examined, it was determined that there was no significant relationship. The variable of employment (work) status does not differentiate the perception according to the faculty members. When the branch variable was examined, it was determined that the teacher candidates were effective in perceiving the instructors. The differentiation between the branches was generally observed to be different in the perceptions of the Turkish language and literature department and those in other departments compared to the faculty members. Obtained data show that pre-service teachers see their instructors as understanding in pedagogical formation education.*

**Keywords:** *Instructor, Perceived Behavior, Teacher Candidate*

## Introduction

The most important element necessary for the development and modernization of a country is human. The acculturation of other people for a certain purpose or the process of deliberate acculturation is called "education" At the same time, education is defined as the process of deliberately creating behaviors in the desired direction in the life of the individual (Büyükkaragöz and Çivi, 1999; Erturk, 1997). When man comes into the world, he needs to learn everything and is ignorant of the laws of life; In fact, in twenty years, he cannot learn the conditions of life. Maybe he needs to learn for the rest of his life. Despite a number of features and abilities that he possesses in creation, it is education and training that will shape man. Every human being is absolutely obliged to be educated and learn from someone (Shepherd, 2018).

The person who has the most responsibility in raising the quality of the learning and teaching process in education to the desired level is the teacher, who is the most important element of the system (Süral and Sarıtaş, 2015). The success of the education system depends on teachers who are qualified, love their profession, have subject knowledge, field knowledge and pedagogical field knowledge (Kartal and Afacan, 2012). Teacher training is an issue that has been on the agenda since the establishment of the republic. Especially in the early years of the republic, the value Atatürk gave to education, and therefore to teachers, has taken an important place in our education history and has been an important constituent and guiding factor of the Turkish education process (YÖK, 2007).

The teacher training system has not lost its importance for our country for a long time. Different ways are used in teacher training. One of these ways is the pedagogical formation education certificate programs allowed by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) so that professionals other than graduates of education faculties can become teachers (Demirtaş and Kırbaç, 2016).

The concept of pedagogical formation is used in the sense of teaching characteristics that enable the child to direct his life by using the word pedagogy, which is produced from the words *peda* (child) and *ago* (to direct) in Greek, together with the word formation, which means shaping in English or cultivation according to the Turkish Language Association (Tuncer and Berkant, 2018). Pedagogical formation is a certificate program that students who have graduated from undergraduate programs of other faculties in the fields determined by the Ministry of National Education, apart from the graduates of the faculties of education, receive within the faculties of education for two semesters. Seven of the "Teaching Areas, Appointment and Course Teaching Principles" prepared by the Ministry of National Education Board of Education and Discipline. According to the article, "it is essential that those who will be appointed as teachers receive the necessary and sufficient level of general culture, special field education and pedagogical formation" (Köse, 2018). When the pedagogical formation programs implemented in Turkey in the recent past are examined, it is seen that trainings of different durations and qualifications are given: In the summer of 1997 and 1998, there are programs that were carried out in a period of only one month. All formation programs were abolished by the Council of Higher Education in the 1998-99 academic year. In 2001, some programs were reopened. In the 2000s, it is seen that there are programs implemented within the scope of non-thesis master's degree in a period of one and a half years within the institutes in universities. In the following years, this practice was abolished and turned into an education program carried out within the faculties of education and given to graduates in two semesters. Today, this practice continues, and pedagogical formation training is given to students who are still receiving undergraduate education as well as graduates (Tuncer and Berkant, 2018).

In the past, individuals from the faculty of engineering, the faculty of veterinary medicine, who did not have pedagogical formation, were appointed as teachers. Today, the pedagogical formation certificate is a criterion sought in teacher appointments. In the event that

the need for teachers cannot be met by teacher candidates who have received pedagogical formation training, after the appointment of teacher candidates with the necessary qualifications, individuals who have not received pedagogical formation training and who have graduated from departments related to the field of appointment can be appointed as teachers, provided that pedagogical formation training is given during the candidacy process (Özdemir and Erol, 2015).

The teacher's attitudes and behaviors and emotional reactions can affect the student. For this reason, teachers need to gain all the competencies in order to become a qualified teacher (Vari, 1998). In his research, Kısakürek (1985) concluded that student-instructor interaction plays an important role among the variables affecting student success.

Students' relationships with their teachers can affect their entire personality. Flanders, who is known for his studies on this subject, has revealed that verbal and non-verbal communication between the teacher and the student, especially in the classroom environment, is effective on the student's personality and school success (Kartal and Afacan, 2012).

Research reveals that teachers who are warm, enthusiastic, organized, frequently explain to students, give rights to students who want to speak, guide students in learning, provide systematic feedback and correction, determine and follow classroom rules with their students, establish good relations with students and give confidence positively affect student success (Sünbül, 1996; Gurbetoğlu and Tomakin, 2011; Kılıç, Kaya, Yıldırım and Genç, 2004).

