



Received: 03.08.2018
Received in revised form: 12.09.2018
Accepted: 15.09.2018

Su Bergil, A., & Sariçoban, A. (2018). Utilizing the EPOSTL for English language teacher education process: Needs and gains. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 5(4), 1007-1029.

<http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/516/309>

UTILIZING THE EPOSTL FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROCESS: NEEDS AND GAINS

Research Article

Ayfer Su Bergil 

Amasya University

ayfer_su@yahoo.com.tr

Arif Sariçoban 

Selçuk University

saricobanarif@gmail.com.tr

Ayfer Su Bergil is an assistant professor doctor at Amasya University, Department of ELT. She received her PhD from Hacettepe University, MA from Gaziosmanpaşa University, BA from Gazi University. Methodologies of ELT, curriculum design, teacher education and development are among the fields of her interest.

Arif Sariçoban is a professor doctor at Selçuk University, Konya. He received his PhD from Çukurova University, MA from Bilkent University, BA from Ondokuz Mayıs University. He has publications in both national and international indexed journals on various topics of language and linguistic studies.

Copyright by Informascope. Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without the written permission of IOJET.

UTILIZING THE EPOSTL FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROCESS: NEEDS AND GAINS¹

Ayfer Su Bergil

ayfer_su@yahoo.com.tr

Arif Sariçoban

saricobanarif@gmail.com.tr

Abstract

The review of literature clarifies that teacher education starting from the faculty as a pre-service process needs refreshment in making revisions of its boundaries, competences and classifications as providing gains for the whole system. Thus, this study provides a sample for other subject fields of teacher education since it aims to show how a new generation tool named as European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) can be used to define the needs of prospective English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers and foster the teacher education system with its gains. The sample of the study consists of 4th grade prospective EFL teachers studying at Hacettepe University, Department of ELT (N=38). For data collection, the adapted 5 point likert-type scale version of EPOSTL was applied to the participants. In the data analysis process in addition to the calculations of frequencies and percentages, some parametric statistics were used. The findings of the study reveal that EPOSTL can be a new tool for describing the competences of both prospective and in-service EFL teachers which could be inspiring for other teacher education programs as well.

Keywords: Teacher education, EFL teacher competences, EPOSTL

1. Theoretical Background

When the experiences of English language prospective teachers are examined, it is seen that all the regularities and requirements are designed by the Council of Higher Education in Turkey. Here, we should be pay attention that among these regularities and requirements there are no specific qualifications that only mention about that kind of subject-teacher. All of these statements and the tasks which the Council of Higher Education offers include all types of teachers ignoring the subject-field they have for their profession. At this point, it is urgently needed to put forward a new teacher education process, especially during the classes of faculties which prepare the prospective teachers of English language to their real life experiences and teaching situations.

Regarding the language teacher education, it is necessary that it should be taken into consideration as a unique part of teacher education as the other subject fields should be

¹ This article relies on the findings obtained in the Ph.D dissertation by Ayfer SU BERGİL and supervised by the second author, accepted in July 31, 2015, Hacettepe University, Division of English Language Teaching, Ankara, Turkey.

Corresponding author. Tel.: +0-358-252-5212 E-mail address: ayfer_su@yahoo.com

handled separately from each other. In addition, the process of language teacher education and the competencies the whole process underlines differ very much from the prescribed one in Turkey. Since the assessment of teacher candidates or the assessment of the prospective teachers by mentors or teacher trainers for all teacher education departments are the same. Thus, the prospective teachers are assessed or their Practice Teachings are observed very generally and as if they were teachers of the same subject field. Such as the prescribed scale by the Council of Higher Education (CHE) for the assessment of prospective teachers include totally four sections with their sub-sections named as subject field knowledge, subject field education, teaching and learning process, classroom management, evaluation and keeping records, other professional competences which consist of 46 items for teacher competences labeled in three likert type format, such as “has deficiencies”, “acceptable” and “well-trained”. When the scale for Practice Teachings is compared with the European scales such as EPOSTL it is observed that the language teacher education deserves to take a new breath into its place in teacher education process.

1.1. The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL)

Supported by Council of Europe, the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) is a comprehensive document for students undergoing their initial teacher education experiences. It totally helps the student teachers of language encourage themselves to reflect their didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, help them to assess their own didactic competences and enable them to monitor their own progress while recording their experiences of teaching during the courses of their teacher education (Newby et al., 2007, p.5) and seeks to summarize the key features of qualifications and competences at different stages of language teachers' development.

Generally, the EPOSTL contains the personal statement section to help the prospective teachers, at the beginning of their teacher education, to reflect on general questions related to teaching; a self-assessment section, consisting of “can-do” descriptors, to facilitate reflection and self-assessment; a dossier, in which student teachers can make the outcome of their self-assessment transparent, to provide evidence of progress and to record examples of work relevant to teaching a glossary of the most important terms relating to language learning and teaching used in the EPOSTL; an index of terms used in the descriptors; and a users' guide which explains the detailed information about the EPOSTL.

At the heart of the EPOSTL, there are 195 descriptors of competences related to language teaching which comprise the self-assessment section. These descriptors may be regarded as a set of core competences that language teachers should strive to attain. The descriptors are grouped into seven general categories. These represent areas in which teachers require knowledge and a variety of competences and need to make decisions related to teaching. Each heading has been sub-divided as follows:

1- Context

- a. Curriculum,
- b. Aim and Needs,
- c. The Role of Language Teacher,
- d. Instructional Resources and Constraints

2- Methodology

- a. Speaking/Spoken Interaction,
- b. Writing/Written Interaction,
- c. Listening,
- d. Reading,
- e. Grammar,

- f. Vocabulary,
- g. Culture
- 3- Resources

- 4- Lesson Planning
 - a. Identification of Learning Objectives,
 - b. Lesson Content,
 - c. Organization
- 5- Conducting a Lesson
 - a. Using Lesson Plans,
 - b. Content,
 - c. Interaction with Learners,
 - d. Classroom Management,
 - e. Classroom Language

- 6- Independent Learning
 - a. Learner Autonomy,
 - b. Homework,
 - c. Projects,
 - d. Portfolios,
 - e. Virtual Learning Environments,
 - f. Extra-Curricular Activities

- 7- Assessment of Learning
 - a. Designing Assessment Tools,
 - b. Evaluation,
 - c. Self and Peer-Assessment,
 - d. Language Performance,
 - e. Culture,
 - f. Error Analysis

In detail, “context” section consists of 4 sub-sections with 23 descriptors named as *curriculum (4)*, *aims and needs (7)*, *the role of the language teacher (10)*, *institutional resources and constraints (2)*. “Methodology” section consists of 7 sub-sections with 57 descriptors named as *speaking/spoken interaction (12)*, *writing/writing interaction (12)*, *listening (8)*, *reading (9)*, *grammar (5)*, *vocabulary (3)*, *culture (8)*. “Resources” section doesn’t include any sub-sections but consists of 11 descriptors. “Lesson Planning” section consists of 3 sub-sections with 22 descriptors named as *identification of learning objectives (6)*, *lesson content (12)*, *organization (4)*. “Conducting a Lesson” section consists of 5 sub-sections with 27 descriptors named as *using lesson plans (6)*, *content (4)*, *interaction with learners (6)*, *classroom management (5)*, *classroom language (6)*. “Independent Learning” section consists of 6 sub-sections with 28 descriptors named as *learner autonomy (6)*, *homework (4)*, *projects (6)*, *portfolios (5)*, *virtual learning environments (3)*, *extra-curricular activities (4)*. “Assessment of Learning” section consists of 6 sub-sections with 27 descriptors named as *designing assessment tools (3)*, *evaluation (8)*, *self and peer assessment (3)*, *language performance (6)*, *culture (3)*, *error analysis (4)*.

