

Evaluation of 1998, 2006 and 2018 Music Teaching Undergraduate Programs in Terms of Program Elements

Mert Gürer¹, Ömer Üçer², Gülce Yılmaz³, Ömer Bilgehan Sonsel^{1*}

¹Department of Music Education, Faculty of Education, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

²Department of Music Education, Faculty of Education, Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey

³Department of Music Education, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

Corresponding author: Ömer Bilgehan Sonsel, E-mail: bilgehansonsel@gazi.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: December 06, 2022

Accepted: December 10, 2022

Published: January 31, 2023

Volume: 11 Issue: 1

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

Teacher training undergraduate programs are of great importance in the training of qualified and well-equipped teachers. Within the scope of this research, 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs were examined in line with the content of the field education, vocational knowledge, general culture courses and the opinions of the instructors. In this research, which aims to examine the 1998, 2006 and 2018 Council of Higher Education (YÖK) music teaching programs, qualitative method was followed and case study model was used. The study group of the research consists of academicians who provide education within the 1998, 2006 and 2018 YÖK music education programs and have a command of all three programs. Of these academics, 20 were contacted via e-mail and phone, and 11 academicians volunteered to participate in the study. The data obtained in terms of instructor opinions were analyzed by content analysis technique. Based on the findings of the research, it was concluded that the content knowledge, vocational knowledge and general culture courses of the 1998, 2006 and 2018 curricula differed in terms of course hours, course periods and number of courses, and that the 2018 curriculum was insufficient in terms of field education courses compared to the 1998 and 2006 curriculum.

Key words: Music Teacher Training, Program Comparison, Music Education Undergraduate Program

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important roles of education is to contribute to the development and progress of countries in the fields of science, art, culture and technology. "One of the basic elements required for a country to be in developed country status is to have an education system that meets the needs of the society" (Kara et al., 2018, p. 1068). For this reason, the quality of education is among the main goals in Turkey as well as in the countries that have kept it high and in accordance with today's conditions. The quality of education provided in schools is directly related to the quality of pre-service education received by teachers (Ballantyne and Packer, 2004). In this process, the main element that plays a role in determining the quality and quality of education is teacher and teacher training. According to the Council of Higher Education (YÖK, 2007) teacher training has been on the agenda since the foundation of the republic. With the establishment of the Council of Higher Education with the 1982 Constitution in our country, teacher training programs affiliated to the Ministry of National Education were included in the structure of universities. Institutions such as higher education schools and educational institutes have

tried to create a standard model by structuring the teacher training programs affiliated to them within the faculties of education/educational sciences and the education colleges that have been transformed into four-year education faculties (Akdemir, 2013; YÖK, 2018). Among these changing systems, the issue of training qualified teachers has always remained up-to-date and necessary. There is no doubt that qualified teacher training education programs are necessary for the training of qualified teachers. Likewise, as stated by Güler, "Increasing the quality of education can be done by implementing qualified education programs. Therefore, training programs should be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the age" (2022, p. 2). Varış (1997) defines the education program as all activities organized by an educational institution for individuals and carried out for the purposes of national education and the institution. Demirel (2021, p. 4) defines it as "the learning experiences mechanism provided to the learner through planned activities at school and outside the school". The curriculum is a program aimed at acquiring knowledge and skills for the purposes of the education program and within the framework of a specific plan (Varış, 1997).

Since the transfer of teacher training to universities, regulations have been made many times regarding teacher training undergraduate programs. Updates/improvements are made to teacher training programs within universities due to the requirements of the age and the emergence of new needs from the day they are structured to the present day. YÖK (2018) explains the general reasons for the updates made in teacher training undergraduate programs as; the fact that many years have passed since the programs, the needs and demands that differ from today, the necessity of structuring courses for field education and teaching vocational knowledge courses, the training of socially and culturally equipped teachers; and bases the changes made in teacher training programs on the training of more qualified and equipped teachers. It was stated that the updated teacher training undergraduate programs were prepared in three stages. These are the process of creating program development commissions, performing field scanning and updating the program. In this process, it was stated that for each undergraduate program, a separate commission was created for teaching profession knowledge and general culture courses with commissions consisting of three or five members, including education programs and education-area trainers (YÖK, 2018; Ulubey and Başaran, 2019).