In addition to competence in the field, teachers need to make a positive impression on the student in order to establish a good dialogue with the student through their attitudes and behaviors. "The teacher's behaviors and communication skills that will positively affect the student reveal the importance of the beloved teacher in terms of learning (Gurbetoğlu and Tomakin, 2011, p.262)". All these behaviors are examined under the concept of teacher affinity. "A teacher's verbal or non-verbal positive behaviors towards students in communication with his student are called teacher proximity behaviors (Geç and Deryakulu, 2004, p. 520)". As a matter of fact, Edwards and Edwards (2001) divide intimacy into two categories of typical communication: verbal or nonverbal intimacy. These verbal or nonverbal behaviors are vital in student success. Teachers' verbal affinity behaviors include addressing students by name, responding to students' thoughts with verbal reinforcement; Among the nonverbal closeness

behaviors, behaviors such as making eye contact with the student, touching the shoulder, and smiling come to the fore. (Christophel, 1990).

Affective behaviors are as important as cognitive behaviors in the success of students. It is known that teachers who are close to students are more active in their lessons and like these lessons more (Geçer and Deryakulu, 2004). In classrooms where teachers and students establish mutual respect and love, productivity increases, discipline-related problems decrease, and it becomes easier to achieve educational goals (Açıkgöz, 1996).

Faced with an authoritarian classroom climate, the student tries to live in his own world by hiding his own existence in the classroom. Thus, an abnormal situation arises such as the realization of common goals by two opposing parties with the bonds of mutual love, respect and trust, which are the basic elements of successful education and training (Gözütok, 2000, 262). Under these conditions, the teacher cannot make the students do what they want them to do, and the students cannot get what they want to get from the teachers. On the one hand, this situation makes teaching annoying, and on the other hand, it causes the teacher to lose control over the students by shaking the love and respect of the students towards the teacher, and negatively affects the teacher-student relations in the classroom (Celep and Erdoğan, 2002)

Teachers, their interest and closeness to students; by making highly positive sentences, giving students the opportunity for individual discussion, and participating in activities that are important to students (Jones & Jones, 1998, 81);

Negative criticism and warnings by teachers often make students feel uncomfortable and ultimately hate school. In this regard; teachers fall into the trap that critical expressions improve student behavior; However, scientific research reveals the opposite. Whether the student or the teacher initiates the discussion in the classroom, if there is a tense situation in the classroom that causes negativity, there will be inevitable consequences that the teacher will upset the students (Smitt & Laslctt, 1996, 67). When the explanations are examined as a whole, it is seen that the students' positive or negative perception of their teachers affects their attitudes towards the school or their success. At every level of education, it is important how teachers are perceived by their students. In this context, it was tried to examine the level of perception of the teaching staff of the teacher candidates who had previously completed a faculty and came to the faculty of education and received pedagogical formation training.

### **Sub-Problems of the Research:**

1. How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive instructors according to gender?
2. How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to age?
3. How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to their work status?
4. How did the teacher candidates who received pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to the branch they graduated from before?
5. How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to their level of satisfaction with the pedagogical formation education they have received?

### **METHOD**

As a data collection tool in research. The Perceived Instructor Behaviors Scale was used. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the scores obtained by the test-retest method of the obtained scale was determined as  $r = 0.86$ . Based on these findings, it has been determined that the Perceived Instructor Behaviors Scale is a measurement tool that produces valid and reliable measurements and can be used to measure how university students perceive the behaviors of the instructors they take courses from (Kara, et al, 2015).

### **Universe and Sample**

This study was applied to pre-service teachers studying in different departments of the Faculty of Education, and the scale of Perceived Instructor Behaviors was applied to pre-service teachers who received pedagogical formation training from a different perspective at the end of the second semester and they were asked to evaluate the behaviors of the instructors. In this context, at the end of the second semester of the 2021-2022 academic year, the registration list of teacher candidates who received formation training at İnönü University Faculty of Education was received and it was determined that there were 16 branches and 582 teacher candidates.

Although we tried to reach all 582 teacher candidates, 271 teacher candidates were able to form our study group, taking into account their attendance and volunteering principles. It is thought that the research will contribute to teacher candidates, lecturers and researchers.

## RESULTS

The scale used in the research consists of four sub-dimensions and the sub-problems were evaluated according to the sub-dimensions. After the negative items were reversed, the points were processed.

**Findings of the First Sub-Problem:** How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive instructors according to gender?

In order to examine the perceptions of instructors according to gender of teacher candidates who received formation training, the distributions of sub-dimensions were primarily examined. First, descriptive statistics were examined.

When the descriptive statistics in table 1 were examined, it was observed that the scores of men and women did not show a distribution in the range of -1 and +1 in the sub-dimension scores. Therefore, it is observed that it does not show normal distribution. However, normality was still examined by examining the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test

According to the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in table 2, it was observed that both women and men were not normally distributed for each score distribution. Therefore, the analysis was carried out with the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test.

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test which is visible in table 3, when the scores of the insufficient, irritable and authoritarian sub-dimensions of this differentiation are examined, it is seen that male teacher candidate students see the faculty members who take their courses as inadequate, irritable and authoritarian, and female teacher candidate students agree in the scores that the faculty members are more understanding.