1.2. Previous Research

The EPOSTL was developed for the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe by a team of teacher educators from five different countries (Armenia, Austria, Norway, Poland, UK). It arose from a project initiated by the ECML, “A Framework

for Teacher Education” which had the overall aim of addressing the broad question of harmonizing teacher education across Europe. The EPOSTL builds on existing documents already developed by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe – *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* and the *European Language Portfolio (ELP)* – as well as the European Commission-financed project *European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference (European Profile)*. Draft versions of the EPOSTL were presented at two ECML workshops, attended by student teachers and teacher educators from more than 30 countries. The EPOSTL is used at a large number of institutions across Europe and also in Asia and North and South America. Due to the result of a four-year project “Piloting and Implementing the *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*” (EPOSTL2), which ran from 2008 to 2011, it was co-ordinated by David Newby (Austria), Anne-Brit Fenner (Norway), Barry Jones (UK) and Sylvia Velikova (Bulgaria) that following the publication of the *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages* (EPOSTL) in 2007, many teacher educators expressed the need for support materials concerning the use of the EPOSTL and clear guidance on how to use it. Thus, some parts of projects were published in order to exemplify and guide the following research on EPOSTL.

In “Using the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages” edited by Newby, Fenner and Jones (2011) sample project works have been presented to guide the people who desire to use it. The EPOSTL in brief *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) –A Reflection Tool for Language Teacher Education* by Newby (Austria), Allan (UK), Fenner (Norway), Jones (UK), Komorowska (Poland), Soghikyan (Armenia) comes at the first line (2007). In this part the authors provide a general framework of EPOSTL by explaining about it briefly. In the part of issues in using the EPOSTL, Newby (2011) comprises a publication deals with eight European countries which experience and implement their own context and research they have carried out among the users of EPOSTL. It also provides many useful insights and a variety of perspectives and gives a snapshot from specific teacher education programmes. Orlova (2010) under the heading of “Challenges of Integrating the EPOSTL into Pre-service Teacher Training” shares her insights regarding the use of the EPOSTL; to be more precise, its self-assessment part which is an integral part of pre-service teacher programmes in the Czech Republic. In the research, The EPOSTL has been consistently used during the three modules of EFL didactics courses which are provided within the framework of an MA programme. The course format includes lectures, seminars and two periods of practicum. The feedback from student teachers bears evidence that they regard the EPOSTL as a useful tool in their learning process.

Mehlmauer-Larcher (2011) with the title of “Implementing the EPOSTL in the Early Phase of Pre-service EFL Teacher Education”, shows that the first implementation of the EPOSTL in the pre-service teacher education programme at the Centre for English Language Teaching, members of the team have been enthusiastic about the EPOSTL and have constantly tried to improve the use of this reflection and self-assessment instrument for its student teachers. It is the declared aim of the team to intensify its application, particularly in the student teachers’ school practice and field experiences. As a further step towards a more intensive use of the EPOSTL, tasks have been devised which the student teachers need to carry out during their pre- and post-teaching conferences with their school mentors. From this, it follows that workshops need to be organized for school mentors to introduce them to the EPOSTL and to encourage them to use it in their work with student teachers.

Fenner (2011) in the study of “The EPOSTL as a Tool for Reflection in Three Contexts of Language Teacher Education” examines the piloting of the EPOSTL in a one-year postgraduate course for student teachers of languages at the University of Bergen, Norway, in

the autumn of 2009. In this article, three different contexts related to using the EPOSTL have been discussed: in university lectures, in seminars to develop students' lesson-planning competence and during school practice. The aims in each context were to enhance the students' ability to critically reflect on the various stages of their professional development. Part of the discussion has been to consider the EPOSTL also as a tool for mentors to improve their mentoring and to increase collaboration between the university and schools.

In the research of "The Use of the Personal Statement", Makinen (2011) provide the reader with a glimpse of how the Personal Statement section was applied in the context of Finnish subject teacher education. The intention was to provide teacher educators with ideas for implementing those particular section of the EPOSTL in their own context. Dealing with the Personal Statement section served as an important source of shared information and knowledge. It encouraged a joint exploration of further theoretical and practical aspects of foreign language teaching. The student participants in the EPOSTL project regarded the tasks in this section as relevant and challenging, encouraging independent as well as group reflection and discussion. A number of issues raised prompted debate and an exchange of ideas, beliefs, attitudes and experiences. During the study, the students felt that the use of the Personal Statement in a language teaching methodology course was an inspiring and thought provoking. It made them think about a foreign language teacher's work in a flexible manner, helping them as student teachers realize what specific questions of teaching and learning needed to be addressed to enhance their professional development.

Nihlen under the title of "What goes into the EPOSTL Dossier and Why?" (2011) has described how parts of the EPOSTL were implemented into a subject matter didactics course for student teachers studying English as a foreign language at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden. One of the aims was to encourage self-assessment and reflection among the student teachers and, after working with the EPOSTL for a year, most students felt that they had developed a more reflective approach. They could relate the Self-Assessment descriptors in Methodology, Lesson Planning and Conducting a Lesson to different kinds of evidence that they had collected for their Dossier during the Practice Teaching periods. At first, the most common pieces of evidence in the Dossier were lesson plans, but when discussing their evidence with peers and receiving more structured instructions, the student teachers collected a variety of activities, for example, lesson observation notes from mentors, learners' tasks, excerpts from diaries and reading logs. By collecting evidence for their Dossier, the student teachers had received more oral and written feedback from their mentors, and the use of the EPOSTL had assisted them in discussions during their Practice Teaching. However, the aim of involving the mentors needs to be developed and must be planned in collaboration with the Board of Teacher Education at the university since it would involve in-service training.

In the study of "The EPOSTL in Iceland: Getting the Mentors on Board", Ingvarstottir (2011) has reached a long-term goal of creating a learning community between university and schools. More than the EPOSTL, it is needed for such as accepting that the partnership school as a whole has a role in teacher education and not just individual teachers. The EPOSTL has, however, undoubtedly brought the partners closer and has narrowed the gap between university and the partnership schools. After the two years of the pilot, there is a consensus between university lecturers and mentors that the EPOSTL is on its way to becoming an integral part of programme. Following that, Bagaric (2011) in the study of "The Role of the EPOSTL in the Evaluation and Development of Teacher Education Programmes in Croatia" needs to find out how student teachers' didactic competences develop during the two year master-level teacher education programme; comparing the level of attained competences with the expected learning outcomes of specific methodology courses in the study programme and state to what extent these courses contribute to the development of teachers competences; and

to develop students' awareness and understanding of their growth through self-evaluation. However, the results of the study suggest that the EPOSTL can be relatively efficiently used for the purposes of evaluation and further development of teacher education programmes. The students' self-ratings provided a good insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher education programme, and gave a clear guideline for its improvement. In this respect, changes to the contents of compulsory courses and introduced two elective courses: Teaching Grammar, and Learning Styles and Strategies are seen. At the same time, it is considered to propose a course on foreign language teaching to learners with special needs. Furthermore, the use of the EPOSTL at different stages of the teacher education programme enables teacher educators and mentors to monitor students' progress and provides them with feedback on the effectiveness of their teaching. At the same time, the EPOSTL enables students to log their growth and reflect on what has been and should be taught and learned as well as on how the contents of different courses are interrelated, thus contributing to the overall teacher competence.

Presented as the last study titled as “The Use of the EPOSTL in a Bilateral Teacher-Education Programme” by Jones (2011), includes the bilateral programme in which each group was engaged allowed comparisons to be made, showing sometimes similar and sometimes different uses of the document within a similar time span. Although reactions differed there was a commonality of opinion; from the students' responses, it is clear that the EPOSTL can be used constructively and imaginatively in a variety of contexts, within and outside those experienced ones in this particular programme.