Within the scope of the program, which was started to be used in 1998, special teaching methods were focused on, and both content knowledge and teaching formation courses increased and expanded. In this program, it is stated in the reports published by the Council of Higher Education that there is no specific standard in subjects such as content, number of courses and credits, when the courses are examined, there is no stepwise and complementary logical relationship between the courses, theoretical courses are given more weight than other courses, and applied courses are neglected. In 2006, the disrupted parts in the 1997-1998 regulation were discussed and tried to be revised. Accordingly, arrangements were made in vocational science courses and the number of courses and credits given increased compared to the previous program. In the update of 2006, the ratio of some general culture courses removed in the regulation made in 1997 was increased, 50-60% of them were distributed as field knowledge, 25-30% of them were distributed as vocational knowledge and 15-20% of them were distributed as general culture courses. Considering the modern developments in the fields of educational sciences and teacher training and the structural changes in the Turkish education system, the needs and demands of the society, it was stated that the faculties of education should be restructured in terms of department and department and teacher training undergraduate programs should be updated again. The relevant programs, which started to be implemented since the 2006-2007 academic year, were updated again in 2018. As a result of the evaluations, it was stated that the courses for field education and teaching vocational knowledge courses should be reviewed and revised and these courses should be emphasized in the programs. Programs; Teaching Profession General Competencies and Teacher Strategy, 10. Development Plan, MEB 2015-2019 Strategic Plan, Turkey

Higher Education Qualifications Framework Teacher Training and Educational Sciences Field Competences, it was stated that it is important to comply with official documents such as the reopening of quality and accreditation studies in faculties of education, adaptation to the Bologna process in the field of European higher education and the need to create common core programs in parallel with the developments in the world. With this program, teaching vocational knowledge courses were 35%; general culture courses were 15-20% and field education courses were 45-50% (YÖK, 1998; 2007; 2018). In teacher training undergraduate programs, three types of content courses are given to teacher candidates throughout the education process. These are teaching vocational knowledge, field knowledge and general culture courses. Küçükahmet (2007) explains the three content courses as follows;

Teaching profession knowledge: These are the courses that answer the questions of “Who, why, where, how should the teacher candidate be taught?”

Field knowledge: They are courses that provide deep and extensive field knowledge about the field of teaching.

General culture: Lessons that give the general culture that will help to place small knowledge, phenomenon and event categories in a large structure.

“These three contents, which constitute the skeleton of teacher training programs, were included as “field and field education”, “teaching vocational knowledge”, “general culture” in the 2006 curriculum, while they were included as “field education”, “vocational knowledge”, “general culture” in the 2018 curriculum” (Akarsu et al., 2020 p.26). When the literature related to teacher training undergraduate programs is examined, it is seen that various studies have been carried out in different branches. Kaymakçı (2012), Tokcan and Tangülü (2019), Şahin (2020), Akarsu et al. (2020), Tonga (2020) social studies undergraduate program, Yaman (2018), Çelik and Kasap (2019) English teaching undergraduate program, Bozpolat and Tanrıverdioğlu (2020) and Zelyurt (2021) preschool teaching undergraduate program, Dağtekin and Zorluoğlu (2019), Arduç et al. (2020) science teaching undergraduate program, Deregözü (2020) German teaching undergraduate program, Yurdakal (2018) classroom teaching undergraduate program, Çoban (2010) Turkish teaching undergraduate program, Demir et al. (2021) primary mathematics undergraduate program have been examined by comparing the previously used programs within the framework of course contents and hours. Karakaya et al. (2020), Özmen (2019), Stebler and Aykaç (2019) presented the general evaluation of the new program updated in 2018. Sağdıç (2020) examined the geography teaching undergraduate program in terms of field knowledge, general culture and pedagogy courses, while Aran and Derman (2020) examined the 2018 science teaching undergraduate program in terms of science competencies of different countries. Karabacak (2022) examined the revision process of the classroom teaching undergraduate program.

One of the undergraduate programs that are being regulated within the faculties of education is music teaching undergraduate programs. Music teaching programs, which

were partially autonomously developed by universities before 1998, were renewed and reduced to a model based on the reasons published by the Council of Higher Education. The general outline of this process has been formed by throwing out, partially changing or expanding certain points of the programs being implemented and adding new courses. The position and programs of music teaching education in the faculties of education were changed in the 1998-99 academic year and the faculties of education were transformed into music education departments and the practice of the renewed program was started by combining the painting-work education department under the name of "fine arts education department" (Kalyoncu, 2005). Uçan (2018, p. 73) explains the music education program as "the pre-designed plan of the 'music education' process and the view of this plan in practice". Saraç (2006, p. 113) explains the importance of music curriculum in music education by explaining that "the most important branch of music education program is music curriculum". For Uçan (2018), the main elements of music teaching programs are divided into six as goals, target behaviors, content-topics, teaching situations, testing-measuring situations and evaluation procedures.