**Findings of the Second Sub-Problem:** How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation education perceive the instructors according to age?

When the descriptive statistics in table 4 were examined, it was observed that the lowest participation was among the participants aged 42 and over, and the highest participation was between the ages of 22-26 in the sub-dimension scores, and the scores in the categories did not show a distribution in the range of -1 and +1. Therefore, it is observed that it does not show normal distribution. However, normality was still examined by examining the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

According to the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in table 5, it was observed that the distributions of the scores of the 27-31 and 37-41 age groups in the 37-41 age group were normal and the categories in the other score distributions were not normal. Therefore, the analyzes were carried out with the non-parametric Kruskal Wallis test.

As can be seen in the table 6, there is no significant difference between the scores obtained from the categories according to the sub-dimension scores. Therefore, the age variable does not differentiate the perception according to the faculty members.

**Findings of the Third Sub-Problem:** How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to their work status?

When the descriptive statistics in table 7 were examined, it was observed that the sub-dimension scores did not show a distribution in the range of -1 and +1. Therefore, it is observed that it does not show normal distribution. However, normality was still examined by examining the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

According to the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in table 8, it was observed that both employees and non-employees were not normally distributed for each score distribution. Therefore, the analysis was carried out with the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test.

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test in table 9, there is no significant difference between the scores obtained from the categories in all sub-dimensions. Therefore, the job status variable does not differentiate the perception according to the faculty members.

**Findings of the Fourth Sub-Problem:** How did the pre-service teachers who received pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to the branch they graduated from before?

In the research, which included participants from 13 different departments, which results can be seen in table 10, the least participants were from the public relations department (7 participants) and the highest number of participants were from the Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip department (57 participants). Since the number of participants was below 22 for each category, the analyzes were carried out with the non-parametric Krukal Wallis test.

When table 11 is examined it is concluded that there is a significant difference between the scores obtained according to the branches only for the insufficient sub-dimension scores. Pairwise comparisons were made to observe which branches differed for the insufficient sub-dimension.

The differentiation between the branches for the insufficient sub-dimension is given in table 12, in general, it is seen that there is a difference in the perceptions of the pre-service teachers in the branch of Turkish language and literature compared to the pre-service teachers in other branches and these differences are low by the pre-service teachers in this department. Therefore, compared to other branches, Turkish Language and Literature branch teacher candidates see the instructors as insufficient.

**Findings of the Fifth Sub-Problem:** How do pre-service teachers who receive pedagogical formation training perceive the instructors according to their level of satisfaction with the pedagogical formation education they have received?

When the descriptive statistics in table 13 were examined, it was observed that the kurtosis and skewness coefficients for the inadequate and insightful were in the range of -1 to +1, while the other sub-dimensions did not show distribution in this range. However, normality was still examined by examining the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

According to the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in table 14, there are no normally distributed score categories in both categories. Therefore, the analysis was carried out with the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test.

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test in table 15 , there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the categories according to all sub-dimension scores, and this difference is that it is not sufficient for all sub-dimensions except for the understanding sub-dimension of formation education, while it is sufficient in the understanding sub-dimension.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, it was focused on how the teacher candidates who received pedagogical formation training at İnönü University evaluated the attitudes of the instructors they were trained in. In the study, in which 271 pre-service teachers participated, the following results were reached based on the information obtained from the findings.

### Conclusions on the First Sub-Problem

According to the descriptive statistics of pre-service teachers who received formation training and the results of the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test in order to examine the perceptions of instructors according to gender, it was observed that both women and men were not normally distributed. Therefore, the analysis was carried out with the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test.

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, it was observed that there was a differentiation in the perceptions of the faculty member according to gender in all sub-dimensions, and that male teacher candidates obtained more points for the inadequate, irritable and authoritarian sub-dimension scores of this differentiation, and female teacher candidates for the understanding sub-dimension. In this case, it is seen that the perceptions of female teacher candidates on the faculty member are more positive than male teacher candidates according to the understanding sub-dimension.

There was no significant relationship between pre-service teachers' attitude scores towards the teaching profession and the gender variable. This finding is in parallel with many studies in the literature (Can, 2000; Gürbüzürk and Genç, 2004; Çakır, Kan and Sünbül, 2006; Bozkırlı and Er, 2011; Kartal et al., 2012b). When the literature is examined, it is possible to encounter different results. For example, in most of the studies conducted to determine the attitudes of pre-service teachers towards the teaching profession, it has been determined that the attitudes of female pre-service teachers are more positive than those of male pre-service

teachers and that the gender variable affects the attitude (Akpınar, Yıldız and Ergin, 2006; Aksoy, 2010; Anchor and Freckle, 2000; Kaya and Büyükkasap, 2005; Soran, Demirci and Atay, 1996). (Kartal and Afacan, 2012)

### **Conclusions on the Second Sub-Problem**

In the Kruskal Wallis test, there is no significant difference between the scores obtained from the categories according to the sub-dimension score. Therefore, the age variable does not differentiate the perception according to the faculty members. This shows that the age variable is not effective in perceiving faculty members.