Moreover, taking attention to the research partially lacking the self-assessment of the prospective teachers of English language in Turkish EFL setting, it is strongly believed and aimed that more importance should be given to self-assessment with European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages. Bearing all abovementioned issues in mind, this research poses the following research questions:

- 1) What are the competency levels of the prospective teachers while taking the “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses related to EPOSTL?
- 2) What sections/subsections of EPOSTL do the prospective teachers need to develop?
- 3) To what extent are the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of EPOSTL effective and useful?

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study relies on a mixed-type research design comprising both qualitative research approach revealing the order of the data in frequencies and percentages for the purpose of describing the situation and quantitative research approach aiming to affirm statistical relations of collected data to set foundations for the hypothetical research questions.

2.2. Participants

The convenience named also as an opportunity sampling model in which the participants were paired with the prospective teachers during the school experience and practice teaching courses were chosen as a participant group of the study. The convenience sampling model is the most common type of sampling model in second language studies where the only criterion according to Dörnyei (2007) is the convenience of the researcher since this study aimed to collect data from the prospective EFL teachers studying at Hacettepe University during the academic year of 2014-2015 (N=38) ranging in gender as 7 male, 31 female and in age between 18-22.

2.3. Data Collection Instrument and Procedure

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are different data collection methods which can be classified into different categories such as observation, interview, survey including also questionnaires or scales (Aiken, 1997). In this research, for the purpose of collecting data European Profiling Grid for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL), which is a document intended for prospective teachers undergoing their initial teacher education and encourages them to reflect on the didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, helps them to assess their own didactic competences and enables them to monitor their progress and to record their experiences of teaching during the course of their teacher education, was used.

The EPOSTL was developed for the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe by a team of teacher educators from five different countries (Armenia, Austria, Norway, Poland, UK). It arose from a project initiated by the ECML, „A Framework for Teacher Education“, which had the overall aim of addressing the broad question of harmonizing teacher education across Europe (2007). The EPOSTL builds on existing documents already developed by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe – Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the European Language Portfolio (ELP) – as well as the European Commission-financed project European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference (European Profile). Draft versions of the EPOSTL were presented at two ECML workshops, attended by student teachers and teacher educators from more than 30 countries. Nowadays, the EPOSTL is used at a large number of institutions across Europe and also in Asia and North and South America.

As mentioned before, although EPOSTL includes three sections of a personal statement, a self-assessment and a dossier section, only the self-assessment section which deals with 195 descriptors is under the scope of this study. This section contains list of 'can-do' descriptors relating to didactic competences of student teachers and each descriptor is accompanied by an arrow divided into three parts in order to give the users the chance of reviewing each descriptor more than once. To prevent the participants from reflecting their experiences in the dossier section and gather numerical data defining the competency level of prospective teachers, these descriptors are transformed into 5 point likert-type scale designed as “not developed”, “less developed”, “developed”, “very developed”, “fully developed “ and graded as 1,2, 3, 4, 5 respectively. In this way one part of the EPOSTL which is a process based document turned into a 195 item likert-type format scale and serves for quality of the practicality of the scale in the literature.

2.6. Data Analysis

In order to analyze the collected data of the current study, SPSS 17.00 packet program was used. The estimated value level of 0.05 was interpreted as meaningful for the findings. The reliability of the data was examined by the coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha. Moreover, the reliability level of the scale met the requirement calculated as .98 since in social sciences the scales are expected to have at least .70 reliability.

Based on the research questions stated beforehand, EPOSTL scale was applied twice to the prospective EFL teachers throughout this study and accordingly different data analysis ways were chosen. For the 1st and 2nd research questions which examined the condition of competency levels of the prospective teachers before beginning to the School Experience and Practice Teaching courses and what sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' the prospective teachers need to develop, the descriptive statistics and one-sample t-test were used. For the

3rd question to find out to what extent the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' were effective and useful, the paired samples t-test was used.

3. Findings and Discussion

Regarding the first question of “What are the competency levels of the prospective teachers while taking the “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses related to EPOSTL? “ Table 3.1. displays the findings in detail in terms of sections of EPOSTL.

Table 3.1. *One-sample t-test results for 7 sections of EPOSTL for “School Experience”*

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Context	38	76.33	9.99	37	47.09	.000
Methodology	38	81.46	10.43		48.11	.000
Resources	38	79.85	12.07		40.78	.000
Lesson Planning	38	80.88	10.18		48.95	.000
Conducting a Lesson	38	80.31	10.95		45.19	.000
Independent Learning	38	79.75	12.43		39.52	.000
Assessment of Learning	38	80.07	8.72		56.55	.000

Table 3.1 One-Sample T-Test Results for 7 Sections of EPOSTL for “School Experience” is presented in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37) = 47.09, 48.11, 40.78, 48.95, 45.19, 39.52, 56.55$, $p < .01$. The mean value of context, methodology, resources, lesson planning, conducting a lesson, independent learning and assessment of learning are sequentially 76.33, 81.46, 79.85, 80.88, 80.31, 79.75 and 80.07. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers have less competencies especially in the *context* section and the other sections are needed to take into consideration in teacher education process especially considering it reflects one of the Turkey’s successful universities’ 4th year prospective teacher’s competency levels.

Table 3.2. *One-sample t-test results for 7 sections of EPOSTL for “Practice Teaching”*

Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Context	38	82.19	8.66	37	58.44	.000
Methodology	38	87.22	7.58		70.84	.000
Resources	38	84.83	10.69		48.89	.000
Lesson Planning	38	85.74	8.93		59.17	.000
Conducting a Lesson	38	86.43	8.84		60.22	.000
Independent Learning	38	84.34	10.12		51.36	.000
Assessment of Learning	38	85.49	10.01		52.63	.000

In Table 3.2 One-sample t-test results for 7 sections of EPOSTL for “Practice Teaching” are clarified in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37) = 58.44, 70.84, 48.89, 59.17, 60.22, 51.36, 52.63$, $p < .01$. The mean value of context, methodology, resources, lesson planning, conducting a lesson, independent learning and assessment of learning are sequentially 82.19, 87.22, 84.83, 85.74, 86.43, 84.34 and 85.49. These results indicate that the mean values of prospective EFL teacher’s competency levels have increased in the context section from

76.33 to 82.19. Moreover, although the mean values of all sections has increased in the second EPOSTL application, all the sections specifically should be integrated and handled in detail in the process of English Language Teacher Education programs and curricula as well. The following tables figure out the answer of the second research question dealing with “What sections/subsections of EPOSTL do the prospective teachers need to develop?”