When the literature on music teaching undergraduate programs is examined, it is seen that Bozkaya (2000) first examined the 1998 music teaching undergraduate program in terms of content. Kalyoncu (2004) examined the relationship between the music teaching undergraduate program and basic music teacher competencies and investigated the reasons for the revision of the music teaching undergraduate program in 2005. Gökçe (2019) examined the music teaching undergraduate program in line with the opinions of students, music teachers and faculty members. Öztürk and Bulut (2021) examined the vocational knowledge courses in music teaching undergraduate programs applied between 1998-2018. However, when the relevant literature is examined, no study has been found in which 1998, 2006 and 2018 programs are discussed in terms of program elements. For this reason, it is important to examine the programs in terms of content, course distributions and instructor opinions because of the changes made.

Based on this purpose, within the scope of the study, 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs were researched in line with the program elements and the opinions of the instructors. The main research question of this research was determined as "What is the evaluation of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs in terms of program elements?"

In line with this main question, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What are the course distributions of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs?
2. What is the appearance of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs in terms of field education courses?
3. What is the appearance of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs in terms of general culture courses?
4. What is the appearance of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs in terms of vocational knowledge courses?
5. What are the opinions of the instructors regarding the 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs?

METHOD

The Model of the Research

Karasar defines the model as "the representative of a system". Models are simpler than the system they represent. The model is a representative of an "ideal" environment and is a summary of the real situation including only the variables that are considered "important" (Karasar, 2009, p. 76). In this study, which aims to examine the 1998, 2006 and 2018 YÖK Music Teaching Undergraduate Programs, the case study model, one of the qualitative research methods, was used. "Qualitative research focuses the sweat of quantitative research on 'cause-and-effect', 'how much' and 'numerical relationships' on the question of 'why' and 'how'. Qualitative research is used more when an explanation is needed rather than a yes or no answer to a question" (Ocak and Olur, 2019, p. 19). Mcmillan defines case study as a method in which one or more events, environments, programs, social groups or other interconnected systems are examined in depth (Türkmen, 2022, p. 80). "Case studies are used in researches to define and see the details that make up an event, to develop possible explanations about an event and to evaluate an event" (Büyüköztürk et al. 2010, quoting from Borg and Gall, p. 273).

Data Collection

Document analysis and interview method, one of the qualitative research designs, were used in the data collection phase of the study. The contents of the 1998, 2006 and 2018 YÖK Music Teaching Undergraduate Programs were examined by document analysis method and the data were obtained. The data related to the 5th sub-problem of the research were collected by interview method. Based on the contents of the YÖK programs, a pool of 9 questions was created by the researchers, including the achievements related to the programs, content, learning teaching and evaluation dimensions. The generated question pool was presented to the opinion of a program development expert and a measurement and evaluation expert and reduced to 5 questions, and 2 questions were detailed. The revised form is ready for implementation.

Document review involves the analysis of written materials containing information about the phenomenon or phenomena to be investigated (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008, p. 187). The interview method is the study conducted by talking to the person or group concerned mutually, asking questions and recording the information received (Arıkan, 2007, p. 112). Interviews are divided into different types according to the characteristics and accessibility of the data. In this study, "structured interview method", one of the interview types, was used. In structured interviews, the questions

of the researchers are ready and sequential in advance. This method allows faster coding and analysis of the data, ease of measurement and comparison with the scope of the research. Contrary to the self-administered survey method, it provides the interviewer with the opportunity to answer the questions of the source person when needed (Büyüköztürk, et al., 2010, p. 163).

Working group

While determining the working group to be interviewed for the 5th sub-problem of the research, academics who gave training in all three of the 1998, 2006 and 2018 YÖK Music Teaching Programs and had a good command of the program were determined. Twenty of these academicians were reached by e-mail and telephone, and 11 of the reached academicians volunteered to participate in the study. Information about the study group of the research is given in Table 1.