When the relationship between the attitude scores of the teacher candidates towards the teaching profession and the age of the teacher candidate was examined, it was determined that there was no significant relationship. This finding coincides with the work of Can (2000), Tanel, Kaya Şengören and Tanel (2007). (Kartal and Afacan, 2012)

### **Conclusions on the Third Sub-Problem**

According to the descriptive statistics and the results of the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test, no normal distribution was observed in order to examine the perceptions of the instructors according to the work status of the pre-service teachers who received formation training. For this reason, the analyzes were carried out with the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test.

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there is no significant difference between the scores obtained from the categories in all sub-dimensions. Therefore, the variable of employment (work) status does not differentiate the perception according to the faculty members. It was concluded that there was no difference in the perception of teaching staff according to whether the teacher candidate students worked or not.

### **Conclusions on the Fourth Sub-Problem**

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, it is concluded that there is a significant difference between the scores obtained according to the branches only for the insufficient sub-dimension. Pairwise comparisons were made to observe which branches differed for the insufficient sub-dimension, and it was observed that there was a difference in the perceptions of the Turkish language and literature department and those in other departments compared to the faculty

members. Pre-service teachers who graduated from Turkish language and literature saw the teaching staff as inadequate, and when the literature was examined, there was no study explaining this situation. It is thought that this situation may be due to the differentiation of the department they graduated from and the courses they received formation education. In this case, it shows that the branch variable is effective in perceiving the instructors of the teacher candidates.

### **Conclusions on the Fifth Sub-Problem**

When the descriptive statistics were examined, it was observed that the kurtosis and skewness coefficients for the inadequate and insightful were in the range of -1 to +1, while the other sub-dimensions did not show distribution in this range. According to the results of the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test, there is no normally distributed score category. Therefore, the analysis was carried out with the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test.

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the categories in all sub-dimensions, and this difference is that it is not sufficient for all sub-dimensions except for the insightful sub-dimension of formation education, while it is sufficient in the insightful sub-dimension.

The data obtained show that pre-service teachers see their instructors as understanding in pedagogical formation education. In their research, Celep and Erdoğan (2002) examined whether there was a significant difference between teachers' and students' perceptions of positive teacher-student relations and found that there was a significant difference in favor of teachers. The fact that this difference was in favor of the teachers, on the one hand, stated that despite all the difficulties and negativities, the teachers felt close to the students with a sense of social responsibility and believed that these feelings were accepted by the students, and on the other hand, they stated that it was an indication of their dedication to the profession.

Based on the data obtained as a result of the research, some suggestions were made;

- Seminars on communication can be given by experts in the field for lecturers at universities.

- This study was carried out only on pre-service teachers who received formation training at a university. A similar research can be done with teacher candidates who receive formation training in the education faculties of different state universities and foundation universities.
- Although female teacher candidates have a more positive view than male teacher candidates, courses such as human relations, educational psychology, communication, etc. should be given in all faculties.

### Statements and Declarations

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for profit sectors.

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

**Ethical Considerations:** This study was approved by the Scientific Research and Ethics Committee of İnönü University, Social and Human Sciences Subcommittee (Decision No: 2022/12-1), on June 9, 2022. The research was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles approved by the İnönü University Scientific Research and Ethics Committee.

A participant information form was provided instead of a separate consent document. Participants were fully informed about the nature and purpose of the study, their rights, and confidentiality measures. Participation was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

**Data Availability:** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request

**Tables:**

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension scores by gender**

Your gender	N	average	Std. deviation	Skew	Skew error	kurtosis	kurtosis error	
Woman	insufficient	223	12,2332	5,50425	1,328	,163	1,910	,324
	irritable	223	14,2691	4,33395	1,084	,163	,562	,324
	Savvy	223	24,1794	5,05413	-1,208	,163	1,434	,324
	authoritarian	223	7,9776	3,82788	1,675	,163	2,929	,324
Male	insufficient	48	14,3125	5,20702	1,109	,343	1,687	,674
	irritable	48	15,2708	3,89074	,915	,343	,874	,674
	Savvy	48	22,5833	4,83706	-,774	,343	-,108	,674
	authoritarian	48	9,4167	3,59570	,774	,343	,431	,674

**Table 2. Examination of the normality of sub-dimension scores according to gender**

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
Your gender	Statistics	Df	Sig.	
insufficien	Woman	,171	223	,000
	Male	,144	48	,014
Irritable	Woman	,158	223	,000
	Male	,141	48	,018
Savvy	Woman	,130	223	,000
	Male	,150	48	,009
Authoritar	Woman	,218	223	,000
	Male	,165	48	,002

**Table 3. Comparison of all score distributions by gender variable**

Your gender	N	Average ranks	Sum of Ranks	U	p	
insufficient	Woman	223	129,41	28859,50	3883,5	0,003
	Male	48	166,59	7996,50		