Table 3.3. One-sample t-test results for sub-sections of EPOSTL for “School Experience”

Sections/Subsections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
CONTEXT	38	76.33	9.99	37	47.15	.000
Curriculum	38	68.42	13.05		32.31	.000
AimsNeeds	38	64.92	10.58		37.82	.000
RoleofLgTr	38	72.89	9.71		46.30	.000
InsResConstraints	38	77.37	18.55		25.71	.000
METHODOLOGY	38	81.46	10.43		32.26	.000
SpkSpokenInteraction	38	80.66	13.09		37.99	.000
WrtWrittenInreaction	38	78.24	10.34		46.65	.000
Listening	38	77.87	12.96		37.04	.000
Reading	38	77.87	12.96		37.04	.000
Grammar	38	78.00	12.22		39.34	.000
Vocabulary	38	81.89	13.42		37.61	.000
Culture	38	73.18	13.99		32.26	.000
RESOURCES	38	79.85	12.07		38.97	.000
LPLAN	38	80.88	10.18		49.08	.000
Objectives	38	73.13	13.91		32.41	.000
LesContent	38	76.97	10.63		44.65	.000
Organization	38	78.29	12.43		38.84	.000
CONDLESSON	38	80.31	10.95		45.38	.000
Usinglessonplans	38	76.16	13.95		33.66	.000
Content	38	76.97	10.43		45.48	.000
Intlearners	38	75.58	13.41		34.73	.000
Management	38	74.32	13.14		34.87	.000
ClassLanguage	38	75.39	12.01		38.69	.000
INDLEARNING	38	79.75	12.43		39.59	.000
Autonomy	38	79.61	12.50		39.25	.000
Homework	38	82.50	12.56		40.49	.000
Project	38	78.95	14.74		33.03	.000
Portfolio	38	78.53	16.52		29.31	.000
VirtuallearningEnv	38	79.82	19.66		25.03	.000
ExtrCurrActs	38	72.76	17.89		25.08	.000
ASSESSOLEARNING	38	80.07	8.72		45.80	.000
DesAsseTools	38	74.37	14.50		31.62	.000
Evaluation	38	75.05	12.49		37.03	.000
SelfPeerAssess	38	71.87	12.77		34.69	.000
LangPerformance	38	72.47	12.57		35.54	.000
CultureAssessoLear	38	77.03	14.10		33.69	.000
ErrorAnalysis	38	76.71	12.80		36.94	.000

In Table 3.3 One-sample t-test results for sub-sections of EPOSTL for “School Experience” are given in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the One-Sample T-Test results, mean values for each sub-section differ

meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37)= 37.31$ for curriculum, 37.82 for aims and need, 46.30 for the role of the language teacher, 25.71 for instructional resources and constraints, 37.99 for speaking/spoken interaction, 46.65 for writing/written interaction, 37.04 for listening, 37.04 for reading, 39.34 for grammar, 37.61 for vocabulary, 32.26 for culture, 32.41 for objectives, 44.65 for lesson content, 38.84 for organization, 33.66 for using lesson plans, 45.48 for content, 34.73 for interaction with learners, 34.87 for management, 38.69 for classroom language, 39.25 for autonomy, 40.49 for homework, 33.03 for project, 29.31 for portfolio, 25.03 for virtual learning environment, 25.08 for extra-curricular activities, 31.62 for designing assessment tools, 37.03 for evaluation, 34.69 for self- and peer assessment, 35.54 for language performance, 33.69 for culture, 36.94 for error analysis, $p<.01$.

The mean values of sub-sections are calculated sequentially 68.42 for curriculum, 64.92 for aims and need, 72.89 for the role of the language teacher, 77.37 for instructional resources and constraints, 80.66 for speaking/spoken interaction, 78.24 for writing/written interaction, 77.87 for listening, 77.87 for reading, 78.00 for grammar, 81.89 for vocabulary, 73.18 for culture, 73.13 for objectives, 76.97 for lesson content, 78.29 for organization, 76.16 for using lesson plans, 76.97 for content, 75.58 for interaction with learners, 74.32 for management, 75.39 for classroom language, 79.61 for autonomy, 82.50 for homework, 78.95 for project, 78.53 for portfolio, 79.82 for virtual learning environment, 72.76 for extra-curricular activities, 74.37 for designing assessment tools, 75.05 for evaluation, 71.87 for self- and peer assessment, 72.47 for language performance, 77.03 for culture, 76.31 for error analysis, $p<.01$. These results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers have less competencies especially in the *curriculum, aims and needs* sub-sections. When the general competency levels of prospective teachers are examined, it is seen that even the highest competency level belongs to sub-section of *homework* as 82.50 which also means that all sections of EPOSTL should be incorporated in the process of English Language Teacher Education.

Table 3.4. *One-sample t-test results for sub-sections of EPOSTL for "Practice Teaching"*

Sections/Subsections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
CONTEXT	38	82.19	8.66	37	58.63	.000
Curriculum	38	79.61	13.17		37.26	.000
AimsNeeds	38	83.45	9.07		56.74	.000
RoleofLgTr	38	82.26	9.60		52.83	.000
InsResConstraints	38	82.89	15.05		33.95	.000
METHODOLOGY	38	87.22	7.58		70.95	.000
SpkSpokenInteraction	38	86.08	9.60		55.30	.000
WrtWrittenInreaction	38	87.26	8.75		61.49	.000
Listening	38	87.05	8.67		61.87	.000
Reading	38	89.76	8.43		65.67	.000
Grammar	38	88.95	11.41		48.07	.000
Vocabulary	38	87.87	11.39		47.55	.000
Culture	38	85.26	10.32		50.95	.000
RESOURCES	38	84.83	10.69		48.94	.000
LPLAN	38	85.74	8.93		59.81	.000
Objectives	38	84.29	9.99		52.02	.000
LesContent	38	86.21	9.39		56.60	.000
Organisation	38	86.58	11.10		48.10	.000

CONDLESSON	38	86.43	8.84	60.29	.000
Usinglessonplans	38	86.08	10.03	52.89	.000
Content	38	88.16	10.16	53.48	.000
Intlearners	38	83.92	11.13	46.47	.000
Management	38	87.05	11.02	48.69	.000
ClassLanguage	38	87.61	10.99	49.13	.000
INDLEARNING	38	84.34	10.12	51.19	.000
Autonomy	38	84.66	11.91	43.82	.000
Homework	38	87.76	10.57	51.18	.000
Project	38	84.13	12.88	40.26	.000
Portfolio	38	84.42	11.94	43.59	.000
VirtuallearningEnv	38	81.53	17.81	28.21	.000
ExtrCurrActs	38	82.76	13.19	38.69	.000
ASSESSOLEARNING	38	85.49	10.01	52.49	.000
DesAsseTools	38	85.42	13.00	40.52	.000
Evaluation	38	85.24	10.81	48.60	.000
SelfPeerAssess	38	84.87	14.17	36.92	.000
LangPerformance	38	84.74	11.79	44.30	.000
CultureAssessoLear	38	86.97	13.59	39.46	.000
ErrorAnalysis	38	86.84	10.29	52.00	.000

In Table 3.4 One-sample t-test results for sub-sections of EPOSTL 2 are submitted in order to support the descriptive results of Research Question 2. According to the one-sample t-test results, mean values for each sub-section differ meaningfully and the difference between sections is significant, $t(37)= 37.26$ for curriculum, 56.74 for aims and need, 52.83 for the role of the language teacher, 33.95 for instructional resources and constraints, 55.30 for speaking/spoken interaction, 61.49 for writing/written interaction, 61.87 for listening, 65.67 for reading, 48.07 for grammar, 47.55 for vocabulary, 50.95 for culture, 52.02 for objectives, 56.60 for lesson content, 48.10 for organization, 52.89 for using lesson plans, 53.48 for content, 46.47 for interaction with learners, 48.69 for management, 49.13 for classroom language, 43.82 for autonomy, 51.18 for homework, 40.26 for project, 43.59 for portfolio, 28.21 for virtual learning environment, 38.69 for extra-curricular activities, 40.52 for designing assessment tools, 48.60 for evaluation, 36.92 for self- and peer assessment, 44.30 for language performance, 39.46 for culture, 52.00 for error analysis, $p<.01$.