Analysis of Data

In order to analyze the data in the research, the “program review form” created by the researchers was used to examine the 1998, 2006 and 2018 YÖK Music Teaching undergraduate programs. In this form, each program was examined in terms of achievement, content, learning, teaching and evaluation, and the results of the examination were presented to three field experts to provide competence and activity. In the study, the data obtained by the interview method were provided through face-to-face interviews and Zoom. During the interviews, audio recordings were taken with the permission of the participants and the audio recordings obtained were dictated and transferred to the digital environment. Content analysis technique was used to analyze the dictated data and their frequencies were determined and tabulated under the relevant categories. The sample instructor opinion for each category is indicated by the Instructor Number (IN1, IN2, etc.) under the relevant table. In order to increase the reliability of the research, the method of coding the data proposed by Büyüköztürk et al. (2010, p. 265) was used by all researchers. Each researcher coded the audio recordings obtained from the instructors separately, and then these codings were

compared and consistency was checked. The opinions of three field experts on these codes and themes were taken and necessary arrangements were made in line with these opinions. The reliability of the study was calculated with Miles and Huberman’s (1994) Reliability Formula = Consensus/Consensus + Disagreement formula. The reconciliation rate was found to be 89%. The codes and themes created were presented to three field experts, a measurement and evaluation expert and a program development expert, and necessary arrangements were made according to the feedback received.

Limitations

Among the music education undergraduate programs examined within the scope of the research, the 1998 and 2018 programs are divided into compulsory and elective courses, and the 2006 program is only included as a package program as compulsory courses. Since the programs do not have a standard in compulsory and elective courses and every university is autonomous in elective courses, elective courses were not included in the research, and the findings were obtained only through the compulsory courses of three programs.

FINDINGS

Findings and Comments on the 1st Research Question

Table 2 shows the course distributions of Music education undergraduate programs in 1998, 2006 and 2018.

Elective courses in the programs are not included in this study as they may differ in each school. There are 9 hours of elective courses in the 1998 program and their types are not specified in the program. There are 32 hours of elective courses in the 2018 program, including 12 hours of field education, 12 hours of vocational knowledge and 8 hours of general culture, and there are no elective courses in the 2006 program. According to Table 2. when the number of courses is compared according to the programs, it is 2006, 2018, 1998, respectively. The highest number of courses is in the 2006 program. The curriculum in which field education courses are most intense is the 2006 curriculum. In the 2018 curriculum, the rate of field education courses decreased compared to other programs. In the 2006 curriculum, general culture courses are higher than other programs and vocational science courses are lower than other programs. When the ratio of vocational courses is examined, it is seen that the highest number of courses is in the 2018 program. When the course hours are examined, the 2006 program has the highest number of course hours with 201 hours of lessons. This is followed by the 1998 and 2018 programs, respectively. When the theoretical hours of the courses are examined, they are listed as 2006, 1998 and 2018 programs according to the high and low.

Findings and Comments on the 2nd Research Question

Table 3 summarizes the field courses in music teaching undergraduate programs in 1998, 2006 and 2018.

Table 1. Instructors in the working group

University where the Instructor Serves	Title
Ankara Müzik ve Güzel Sanatlar University	Prof. Dr.
Gazi University	Prof. Dr.
Gazi University	Prof. Dr.
Uludağ University	Prof. Dr.
Trabzon University	Prof. Dr.
Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University	Assoc. Prof. Dr.
Harran University	Assoc. Prof. Dr.
Atatürk University	Assoc. Prof. Dr.
Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University	Assistant Professor
Trabzon University	Doctoral Lecturer
Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen University	Lecturer

Table 2. Course distributions of 1998, 2006 and 2018 Music education undergraduate programs

	1998 Program					2006 Program					2018 Program				
	T	P	Hour	%	NoL	T	P	Hour	%	NoL	T	U	Hour	%	NoL
Field Education	75	28	103	61	42	72	56	128	64	62	51	32	83	56	40
Vocational Knowledge	24	24	48	28	11	28	14	42	21	12	32	12	44	30	16
General Culture	16	2	18	11	7	25	6	31	15	12	18	2	20	14	8
Total	115	54	169	100	60	125	76	201	100	86	101	46	147	100	64

*T: Theoretical, P: Practice, NoL: Number of Lessons

Table 3. Field courses in music teaching undergraduate programs in 1998, 2006 and 2018