Irritable	Woman	223	131,29	29277,50	4301,5	0,031
	Male	48	157,89	7578,50		
Savvy	Woman	223	141,18	31483,00	4197	0,019
	Male	48	111,94	5373,00		
authoritarian	Woman	223	129,16	28803,00	3827	0,001
	Male	48	167,77	8053,00		

**Table 4. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension scores by age**

Age	N	average	Std. deviation	Skew	Skew error	kurtosis	kurtosis error
Ages insufficient	114	12,7807	4,81656	,684	,226	,133	,449
22- irritable	114	14,7368	4,31103	,874	,226	,207	,449
26 Savvy	114	23,3947	5,08793	-,867	,226	,315	,449
authoritarian	114	8,4298	3,73211	1,124	,226	,882	,449
27- insufficient	54	13,2593	6,63378	1,473	,325	1,936	,639
31 irritable	54	14,3333	4,29128	1,375	,325	1,886	,639
years Savvy	54	24,0000	5,01695	-1,384	,325	2,023	,639
old authoritarian	54	8,1852	3,85136	1,621	,325	3,135	,639
32-36 insufficient	44	12,3864	5,62063	1,130	,357	,836	,702
Years irritable	44	14,4091	4,83840	,905	,357	-,383	,702
Savvy	44	24,2045	5,79727	-1,459	,357	1,966	,702
authoritarian	44	7,9773	4,13431	1,771	,357	3,298	,702
37-41 insufficient	42	11,5000	4,54919	,987	,365	,463	,717
years irritable	42	14,0952	3,26705	,559	,365	-,439	,717
old Savvy	42	24,5714	4,05537	-,357	,365	-1,064	,717
authoritarian	42	8,0714	3,03952	1,280	,365	1,651	,717
sum	42	58,2381	6,75281	,798	,365	1,026	,717
42 and insufficient	17	12,5882	7,62446	1,690	,550	2,284	1,063
above irritable	17	13,8235	4,86358	1,788	,550	2,674	1,063
Savvy	17	24,4706	5,20958	-1,579	,550	2,745	1,063

authoritarian	17	8,1176	5,36053	2,007	,550	3,426	1,063
---------------	----	--------	---------	-------	------	-------	-------

**Table 5. Examination of the normality of sub-dimension scores according to age**

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
	Your age	Statistics	Df	p
insufficient	Ages 22-26	,120	114	,000
	27-31 years old	,173	54	,000
	32-36 Years	,169	44	,003
	37-41 years old	,161	42	,008
	42 and above	,243	17	,009
irritable	Ages 22-26	,134	114	,000
	27-31 years old	,156	54	,002
	32-36 Years	,191	44	,000
	37-41 years old	,114	42	,196
	42 and above	,250	17	,006
Savvy	Ages 22-26	,133	114	,000
	27-31 years old	,148	54	,005
	32-36 Years	,159	44	,007
	37-41 years old	,138	42	,044
	42 and above	,305	17	,000
authoritarian	Ages 22-26	,181	114	,000
	27-31 years old	,204	54	,000
	32-36 Years	,236	44	,000
	37-41 years old	,209	42	,000
	42 and above	,301	17	,000

**Table 6. Comparison of all score distributions by age variable**

Your age		N	Average ranks	Kruskal-Wallis H	Df	p
insufficient	Ages 22-26	114	143,46	3,282	4	0,512
	27-31 years old	54	139,29			
	32-36 Years	44	131,73			
	37-41 years old	42	122,71			
	42 and above	17	119,38			
irritable	Ages 22-26	114	142,05	2,099	4	0,718
	27-31 years old	54	134,03			
	32-36 Years	44	129,16			
	37-41 years old	42	137,01			
	42 and above	17	116,91			
Savvy	Ages 22-26	114	127,25	2,953	4	0,566
	27-31 years old	54	137,35			
	32-36 Years	44	147,07			
	37-41 years old	42	141,49			
	42 and above	17	148,21			
authoritarian	Ages 22-26	114	140,93	2,704	4	0,609
	27-31 years old	54	134,58			
	32-36 Years	44	125,77			
	37-41 years old	42	142,89			
	42 and above	17	116,91			

**Table 7. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension scores according to employment status**

Employment Status	N	average	Std. deviation	Skew	Skew error	kurtosis	kurtosis error	
I'm working	insufficient	78	13,0128	5,29026	,849	,272	,500	,538
	irritable	78	14,2436	3,99411	1,199	,272	1,141	,538
	Savvy	78	24,0000	4,85905	-,841	,272	,030	,538
	authoritarian	78	8,2564	3,79486	1,294	,272	1,245	,538
	insufficient	193	12,4352	5,58898	1,387	,175	2,159	,348

I'm not working	irritable	193	14,5285	4,38279	,970	,175	,347	,348
	Savvy	193	23,8549	5,12954	-1,193	,175	1,375	,348
	authoritarian	193	8,2228	3,84154	1,554	,175	2,648	,348