Moreover, the mean values of sub-sections are calculated sequentially 79.61 for curriculum, 83.45 for aims and need, 82.26 for the role of the language teacher, 82.89 for instructional resources and constraints, 86.08 for speaking/spoken interaction, 87.26 for writing/written interaction, 87.05 for listening, 89.06 for reading, 88.95 for grammar, 87.87 for vocabulary, 85.26 for culture, 84.29 for objectives, 86.21 for lesson content, 86.58 for organization, 86.08 for using lesson plans, 88.16 for content, 83.92 for interaction with learners, 87.05 for management, 87.61 for classroom language, 84.66 for autonomy, 87.76 for homework, 84.13 for project, 84.42 for portfolio, 81.53 for virtual learning environment, 82.76 for extra-curricular activities, 85.42 for designing assessment tools, 85.24 for evaluation, 84.87 for self- and peer assessment, 84.74 for language performance, 86.97 for culture, 86.84 for error analysis, $p<.01$. Although these results indicate that the prospective EFL teachers' competency levels improved in a positive way, the prospective teachers still need help in the sub-sections of EPOSTL. In addition, the *curriculum* sub-section deserves to have importance in the ELT programs and should be dealt with conscientiously during the EFL teacher education process.

Referring the answer of the third question the study which searches for “To what extent are the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of EPOSTL effective and useful?” Table 3.5 summarizes the influence of the micro-teaching sessions in general at first. Moreover, the following tables reflects the findings of differences between the “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses.

Table 3.5. Paired samples t-test result of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”

Courses	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
School Experience	38	75.5787	8.87113	37	6.349	.000
Practice Teaching	38	85.5655	8.07461			

Table 3.5 shows the paired-sample t-test results of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”. According to the paired-sample t-test results, mean values for each application of EPOSTL differ meaningfully and the difference between the competency levels for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are significant, $t(37)= 6.349$, $p<.01$. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency levels for “School Experience” is 75.57 while the competency levels for “Practice Teaching” is 85.56. The findings indicate that micro-teaching sessions for sections/subsections of self-assessments in EPOSTL scale have significant effects on prospective EFL teachers' teaching competency levels.

Table 3.6. Paired samples t-test result of EPOSTL sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching”

Pairs	Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Pair1	Context	38	76.3387	9.99291	37	3.537	.001
	Context2	38	82.1968	8.66914			
Pair2	Methodology	38	81.4681	10.43866		3.587	.001
	Methodology2	38	87.2207	7.58916			
Pair3	Resources	38	79.8565	12.07068		3.422	.002
	Resources2	38	84.8325	10.69634			
Pair4	Lesson planning	38	80.8852	10.18587		3.634	.001
	Lesson planning2	38	85.7416	8.93254			
Pair5	Conducting a lesson	38	80.3119	10.95537		4.351	.000
	Conducting a lesson2	38	86.4327	8.84726			
Pair6	Independent learning	38	79.7556	12.43768		2.676	.011
	Independent learning2	38	84.3421	10.12250			
Pair7	Assessment of learning	38	80.0774	8.72781		3.295	.002
	Assessment of learning2	38	85.4971	10.01335			

Table 3.6 includes the paired-sample t-test results of EPOSTL sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses as pre- and post-tests. According to the paired-sample t-test results, the mean values of “context”, “methodology”, “resources”, “lesson planning”, “conducting a lesson”, “independent learning” and “assessment of learning” sections are calculated respectively for School Experience and Practice Teaching courses. The results reveal that each EPOSTL application differs meaningfully and the difference between the competency levels for each labeled sections of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are significant, $t(37)= 3.53$ for *context*, 3.58 for *methodology*,

3.42 for *resources*, 3.63 for *lesson planning*, 4.35 for *conducting a lesson*, 2.67 for *independent learning*, 3.29 for *assessment of learning* respectively, $p < .01$.

The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "context" section for "School Experience" is 76.33 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 82.19. The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "methodology" section for "School Experience" is 81.46 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 87.22. The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "resources" section for "School Experience" is 79.85 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 84.83. The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "lesson planning" section for "School Experience" is 80.88 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 85.74. The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "conducting a lesson" section for "School Experience" is 80.31 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 86.43. The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "independent learning" section for "School Experience" is 79.75 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 84.34. The mean value of prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "assessment of learning" section for "School Experience" is 80.07 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 85.49. The results show that prospective EFL teachers' competency levels do not differ meaningfully only in terms of their general competency levels but also their competency levels differ meaningfully in terms of the sections of EPOSTL they are expected to fill during the courses.

Table 3.7. Paired samples *t*-test result of EPOSTL sub-sections for "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching"

Pairs	Sections	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Pair1	Curriculum	38	68.42	13.054	37	3.647	.001
	Curriculum2	38	79.6053	13.17151			
Pair2	AimsNeeds	38	64.92	10.581	9.06641	8.874	.000
	AimsNeeds2	38	83.4474	9.06641			
Pair3	RoleofLgTr	38	72.89	9.706	9.59922	4.936	.000
	RoleofLgTr2	38	82.2632	9.59922			
Pair4	InsResConstraints	38	77.37	18.554	15.05089	1.530	.134
	InsResConstraints2	38	82.8947	15.05089			
Pair5	SpkSpokenInteraction	38	80.66	13.089	9.59556	2.504	.017
	SpkSpokenInteraction2	38	86.0789	9.59556			
Pair6	WrtWrittenInreaction	38	78.24	10.339	8.74777	4.563	.000
	WrtWrittenInreaction2	38	87.2632	8.74777			
Pair7	Listening	38	77.87	12.960	8.67412	4.240	.000
	Listening2	38	87.0526	8.67412			
Pair8	Reading	38	77.87	12.960	8.42594	5.248	.000
	Reading2	38	89.7632	8.42594			
Pair9	Grammar	38	78.00	12.223	11.40637	4.402	.000
	Grammar2	38	88.9474	11.40637			
Pair10	Vocabulary	38	81.89	13.422	11.39030	3.086	.004
	Vocabulary2	38	87.8684	11.39030			
Pair11	Culture	38	73.18	13.986	10.31578	5.408	.000
	Culture2	38	85.2632	10.31578			

Pair12	RESOURCES	38	79.85	12.071	4.264	.000
	RESOURCES2	38	84.8326	10.69619		
Pair13	LPLAN	38	80.88	10.185	3.609	.001
	LPLAN2	38	85.7413	8.93152		
Pair14	CONTEXT	38	76.33	9.993	3.554	.001
	CONTEXT2	38	82.1968	8.66922		
Pair15	METHODOLOGY	38	81.4684	10.43833	6.524	.000
	METHODOLOGY2	38	87.2205	7.58945		
Pair16	Objectives	38	73.13	13.911	4.841	.000
	Objectives2	38	84.2895	9.98893		
Pair17	LesContent	38	76.97	10.628	4.968	.000
	LesContent2	38	86.2105	9.38993		
Pair18	Organization	38	78.29	12.427	3.472	.001
	Organisation2	38	86.5789	11.09573		
Pair19	CONDLESSON	38	80.31	10.955	4.348	.000
	CONDLESSON2	38	86.4342	8.84742		
Pair20	Usinglessonplans	38	76.1579	13.94686	4.413	.000
	Usinglessonplans2	38	86.0789	10.03341		
Pair21	Content	38	76.97	10.433	5.023	.000
	Content2	38	88.1579	10.16227		
Pair22	Intlearners	38	75.58	13.414	3.215	.003
	Intlearners2	38	83.9211	11.13160		
Pair23	Management	38	74.32	13.140	5.289	.000
	Management2	38	87.0526	11.02074		
Pair24	ClassLanguage	38	75.39	12.012	5.835	.000
	ClassLanguage2	38	87.6053	10.99272		
Pair25	INDLEARNING	38	79.75	12.438	2.662	.011
	INDLEARNING2	38	84.3426	10.12245		
Pair26	Autonomy	38	79.61	12.502	2.426	.020
	Autonomy2	38	84.6579	11.91020		
Pair27	Homework	38	82.50	12.561	2.559	.015
	Homework2	38	87.7632	10.57134		
Pair28	Project	38	78.95	14.735	2.195	.034
	Project2	38	84.1316	12.88236		
Pair29	Portfolio	38	78.53	16.517	2.852	.007
	Portfolio2	38	84.4211	11.93820		
Pair30	VirtuallearningEnv	38	79.8158	19.65769	.657	.515
	VirtuallearningEnv2	38	81.5263	17.81244		
Pair31	ExtrCurrActs	38	72.76	17.885	3.227	.003
	ExtrCurrActs2	38	82.7632	13.18770		
Pair32	ASSESSOLEARNING	38	80.07	8.727	3.278	.002
	ASSESSOLEARNING2	38	85.4966	10.01253		
Pair33	DesAsseTools	38	74.37	14.500	3.498	.001
	DesAsseTools2	38	85.4211	12.99611		
Pair34	Evaluation	38	75.05	12.494	4.122	.000
	Evaluation2	38	85.2368	10.81149		
Pair35	SelfPeerAssess	38	71.87	12.773	4.721	.000
	SelfPeerAssess2	38	84.8684	14.17110		