	1998	T*	P	C	2006	T	P	C	2018	T	P	C
	1 st semester	Music Theory and Hearing Education I	4	2	5	Musical Hearing, Reading, Writing I	2	2	3	Western Music Theory and Practice 1	2	2
	Piano I	2	0	2	Piano I	1	0	1	Piano Education 1	1	0	1
	Individual Instrument Training I	1	0	1	Individual Instrument 1	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 1	1	0	1
	Individual Voice Training I	2	0	2	Individual Voice Training I	1	0	1	Voice Training I	1	0	1
	School Instruments I	2	0	2	School Instruments I (Guitar, baglama, flute)	0	2	1				
					Culture of Music	2	0	2				
2 nd semester	Music Theory and Hearing Education II	4	2	5	Musical Hearing, Reading, Writing II	2	2	3	Western Music Theory and Practice 2	2	2	3
	Piano II	2	0	2	Piano II	1	0	1	Piano Education 2	1	0	1
	Individual Instrument Training II	1	0	1	Individual Instrument II	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 2	1	0	1
	Individual Voice Training II	2	0	2	Individual Voice Training II	1	0	1	Voice Training 2	1	0	1
	School Instruments II	2	0	2	School Instruments II (Guitar, baglama, flute)	0	2	1				
					Choir I	0	2	1				
					General Music History	2	0	2	Culture of Music	2	0	2
3 rd semester	Music Theory and Hearing Education III	4	2	5	Musical Hearing, Reading, Writing III	2	2	3	Music Learning and Teaching Approaches	2	0	2
	Piano III	2	0	2	Piano III	1	0	1				
	Individual Instrument Training III	1	0	1	Individual Instrument III	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 3	1	0	1
	Collective Voice Training I	1	2	2	Individual Voice Training III	1	0	1				
					Choir II	2	2	3	Polyphonic Choir 1	1	2	2
					Harmony - Counterpoint - Accompaniment I	2	0	2	Harmony and Accompaniment 1	2	0	2
					Traditional Turkish Folk Music	2	0	2	Turkish Folk Music Theory and Practice 1	1	2	2

(Contd...)

Table 3. (Continued)

	1998	T*	P	C	2006	T	P	C	2018	T	P	C
4 th semester	School Instruments III	2	0	2	School Instruments III (Guitar, baglama, flute)	0	2	1	Baglama Education 1	1	0	1
					Turkish Music History	2	0	0	Western Music History	2	0	2
					Musical Hearing, Reading, Writing IV	2	2	3	Music Teaching Programs	2	0	2
	Piano IV	2	0	2	Piano IV	1	0	1				
	Individual Instrument Training IV	1	0	1	Individual Instrument IV	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 4	1	0	1
	Collective Voice Training II	1	2	2	Individual Voice Training IV	1	0	1				
					Choir III	2	2	3	Polyphonic Choir 2	1	2	2
					Harmony - Counterpoint - Accompaniment II	2	0	2	Harmony and Accompaniment 2	2	0	2
	Music History	2	0	2	Traditional Turkish Folk Music Practice	0	2	1	Turkish Folk Music Theory and Practice 2	1	2	2
	Electronic Keyboard Training	2	0	2	Electronic Keyboard Training	0	2	1	Baglama Education 1	1	0	1
5 th semester	School Band	2	0	2					Turkish Music History	2	0	2
					Musical Hearing, Reading, Writing V	2	0	2				
	Piano V	2	0	2	Piano V	1	0	1				
	Individual Instrument Training V	1	0	1	Individual Instrument V	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 5	1	0	1
					Harmony - Counterpoint - Accompaniment III	2	0	2				
	Choir I	1	2	2	Choir IV	1	2	2	Turkish Folk Music Choir 1	1	2	2
	Orchestra/Chamber Music I	2	2	3	Orchestra/Chamber Music I	1	2	2	Orchestra/Chamber Music I	1	2	2
	Turkish Folk Music	2	0	2	Traditional Turkish Classical Music	2	0	2	Turkish Classical Music Theory and Practice 1	1	2	2
	Accompaniment (Corepetition)	1	0	1	Playing Accompaniment	0	2	1	Guitar Training and Accompaniment 1	1	0	1
					Educational Music Repertoire	2	0	2				
Current/Popular Music	2	0	2	Current and Popular Music	2	0	2					
Music Culture	3	0	3									

(Contd...)

Table 3. (Continued)