**Table 8: Examination of the normality of sub-dimension scores according to job status**

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
Your business situation		Statistics	Df	p
insufficient	I'm working	,135	78	,001
	I'm not working	,165	193	,000
irritable	I'm working	,144	78	,000
	I'm not working	,146	193	,000
Savvy	I'm working	,141	78	,001
	I'm not working	,138	193	,000
authoritarian	I'm working	,195	78	,000
	I'm not working	,201	193	,000

**Table 9. Comparison across all score distributions by job case variable**

Your business situation		N	Average ranks	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	p
insufficient	I'm working	78	145,18	11324,00	6811,000	0,217
	I'm not working	193	132,29	25532,00		
irritable	I'm working	78	134,70	10506,50	7425,500	0,861
	I'm not working	193	136,53	26349,50		
Savvy	I'm working	78	137,15	10697,50	7437,500	0,878
	I'm not working	193	135,54	26158,50		
authoritarian	I'm working	78	137,18	10700,00	7435,000	0,871
	I'm not working	193	135,52	26156,00		

**Table 10. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension scores according to the branch they graduated from**

The branch they graduated from		N	average	Std. deviation	Skew	Skew error	kurtosis	kurtosis error
Physical education	insufficient	8	15,8750	8,42509	1,685	,752	3,015	1,481
	irritable	8	15,7500	4,33425	-,195	,752	-1,263	1,481
	Savvy	8	22,3750	6,78101	-1,055	,752	-,074	1,481
	authoritarian	8	9,2500	3,19598	-,127	,752	-,855	1,481
Biology	insufficient	9	9,3333	3,20156	1,139	,717	-,395	1,400
	irritable	9	12,0000	2,78388	,849	,717	-1,566	1,400
	Savvy	9	25,0000	2,95804	-,149	,717	,208	1,400
	authoritarian	9	6,8889	3,21887	1,690	,717	2,237	1,400
Geography	insufficient	11	11,0909	4,72132	1,868	,661	3,745	1,279
	irritable	11	14,0000	3,92428	1,080	,661	,600	1,279
	Savvy	11	22,9091	6,33174	-,800	,661	-,761	1,279
	authoritarian	11	7,9091	4,34637	2,558	,661	6,961	1,279
Child Development/Preschool	insufficient	17	11,7059	5,93469	1,440	,550	1,390	1,063
	irritable	17	13,1176	4,13646	1,785	,550	2,853	1,063
	Savvy	17	25,3529	4,78201	-1,495	,550	2,680	1,063
	authoritarian	17	6,6471	2,97786	1,950	,550	3,176	1,063
Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip	insufficient	57	11,7719	5,24751	1,465	,316	2,055	,623
	irritable	57	14,4561	4,23029	1,040	,316	,553	,623
	Savvy	57	24,3860	5,05595	-1,489	,316	2,951	,623
	authoritarian	57	8,3333	4,13752	1,613	,316	2,485	,623
Electrical and Electronics Technology	insufficient	12	13,2500	6,46845	2,024	,637	5,251	1,232
	irritable	12	14,9167	4,37884	2,055	,637	5,532	1,232
	Savvy	12	24,1667	4,52937	-1,307	,637	2,600	1,232
	authoritarian	12	8,7500	4,02549	2,155	,637	5,874	1,232
Philosophy	insufficient	48	13,7292	5,84094	,600	,343	-,566	,674
	irritable	48	15,8333	5,00780	,693	,343	-,343	,674
	Savvy	48	22,1250	5,73761	-,644	,343	-,211	,674
	authoritarian	48	9,2292	4,35274	1,196	,343	1,022	,674

Healthcare/Healthcare	insufficient	9	14,0000	4,27200	-,581	,717	-,526	1,400
	irritable	9	14,3333	4,76970	1,432	,717	2,699	1,400
	Savvy	9	23,5556	5,02770	-1,105	,717	1,473	1,400
	authoritarian	9	9,7778	4,08588	,827	,717	,986	1,400
English	insufficient	18	14,3889	3,55029	,313	,536	1,366	1,038
	irritable	18	15,1111	3,10387	,694	,536	,593	1,038
	Savvy	18	23,1111	3,67646	-1,514	,536	4,266	1,038
	authoritarian	18	8,3889	3,14622	,909	,536	,731	1,038
Public Relations	insufficient	7	13,7143	6,52468	1,276	,794	1,097	1,587
	irritable	7	14,8571	5,45981	1,210	,794	1,036	1,587
	Savvy	7	24,4286	4,96176	-,679	,794	-,396	1,587
	authoritarian	7	7,7143	3,63842	,931	,794	-,520	1,587
Accounting & Finance	insufficient	40	13,3000	6,15276	1,456	,374	2,571	,733
	irritable	40	14,6000	4,37827	1,066	,374	,493	,733
	Savvy	40	24,0250	5,18127	-1,376	,374	1,947	,733
	authoritarian	40	8,1500	4,07966	1,608	,374	3,114	,733
History	insufficient	10	11,9000	4,35762	,094	,687	-1,374	1,334
	irritable	10	14,1000	3,84274	,434	,687	-1,547	1,334
	Savvy	10	24,4000	5,05964	-,299	,687	-1,977	1,334
	authoritarian	10	8,4000	3,20416	,205	,687	-1,060	1,334
Turkish Language and Literature	insufficient	25	10,4800	4,03237	,733	,464	-,847	,902
	irritable	25	12,4400	2,85890	,795	,464	-,900	,902
	Savvy	25	25,7200	3,58841	-,505	,464	-,952	,902
	authoritarian	25	6,7600	2,12681	,624	,464	-1,449	,902