Pair36	LangPerformance	38	72.47	12.569	4.737	.000
	LangPerformance2	38	84.7368	11.79254		
Pair37	CultureAssessoLear	38	77.03	14.095	3.864	.000
	CultureAssessoLear2	38	86.9737	13.58554		
Pair38	ErrorAnalysis	38	76.71	12.802	3.988	.000
	ErrorAnalysis2	38	86.8421	10.29439		

Table 3.7 includes the paired-sample t-test results of EPOSTL sub-sections for “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses as pre- and post-tests. According to the paired-sample t-test results, mean values of sub-sections of “context” section labeled as “*curriculum*”, “*aims and needs*”, “*the role of language teacher*”, “*institutional resources and constraints*”, sub-sections of “methodology” section labeled as “*speaking/spoken interaction*”, “*writing/written interaction*”, “*listening*”, “*reading*”, “*grammar*”, “*vocabulary*”, “*culture*”, sub-sections of “resources” section, sub-sections of “lesson planning” section labeled as “*identification of learning objectives*”, “*lesson content*”, “*organization*”, sub-section of “conducting a lesson” section labeled as “*using lesson plans*”, “*content*”, “*interaction with learners*”, “*classroom management*”, “*classroom language*”, sub-sections of “independent learning” section labeled as “*learner autonomy*”, “*homework*”, “*projects*”, “*portfolios*”, “*virtual learning environments*”, “*extra-curricular activities*”, sub-sections of “assessment of learning” section labeled as “*designing assessment tools*”, “*evaluation*”, “*self- and peer assessment*”, “*language performance*”, “*culture*”, “*error analysis*” for each application of EPOSTL differ meaningfully and the difference between the competency levels for each labeled sub-sections of “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses are mostly significant, $t(37) = 3.55$ for context, 3.64 for curriculum, 8.87 for aims and needs, 4.93 for the role of the language teacher, 1.53 for institutional resources and constraints, 6.52 for methodology, 2.50 for speaking and spoken interaction, 4.56 for writing and written interaction, 4.24 for listening, 5.24 for reading, 4.40 for grammar, 3.08 for vocabulary, 5.40 for culture, 4.26 for resources, 3.60 for lesson planning, 4.84 for objectives, 4.96 for lesson content, 3.47 for organization, 4.34 for conducting a lesson, 4.41 for using lesson plans, 5.02 for content, 3.21 for interaction with learners, 5.28 for management, 5.83 for classroom language, 2.66 for independent learning, 2.42 for autonomy, 2.55 for homework, 2.19 for project, 2.85 for portfolio, .65 for virtual learning environment, 3.22 for extra-curricular activities, 3.27 for assessment of learning, 3.49 for designing assessment tools, 4.12 for evaluation, 4.72 for self and peer assessment, 4.73 for language performance, 3.86 for culture, 3.98 for error analysis, $p < .01$.

The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “*curriculum*” sub-section for “School Experience” is 68.42 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 79.60. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “*aims and needs*” sub-section for “School Experience” is 64.92. However, it is 83.44 for “Practice Teaching”. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “*the role of the language teacher*” sub-section for “School Experience” is 72.89, but the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 82.26. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “*institutional resources and constraints*” sub-section for “School Experience” is 77.37, while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 82.89.

The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “*speaking/spoken interaction*” sub-section for “School Experience” is 80.66 whereas the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.07. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “*writing/written interaction*” sub-section for “School

Experience” is 78.24. On the other hand, the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.26. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “listening” sub-section for “School Experience” is 77.87, yet the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.05. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “reading” sub-section for “School Experience” is 77.87, while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 89.76. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “grammar” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.00, but the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 88.94. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “vocabulary” sub-section for “School Experience” is 81.89 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.86. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “culture” sub-section for “School Experience” is 73.18 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 85.26. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “resources” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.61 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.84.

The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “identification of learning objectives” sub-section for “School Experience” is 73.13 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.28. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “lesson content” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.97 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.21. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “organization” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.29 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.57.

The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “using lesson plans” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.15 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 86.07. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “content” sub-section for “School Experience” is 76.97 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 88.15. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “interaction with learners” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.58 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 83.92. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “classroom management” sub-section for “School Experience” is 74.32 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.05. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “classroom language” sub-section for “School Experience” is 75.39 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.60.

The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “learner autonomy” sub-section for “School Experience” is 79.61 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.65. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “homework” sub-section for “School Experience” is 82.50 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 87.76. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “projects” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.95 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.13. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “portfolios” sub-section for “School Experience” is 78.53 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 84.42. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “virtual learning environments” sub-section for “School Experience” is 79.81 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 81.52. The mean value of each prospective teacher’s EPOSTL competency level of “extra-curricular activities” sub-section for “School Experience” is 72.76 while the competency level for “Practice Teaching” is 82.76.

The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "designing assessment tools" sub-section for "School Experience" is 74.37 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 85.42. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "evaluation" sub-section for "School Experience" is 75.05 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 85.23. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "self- and peer assessment" sub-section for "School Experience" is 71.87 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 84.86. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "language performance" sub-section for "School Experience" is 72.47 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 84.73. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "culture" sub-section for "School Experience" is 77.03 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 86.97. The mean value of each prospective teacher's EPOSTL competency level of "error analysis" sub-section for "School Experience" is 76.71 while the competency level for "Practice Teaching" is 86.84.

The results declare that prospective EFL teachers' competency levels do not differ meaningfully only in terms of the sections of EPOSTL but also the prospective teachers competency level differ significantly in the sub-sections of EPOSTL as well. In addition, although the mean values of virtual learning environment indicate difference between the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses, this result do show significant difference statistically may be due to the fact that prospective teachers didn't have virtual learning experiences.

4. Conclusion

When the importance of teachers and the quality of education for societies are considered, the quality of teacher education gains high vitality as much as other important educational issues. For that reason, this study started with the general discussion on the importance of teacher education which is among very important factors as effective teacher preparation. However, the preparation process of teacher candidates is also debatable, since there are many options offered by various institutions for the ones who want to be a teacher. These options may be discussed as different teacher education alternatives and models for further studies. Nonetheless, this study does not aim to refer to this general teacher education policies. Instead, under the influence of different teacher education policies or studies, this research intends to reflect what can be done for better foreign language teacher education process in Turkey.