	1998	T*	P	C	2006	T	P	C	2018	T	P	C
6 th semester					Musical Hearing, Reading, Writing VI	2	0	2				
	Piano VI	2	0	2	Piano VI	1	0	1				
	Individual Instrument Training VI	1	0	1	Individual Instrument VI	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 6	1	0	1
					Harmony - Counterpoint - Accompaniment IV	2	0	2	Guitar Training and Accompaniment 2	1	0	1
	Choir II	1	2	2	Choir V	1	2	2	Turkish Folk Music Choir 2	1	2	2
	Orchestra/Chamber Music II	2	2	3	Orchestra/Chamber Music II	1	2	2	Orchestra/Chamber Music 2	1	2	2
	Turkish Classical Music	2	0	2	Traditional Turkish Art Music Practice	0	2	1	Turkish Classical Music Theory and Practice 2	1	2	2
					Instrument Maintenance and Repair Information	0	2	1	School Music Repertoire	2	0	2
					Music Forms	2	0	2				
7 th semester					Piano VII	1	0	1				
	Individual Instrument Training VII	1	0	1	Individual Instrument VII	1	0	1	Individual Instrument Training 7	1	0	1
	Choir III	1	2	2	Choir VI	2	2	3	Turkish Classical Music Choir 1	1	2	2
	Orchestra/Chamber Music III	2	2	3	Orchestra/Chamber Music III	1	2	2	Orchestra/Chamber Music 3	1	2	2
					Turkish Music Polyphony	0	2	1				
					Special Teaching Methods II	2	2	3				
	Game, Dance and Music	2	0	2	Game, Dance and Music	0	2	1	Orff Instruments	2	0	2
8 th semester					Choir and Conducting	0	2	1	Turkish Classical Music Choir 2	1	2	2
	Orchestra/Chamber Music and Conducting	1	2	2	Orchestra/Chamber Music and Conducting	1	2	2	Orchestra/Chamber Music 4	1	2	2
					Individual Instrument and Teaching	1	0	1				
					General Approaches in Preschool Music Education	0	2	1				
	Composing Educational Music	2	2	3	Composing Educational Music	2	2	3				
					Piano and Teaching	1	0	1				
	Individual Instrument Training VII	1	0	1								

*T: Theoretical, P: Practice, C: Credit

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the course, which was included as Music Theory and Hearing Education in the 1998 curriculum for the first 3 semesters as 6 hours (4 hours theory + 2 hours practice), was included as a total of 6 semesters in the 2006 curriculum, 4 hours in the first 4 semesters (2 hours theory + 2 hours practice), and 2 hours in the 5th and 6th semesters. The course, which was included as Western Music Theory and Practice 1-2 in the 2018 curriculum, was reduced to 4 hours (2 hours theory + 2 hours practice). It is seen that Turkish Folk Music Theory and Practice 1-2 and Turkish Art Music Theory and Practice 1-2 courses, which were not included in other programs, were added to the 2018 curriculum. The course, which was named as Piano in the 1998 and 2006 programs, was changed to Piano Education in the 2018 program. The first 6 semesters of the 1998 program, 2 hours of theoretical piano lesson was rearranged to be 1-hour theory by upgrading to the first 7 semesters in the 2006 program. In the 2018 program, this course was reduced to 1 hour only in the first 2 semesters. 1 hour in the semester is theoretically included. It is seen that the relevant course is not included in the 1998 and 2018 programs. The course, which is included in the 1998, 2006 and 2018 programs with the name of Individual Instrument Training, is given theoretically for 1 hour for 8 semesters in the 1998 program, while the first 7 semesters are included theoretically for 1 hour in the 2006 and 2018 programs. The course named Individual Instrument and Teaching was added theoretically for 1 hour to the 8th semester of the 2006 program. It is seen that the relevant course is not included in the 1998 and 2018 programs. The course included in the Individual Voice Education title in the 1998 and 2006 programs was changed to Voice Education in the 2018 program. While the relevant course was given as 2 hours theory in the 1st and 2nd semesters in 1998 program, 1 hour was given theoretically in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th semesters in 2006 program. In the 2018 programs, it is seen that the course hour is reduced to 1 hour as in the 1st and 2nd semesters. Mass Voice Education 1-2 course, which is included as 3 hours (1-hour theory + 2 hours practice) in the 3rd and 4th semesters of 1998 program, is not included in the 2006 and 2018 programs. The course, which is called School Instruments in the 1998 program and School Instruments (Guitar-Baglma- Flute) in the 2006 program, is given as the first 3 semesters in both programs, while it is theoretically included in the 1998 program for 2 hours, it is practically included in the 2006 program for 2 hours. It is seen that this course is not included in the 2018 program, but there is only one course on the education of the baglama instrument among the guitar, baglama and flute instruments taught under the name of School Instruments in other programs. In the 3rd and 4th semesters of the 2018 program, 1 hour theoretically included Baglama Education lesson. The course, which was named as Choir in the 1998 and 2006 programs, was changed to Polyphonic Choir in the 2018 program. While the course was given as 3 hours (1 hour theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 5th, 6th and 7th semesters of the program in 1998 program, the 2006 program was given as 2 hours practice in the 2nd semester, 4 hours (2 hours theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 3rd and 4th semesters, 3 hours (1 hour theoretical + 2 hours