**Table 11. Comparison of all score distributions according to branch variable**

Your Branch	N	Average ranks	Kruskal-Wallis H	Df	p
insufficient Physical education	8	166,88	22,264	12	0,035
Biology	9	86,83			
Geography	11	115,18			

	Child Development/Preschool	17	117,85		
	Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip	57	121,90		
	Electrical and Electronics Technology	12	143,33		
	Philosophy	48	152,01		
	Healthcare/Healthcare	9	169,72		
	English	18	176,58		
	Public Relations	7	153,71		
	Accounting & Finance	40	144,89		
	History	10	132,05		
	Turkish Language and Literature	25	104,24		
irritable	Physical education	8	162,50	18,904	12 0,091
	Biology	9	88,50		
	Geography	11	127,91		
	Child Development/Preschool	17	104,09		
	Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip	57	136,09		
	Electrical and Electronics Technology	12	148,13		
	Philosophy	48	158,40		
	Healthcare/Healthcare	9	131,89		
	English	18	160,22		
	Public Relations	7	137,07		
	Accounting & Finance	40	139,49		
	History	10	134,60		
	Turkish Language and Literature	25	99,58		
Savvy	Physical education	8	122,88	13,011	12 0,368

	Biology	9	144,94		
	Geography	11	129,55		
	Child Development/Preschool	17	161,56		
	Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip	57	144,07		
	Electrical and Electronics Technology	12	136,71		
	Philosophy	48	110,72		
	Healthcare/Healthcare	9	127,22		
	English	18	110,44		
	Public Relations	7	140,57		
	Accounting & Finance	40	140,19		
	History	10	144,85		
	Turkish Language and Literature	25	162,28		
authoritarian	Physical education	8	166,81	17,979	12 0,116
	Biology	9	100,56		
	Geography	11	133,68		
	Child Development/Preschool	17	96,91		
	Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip	57	135,77		
	Electrical and Electronics Technology	12	153,96		
	Philosophy	48	155,86		
	Healthcare/Healthcare	9	171,11		
	English	18	146,81		
	Public Relations	7	121,50		
	Accounting & Finance	40	131,49		
	History	10	144,80		

	Turkish Language and Literature	25	107,60		
sum	Physical education	8	175,69	22,258	12 0,035
	Biology	9	74,83		
	Geography	11	103,45		
	Child Development/Preschool	17	110,00		
	Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge/Imam Hatip	57	132,45		
	Electrical and Electronics Technology	12	150,29		
	Philosophy	48	149,54		
	Healthcare/Healthcare	9	164,72		
	English	18	164,50		
	Public Relations	7	149,57		
	Accounting & Finance	40	144,35		
	History	10	141,55		
	Turkish Language and Literature	25	102,32		

**Table 12. Inadequate subsize for differences between branches**

	Your Branch	N	Average ranks	Sum of Ranks	U	p
insufficie nt	Biology	9	18,06	162,50	117,500	030
	Philosophy	48	31,05	1490,50		
	Total	57				
	Biology	9	6,83	61,50	16,500	,031
	Healthcare /Healthcar e	9	12,17	109,50		
	Total	18				
insufficient	Biology	9	7,89	71,00	26,000	,004

	English	18	17,06	307,00		
	Total	27				
	Biology	9	16,22	146,00	101,000	,039
insufficient	Accounting & Finance	40	26,98	1079,00		
	Total	49				
	Geography	11	9,95	109,50	43,500	,012
insufficient	English	18	18,08	325,50		
	Total	29				
	Child Development/Preschool	17	14,18	241,00	88,000	,031
insufficient	English	18	21,61	389,00		
	Total	35				
	Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge /Imam Hatip	57	34,05	1941,00	288,000	,005
insufficient	English	18	50,50	909,00		
	Total	75				
	Philosophy	48	41,28	1981,50	394,500	,016
insufficient	Turkish Language and Literature	25	28,78	719,50		
	Total	73				
	Healthcare /Healthcare	9	23,56	212,00	58,000	,029
insufficient						

	Turkish Language and Literature	25	15,32	383,00		
	Total	34				
insufficient	English	18	28,47	512,50	108,500	,004
	Turkish Language and Literature	25	17,34	433,50		
	Total	43				

**Table 13. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension scores according to satisfaction levels for pedagogical formation education**