Starting with the findings and the results of the first research question which tries to find out the answer of what the competency levels of the prospective teachers are while taking the "School Experience" and "Practice Teaching" courses, it seems that the competency levels of prospective ELT teachers at Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education differ not only from each other but also the competency levels of teaching abilities change in terms of the courses taken in the fall and spring semester as well. Paying attention to the competency levels of the prospective teachers in the fall semester, the competency levels range between 53.84 to 98.46 which underlines the individual differences of prospective teachers at the teacher education level. Although the mean value of the prospective teachers is 75.48 in the fall semester for the "School Experience" course, keeping in mind that this EPOSTL application was carried out after the middle of the semester, the prospective teachers should take more practices in order to come nearer or decrease the individual differences in their teacher education process. The second application of the EPOSTL was carried out in the middle of the spring term and it is observed that the competency levels of prospective teachers differ from 62.76 to 99.07. However, the competency levels of prospective teachers and the mean value of 85.56 competency level are higher than the fall semester, the prospective teachers' competency

levels change from each other again. From this point of view, the importance of “School Experience” and the effects of this course on competency levels of prospective teachers are irresistible.

As the findings of the study emphasize the “School Experience” course serve as a prerequisite stage in teacher education process and gives a better way for “Practice Teachings”. As Wallace (1998, p. 89) states that, while there was a huge time allotted for the knowledge base for the teaching profession provided by the university professors or teacher trainers, nowadays the experiences of the teachers and pupils in the classroom are just as very important in the teaching and learning process. This should be a strong belief, with which we, as researchers, should be in complete agreement. Parallel to the findings for this research question, aside from the importance of the “School Experience” and “Practice Teaching” courses, the teacher education comes to the gate of “in harmony” stage. Since, as the teaching is a profession and the teachers are the agent of change, perhaps the most crucial task of teacher education should be applied in harmony that it will decrease the individual differences while they are carrying out their jobs. As Pathak (2012) proclaims that holistic perception through proper education provides also correct understanding of the human reality. In recent years, although all across the globe several attempts are being made towards evolving suitable models and methodologies, integrating the harmony in the teacher education gained necessity as the students of English language teachers deserves equal education process, which demands the harmony in the teaching competency levels of ELT prospective teachers.

The findings and the results of the second research question which tries to find out the answer to what sections/subsections of 'self-assessment' the prospective teachers need to develop show that the prospective teachers competency levels are lower in the context section than the other sections as the mean value is 76.33 while taking the “School Experience” course in the fall semester. Supporting that finding the sub-sections of context section’s mean values are also lower than the other sections’ sub-sections which announces the urgent need of support for prospective teachers to be more experienced for the context section of EPOSTL. Although the mean values of context section and sub-sections of this part are higher than the fall semester that is calculated as 82.19 during the Practice Teaching course in the spring term, it is observed that again the mean value of prospective teachers’ competency level is lower than the other sections of EPOSTL. Thus, here the ELT prospective teachers are expected to have more knowledge about the related subjects of their own context. Here, context refers not only the classroom where prospective teachers are going to teach something but also it means a kind of an abstract condition of their teaching which will underline the national and international requirements, and directs the way how they will teach in their classrooms. Because context competency for prospective teachers mean that they should have knowledge about the curriculum, aims and needs, the role of the language teacher and institutional resources and constrains. Moreover, the prospective teachers may be well prepared for their profession but if they don’t know national requirements, the prescribed norms of teaching or the desired results of this long journey, they may fail and feel unsuccessful themselves since the ELT prospective teacher should know what to teach, under what conditions and also where to reach at the end of this process. As experienced the same situation in the faculty of education many years before, the prospective teachers need to know all the formal procedures and anticipated results of their own teaching. These underlying features of the context section deserve to pay attention through the process of teacher education since if the ELT prospective teachers do not have knowledge about all these prominent features of the context, they may get confused in the early days of their teaching process. Thus, during the teacher education process the importance of the context which is the professional part of ELT prospective teachers should be focused on heavily because the

regulations and the real situations of our nation and the institution where the prospective teachers will work is as important as how to teach our pupils in the classrooms. As Wedell (2008) argues:

If English teachers working to help learners achieve the outcomes of a particular EFL curriculum are to become 'qualified', it is necessary for those planning to support them to be clear about what knowledge and skills the curriculum expects of them, and so how teacher educators can help them become qualified (p. 23).

In addition, when EPOSTL results are compared terms of sections, it seems that the prospective teachers' competency levels are higher in the spring semester during the Practice Teaching course than the fall semester during the School Experience course. The mean values of competency levels of prospective teachers for each section of EPOSTL applied both during the School Experience and Practice Teaching present that the ELT prospective teachers competency levels range from 76.33 to 81.46 for School Experience and from 82.19 to 87.22 for Practice Teaching courses. This finding underlines the need for urgent changes in the procedure of ELT teacher education in Turkey because Hacettepe University is among the most successful universities in Turkey. Although the results are satisfying for ELT prospective teachers at Hacettepe University, the results and findings for other universities may be catastrophic. Thus, ELT teacher education process needs to be reconstructed with respect to the international requirements and by taking into consideration the updated scales being used for not only all teachers of different subject fields but also for only English language teachers in pre-in and post-service of their profession.

The findings and the results of the third research question which tries to find out the answer to what extent the micro-teaching sessions of sections/subsections of EPOSTL are effective and useful, starting with the effect of micro-teaching sessions about the section and sub-sections of EPOSTL when the results of this part are examined, it is clearly seen that these sessions have significant effects on prospective teachers competency levels. Since the mean value of the prospective teachers' competency levels is 75.57 in the fall semester during the School Experience course while the mean value of teaching competency level in the spring semester during the Practice Teaching course found as 85.56. After the analysis it can be claimed that the effects of micro-teaching sessions of EPOSTL to prospective teachers' competency levels are very remarkable and worth considering. Thus, the general results of competency levels are very significant. Moreover, it is claimed that although the micro-teaching sessions or video recordings are conveyed through distance education, it proposes that teacher education process may also be followed theoretically in distance and the results of this process may be as observable as the one in this study. Supporting this conclusion, the seven sections of EPOSTL for School Experience and Practice Teaching courses are calculated and it is seen that from the most to the least significant ones in *conducting a lesson, context, methodology, lesson planning, resources, assessment of learning and independent learning* sections, there are meaningful effects of teaching sessions between the EPOSTL applications for the two different semesters when School Experience and Practice Teachings courses are taken. The effects of micro-teaching sessions can be accepted in positive way since the competency levels of prospective teachers are higher in the semester when they take Practice Teaching course after the micro-teaching sessions than the semester they are obliged to take School Experience course. In detail, the effects of micro-teaching recordings have also seen in the sub-sections of EPOSTL applications as well. When the results are checked it is clearly seen that apart from the institutional resources and constrains, and virtual learning environments all the other sub-sections differs significantly from each other again. Although the above mentioned sub-sections' mean values are higher during the Practice Teaching course than the School Experience one, the competency levels of prospective teachers do not have significant difference but they have more successful

competency levels than the fall semester. Thus, although the significant levels of other sub-sections are different from each other, it should be paid attention that they all have significant effects. Perhaps, the institutional resources and constraints, and virtual learning environments not being significant lies under the truth that these prospective teachers are not teaching in their real environments, they do not need to know all the details about their teaching context meanwhile their experiences about virtual learning environment are only limited to their own learning experiences and they mostly do not have allotted time for virtual teaching process as their Practice Teaching hours are scheduled before and very limited because of the mentors' own programs. These results and conclusions refer to not only the importance of the use of EPOSTL but also to the claim by Newby (2011) ultimately, the usefulness of EPOSTL must be evaluated by its main target audience who are student teachers undergoing their pre-service education. Therefore, particularly or as a whole EPOSTL also provides a means of analyzing and assessing the content of teacher education curricula, so it can be used as a way of planning and determining the content of pre-service courses. Here, the effects of technology or the distance education which proves the recordings to the prospective teachers should be emphasized and focused on utilizing them for teacher education process of continuing professional development during the teaching profession. At that point, Burns (2011) deserves to be remembered as the researcher claims that distance education not about technology; it is about people, about improving the knowledge, skills, attitudes, aptitudes, and values of teachers with the ultimate aim of improving the learning and achievement of our students of today and tomorrow.