practice) in the 5th and 6th semesters, and 4 hours (2 hours theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 7th semester. When the 2018 program is examined, it is seen that the Polyphonic Choir course is included as 3 hours (1 hour theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 1st and 2nd semesters of the program. It is not included in the 3 hours (1 hour theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 8th semester of the 1998 program, and in the 8th semester of the 2006 program as 2 hours applied place and in the 2018 program. It is seen that Turkish Folk Music Choir 1-2 courses, which are not included in the other two programs, are included in the 5th and 6th semesters of the 2018 program as 3 hours (1 hour theoretical + 2 hours practice), and Turkish Art Music Choir 1-2 courses, which are included in the 7th and 8th semesters of the program with the same hour, are added to this program. In the 5th, 6th and 7th semesters of the 1998, 2006 programs, the course under the name Orchestra/Chamber Music in the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th semesters of the 2018 program is included as 4 hours (2 hours theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 1998 program, 3 hours (1 hour theoretical + 2 hours practice) in the 2006 and 2018 programs. The course under Orchestra/Chamber Music and Management, which is included as 3 hours (1 hour theory + 2 hours practice) in the 8th semester of the 1998 and 2006 programs, is not included in the 2018 program. The Accompanying (Corepetition) course, which takes place theoretically for 1 hour in the 5th semester of the 1998 program, takes place theoretically for 2 hours in the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th semesters of the 2006 program. In addition, it is seen that the 2006 program has 2 hours of practical Accompanying course in the 5th semester. In the 2018 program, it is seen that the course called Harmony and Accompaniment is in the 3rd and 4th semesters of the program and is reduced to 2 hours. In addition, it is seen that the course titled Guitar Training and Accompaniment, which is not included in other programs, takes place theoretically for 1 hour in the 5th and 6th semesters of the 2018 program. While 3 hours in the 5th semester of the 1998 program are theoretically included in the 1998, 2006 and 2018 programs, 2 hours in the 1st semester of the 2006 program is given theoretically, and the 2018 program is in the 2nd semester and 2 hours theoretically. It is seen that only the courses named Turkish Folk Music, Turkish Art Music, School Band, Music History included in the 1998 curriculum are not included in the 2006 and 2018 curriculum. It is seen that the courses named Instrument Maintenance Repair Knowledge, Music Forms, General Music History, Traditional Turkish Folk Music, Traditional Turkish Folk Music Practice, Traditional Turkish Art Music, Traditional Turkish Art Music Practice, Turkish Music History, Turkish Music Multiple Voicing, Special Teaching Methods, General Approaches in Preschool Music Education, which are only included in the 2006 program, are not included in the 1998 and 2018 programs. It is seen that the courses named Music Learning and Teaching Approaches, Music Teaching Programs, Western Music History, Orff Instruments, which are not included in the 1998 and 2006 programs, are included in the 2018 program.

Table 5. Vocational courses in 1998, 2006, 2018 music education undergraduate programs

	1998	T	P	C	2006	T	P	C	2018	T	P	C
1 st Semester	Introduction to the Teaching Profession	3	0	3	Introduction to Education Science	3	0	3	Introduction to Education	2	0	2
									Education Psychology	2	0	2
2 nd Semester	School Experience I	1	4	3	Education Psychology	3	0	3	Education Sociology	2	0	2
									Educational Philosophy	2	0	2
3 rd Semester	Development and Learning	3	0	3	Teaching Principles and Methods	3	0	3	Turkish Education History	2	0	2
									Teaching Principles and Methods	2	0	2
4 th Semester	Planning and Evaluation in Instruction	3	2	4	Measurement and Evaluation	3	0	3	Instructional Technologies	2	0	2
									Research Methods in Education	2	0	2
5 th Semester	Instructional Technologies and Material Development	2	2	3	Instructional Technologies and Material Design	2	2	3	Turkish Education System and School Management	2	0	2
									Measurement and Evaluation in Education	2	0	2
6 th Semester	Classroom Management	2	2	3	Classroom Management	2	0	2	Morals and Ethics in Education	2	0	2
	Special Teaching Methods I	2	2	3	Special Teaching Methods I	2	2	3	Classroom Management	2	0	2
7 th Semester	Special Teaching Methods II	2	2	3	Guidance	3	0	3	Teaching Practice 1	2	6	5
	School Experience II	1	4	3	School Experience	1	4	3	Guidance in Schools	2	0	2
8 th Semester	Teaching Practice	2	6	5	Teaching Practice	2	6	5	Teaching Practice 2	2	6	5
	Guidance	3	0	3	Turkish Education System and School Management	2	0	2	Special Education and Inclusion	2	0	2
					Special Education	2	0	2				