Do you find the pedagogical formation training you have received sufficient?		N	Average	Standard Aberration	Skew	Skew Error	kurtosis	kurtosis Error
Yes	insufficient	199	11,2864	4,17585	0,952	0,172	0,752	0,343
	irritable	199	13,4925	3,34221	0,924	0,172	0,514	0,343
	Savvy	199	25,0955	3,78139	-0,878	0,172	0,984	0,343
	authoritarian	199	7,4724	2,90384	1,157	0,172	0,882	0,343
No	insufficient	72	16,2361	6,94342	0,641	0,283	-0,168	0,559
	irritable	72	17,0833	5,34381	0,360	0,283	-1,037	0,559
	Savvy	72	20,5833	6,46061	-0,378	0,283	-0,830	0,559
	authoritarian	72	10,3333	5,09073	0,891	0,283	-0,067	0,559

**Table 14. Examination of the normality of sub-dimension scores according to satisfaction levels for pedagogical formation education**

Do you find the pedagogical formation training you have received sufficient?		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
		Statistics	Df	p
insufficient	Yes	,156	199	,000
	No	,097	72	,091
Irritable	Yes	,143	199	,000
	No	,122	72	,010
Savvy	Yes	,112	199	,000
	No	,101	72	,068
authoritaria	Yes	,220	199	,000
	n	,151	72	,000

**Table 15. Comparison of all score distributions according to the satisfaction variable**

Do you find the pedagogical formation training you have received sufficient?		N	Average ranks	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	p
insufficient	Yes					
	No	72	179,94	12956,00		
irritable	Yes	199	121,77	24232,50	4332,500	0,000
	No	72	175,33	12623,50		
Savvy	Yes	199	150,92	30032,50	4195,500	0,000
	No	72	94,77	6823,50		
authoritarian	Yes	199	123,93	24662,00	4762,000	0,000
	No	72	169,36	12194,00		

## REFERENCES

- Açıkğöz, K. U. (1996). Effective learning and teaching. Izmir: Kanyılmaz Printing House.
- Büyükkaragöz, S. Ş. and Çivi, C. (1999). General teaching methods, application of planning in teaching. (10 editions). Istanbul: Beta Basım Publishing Distribution
- Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors student motivation and learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 323-340.
- Shepherd, A. (2018). Historical foundations of our teacher training system. M. Ergün, B. Oral & T. Yazar (Eds.). In *Our Teacher Training System (Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow)* (pp. 29-56). Pegem Academy.
- Demirtas, H. & Kırbaç, M. (2016). Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program Students' Views on Pedagogical Formation Education. *Trakya University Journal of Education Faculty*, 2, 138-152.
- Ertürk, S. (1997). Curriculum development in education. Ankara: Meteksan.
- Gozutok, F. Dilek (2000). I'm improving my teaching. Ankara.
- Gurbetoğlu, A. and Tomakin, E. (2011). Examination of students' views on popular and disliked teacher behaviors. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Education Faculty*, 1(12), 261-276.
- Jones, V.F., Jones, L.S. (1998). *Coinprehensive Classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problems*, (Fifth Edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Eagle, T. & Afacan, Ö. (2012). Investigation of the Attitudes of Teacher Candidates Receiving Pedagogical Formation Training Towards the Teaching Profession. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 24, 76-96.
- Kılıç, M., Kaya, A., Yildirim, N. and Genç, G. (2004). Teacher and student through the eyes of an educator. XIII. National Congress of Educational Sciences, İnönü University, Malatya.
- Kısakürek, M. A. (1985). The effect of classroom atmosphere on student achievement, Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences Publications.
- Köse, E. (2018). The problem of quantity and quality in our teacher training system. M. Ergün, B. Oral & T. Yazar (Eds.). In *Our Teacher Training System (Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow)* (pp. 193-215). Pegem Academy.
- Özdemir, T. Y. & Erol, Y. C. (2015). Perceptions of Teacher Candidates Receiving Pedagogical Formation Training on the Concepts of School, Teaching and Student. *Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 4, 215-244.
- Smith, C. J. & Lasletl, R. (1996). *Effective classroom mnngameol*. (Second Edilion) New York: Roulledge
- Sunbul, A. M. (1996). Teacher qualification and teaching roles. (2016, December 10).

- Sural, S. & Sarıtaş, E. (2015). Examination of the Competencies of the Students Participating in the Pedagogical Formation Program for the Teaching Profession. *Mersin University Journal of Education Faculty*, 1, 62-75.
- Tuncer, M. & Berkant, H. G. (2018). Characteristics of teacher training programs. M. Ergün, B. Oral & T. Yazar (Eds.). In *Our Teacher Training System (Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow)* (pp. 193-215). Pegem Academy.
- Arrival, F. (1988). *Theory and techniques of curriculum development in education*. (4th Edition). Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Education Publications.
- Council of Higher Education (YÖK). (2007). *Faculties of teacher training and education (1982-2007)*. Ankara. The access address <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/ogretmen-yetistirme-ve-egitim-fakulteleri.pdf>. Date accessed: 05.03.2022