To sum up, at the European Union (EU) level, the cooperation on teacher education among member states have increased in recent years in the context of the increased political cooperation on education since the launch of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000. Especially language teacher education gets the most important part of the recent improvements and reconstruction changes in Europe. Among these tremendous advances, EPOSTL applications serve a vital importance in the process of language teacher education. Paying attention and examining these advances in detail, it seems that at first language teacher education should be taken into consideration as a unique part of teacher education as the other subject fields should be handled separately from each other. In addition, the process of language teacher education and the competencies the whole process underlines differ very much from the prescribed one in Turkey. Since the assessment of teacher candidates or the assessment of the prospective teachers by mentors or teacher trainers for all teacher education departments are the same. Thus, the prospective teachers are assessed or their Practice Teachings are observed very generally and as if they were teachers of the same subject field. Such as the prescribed scale by the CHE for the assessment of prospective teachers include totally four sections with their sub-sections named as subject field knowledge, subject field education, teaching and learning process, classroom management, evaluation and keeping records, other professional competences which consist of 46 items for teacher competences labeled in three likert type format, such as “has deficiencies”, “acceptable” and “well-trained”. When the scale for Practice Teachings is compared with the European scales such as EPOSTL, it is observed that the language teacher education deserves to take a new breath into its place in teacher education process. For these reasons, this study intends to serve a small sample of new trend language teacher education applications with the help of these new instruments called as EPOSTL in Turkey setting. More detailed and complicated than the CHE's scale, the applications of EPOSTL for English Language Teacher Education at Hacettepe University, Education Faculty the conclusions reached from the findings and mentioned below worth much consideration for the future of English Language Teacher Education in Turkey.

References

- Aiken, L.R. (1997). *Questionnaires and inventories: Surveying opinions and assessing personality*. New York: J. Wiley.
- Bagaric, V. (2011). The role of the EPOSTL in the evaluation and development of teacher education programmes in Croatia. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 71-83). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bergil, A.S. & Sariçoban, A. (2016). *Milestone in english language teacher education: how to use European profiling grid in the assessment of prospective EFL teachers' qualifications*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 206-220.
- Bergil, A.S. & Sariçoban, A. (2017). *The use of EPOSTL to determine the self-efficacy of prospective EFL teachers: Raising awareness in English language teacher education*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 399-411.
- Binbaşıoğlu, C. (1995). *Türkiye'de eğitim bilimleri tarihi (History of Turkish educational sciences): The series of research and examination*. Ankara, Turkey: MEB Publication.
- Burn, M. (2011). *Distance ducation for teacher training: Modes, models, and methods*. Washington, DC: Education Development Center Inc.
- Council of Europe. (2000). *European language portfolio (ELP): Principles and guidelines*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Document DGIV/EDU/LANG(2000) (33)
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2004). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Council for Cultural Cooperation Education Committee Modern Languages Division. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2007). *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages*. Available at: www.coe.int/portfolio
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). *In tasc model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf
- Council of Higher Education (CHE). (2007). *Teacher education guide book*. Ankara: CHE Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- European Agency. (2010). *Teacher training -basic and specialist teacher Training – Germany*. Retrieved from <http://www.european-agency.org/>
- European Commission. (2005). *Common European principles for teacher competencies and qualifications*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Fenner, A.-B. (2011). The EPOSTL as a tool for reflection in three contexts of language teacher education. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 37-45). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.

- Ingvarstottir, H. (2011). The EPOSTL in Iceland: getting the mentors on board. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.) (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 63-71). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Jones, B. (2011). The use of the EPOSTL in a bilateral teacher-education programme. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.) (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 83-93). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Makinen, K. (2011). The use of the personal statement. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 45-55). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- MEB. (1982). *11. Milli eğitim şurası*. Retrieved from http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_06/06021545_11_sura.pdf.
- MEB. (2009). Ortaöğretim kurumları haftalık ders çizelgeleri ve açıklamaları. *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Tebliğler Dergisi*, 72 (2624), 534-593.
- MEB. (2010). *Milli eğitim temel kanunu*. Retrieved from www.meb.gov.tr.
- MEB. (2010). Öğretmen yetiştirme ve eğitimi genel müdürlüğünün görev, yetki ve sorumluluklarına ilişkin yönerge. *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Tebliğler Dergisi*, 73(2631), 227-238.
- Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. (2011). Die implementierung des eposa am fachdidaktischen zentrum Englisch der universität Wien. In D. Newby & A. Horak (Eds.), *Die implementierung des Europäischen portfolios für sprachlehrende in ausbildung (EPOSA) in der Lehrer/innenbildung in Österreich* (pp. 15-20). Graz: Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum.
- Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. (2011). Implementing the epostl in the early phase of pre-service EFL teacher education. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 29-37). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Mirici, İ.H., & Öztürk, Z. (2003). *Some suggestions for global citizenship education*. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 5(1), 87-95. ISSN 1562-0500.
- Mirici, İ.H. (2004). *European language portfolio: A tool for a common language education policy in Europe*. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Education*, 6(1), 161-166. USA: WCCI North American Chapter.
- Mirici, İ.H. (2006). *Electronic in-service teacher-training for the new national EFL curriculum in Turkey*. *TOJDE*, 7(1), 155-164.
- Mirici, İ.H. (2007). *Training multicultural and plurilingual children with an identity of European citizenship*. Proceedings of the International Academic Conference Children's Identity and Citizenship in Visegard Context, Presov University, 29-31.
- Mirici, İ.H. (2008). *Development and validation process of a European language portfolio model for young learners*. *TOJDE*, 9(2), 26-34. ISSN 1302-6488.
- Mirici, İ.H., & Demirbaş, S. (2013). *How to turn EPOSTL into an electronic setting: The e-EPOSTL*. 4th International Conference on New Horizons in Education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 1368-1377.

- Newby, D., Fenner, A. B., Komorowska, H. & Jones, B. (Eds.). (forthcoming), *Insights from the European portfolio for student teachers of languages*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Newby, D. (2007). *The European portfolio for student teachers of languages*. *Babylonia*, 3 (7), 23-26. www.babylonia-ti.ch.
- Newby, D. (2011). Issues in using the EPOSTL. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 9-19). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A.-B., Jones, B., Komorowska, H., & Soghikyan, K. (2007). *European portfolio for student teachers of languages. A reflection tool for language teacher education*. Strasbourg/Graz: Council of Europe Publishing, <http://EPOSTL2.ecml.at>.
- Newby, D., Fenner, A.-B., & Jones, B. (2011). *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Nihlen, C. (2011). What goes into the EPOSTL Dossier and why? In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 55-63). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Orlova, N. (2011). Challenges of integrating the EPOSTL into pre-service teacher training. In D. Newby, A.-B. Fenner, & B. Jones (Eds.), *Using the European portfolio for student teachers of languages* (pp. 19-29). European Centre for Modern Languages: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Pathak, S. (2012). *International seminar on teacher education for peace and harmony*. Retrieved from: <http://www.iaseuniversity.org.in/intSeminar/index.asp>.
- Wallace, M.J. (1998). *Action research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wedell, M. (2008). Developing a capacity to make English for everyone worthwhile: Reconsidering outcomes and how to start achieving them. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(6), 628-239.