was changed to Educational Psychology in the 2006 and 2018 programs. This course was theoretically included in the 1998 and 2006 programs for three hours, while it was reduced to two hours in the 2018 program. The course, which was named as Planning and Evaluation in Teaching for five hours (3 hours theory + 2 hours practice) in the 1998 curriculum, was divided into three hours theoretical Teaching Principles and Methods and 3 hours theoretical Measurement and Evaluation courses in the 2006 curriculum. In the 2018 curriculum, these courses were included as two hours theoretical Teaching Principles and Methods and 2 hours theoretical Measurement and Evaluation in Education. The course, which was held for four hours (2 hours theory + 2 hours practice) in the 1998 curriculum under the name of Instructional Technologies and Material Development, continued with the same name and course time in the 2006 curriculum, and in the 2018 curriculum, the name of the course was changed to Instructional Technologies and reduced to 2 hours. Although material development was extracted from the course name,

material development is included in the course content. As technology develops, more up-to-date information is included in the content of this course. The Classroom Management course in the 1998 program was reduced from four hours to two hours in the 2006 and 2018 programs under the same name. Special Teaching Methods I and Special Teaching Methods II courses, which are included in the 1998 curriculum as four hours (2 hours theory + 2 hours practice), are also included in the 2006 curriculum with the same name and lesson time. However, the Special Teaching Methods II course is included in the field education category in the 2006 curriculum and has a special content for music education. There is no course with this name in the 2018 curriculum. School Experience I and School Experience II courses in the 1998 curriculum consisted of five hours (1-hour theory + 4 hours practice) and this course was included in the 2006 curriculum as five hours again as one semester and 8 hours (2 hours theory + 6 hours practice) Teaching Practice course was added. In the 2018 curriculum, the relevant course

was divided into two semesters as Teaching Practice 1 and Teaching Practice 2 and the course was included as eight hours (2 hours theory + 6 hours practice). The Guidance course in the 1998 curriculum is considered theoretical for three hours. The 2006 curriculum includes the same name and lesson time, and has been changed to two hours in the 2018 curriculum under the name of Guidance in Schools. The Turkish Education System and School Management course, which is theoretical for two hours in the 2006 curriculum, is also included in the 2018 curriculum with the same name and lesson time. This course is not included in the 1998 program. The Special Education course, which is theoretically available for two hours in the 2006 curriculum, is given under the name of Special Education and Inclusion with the same course time in the 2018 curriculum. The courses added in the 1998 and 2006 programs are as follows; Education Sociology, Education Philosophy, Turkish Education History, Research Methods in Education, Ethics and Ethics in Education.

Findings and Comments on the 5th Research Question

In the last sub-problem of the research, expert opinions on 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs were included. In all three training programs, five questions were asked to the instructors who taught about this sub-problem. The most striking of the opinions obtained from the lecturers are given under this sub-problem. The opinions of the lecturers on the programs are as follows;

Question: What are your thoughts on the similarities or differences of 1998, 2006, 2018 music teaching programs?

Programs differ in terms of gains. It can be said that the 2006 program is more effective in cognitive and mobility gains related to Western Music and the 2018 program is more effective for Turkish music. The 1998 program is the least effective among these programs in terms of gains. In terms of content, the 2018 program differs from other programs. The 1998 and 2006 programs are similar in terms of teaching and learning, and 2018 is different from these programs. When all the programs are evaluated, we can say that the 2006 program is the most appropriate program to train more qualified teachers, although there are some deficiencies. (IN3)

In terms of achievements, although the 1998 and 2006 programs are similar, the 2018 program has significant differences compared to these two programs. I think that some field and field knowledge courses in the 2018 program should be reviewed and included in the program. In terms of content, it is thought that the 2018 curriculum draws a partially sufficient picture in terms of the knowledge and equipment that a music teacher should have and the level of gaining the necessary competencies, but the information to be gained in these courses forms the basis of music teaching and puts the musical skills designed to be gained in the framework determined before the service, especially in field knowledge subjects, in a limited position. In terms of learning and teaching, it is thought that the 1998 and 2006 curricula

are in a broader framework in terms of field and field knowledge compared to the 2018 curriculum in terms of vocational music education. (IN5)

1998 music teaching program was a program with very high level of achievements and high-quality aspects. 2006 music teaching program was a program with good achievements. 1998-2006 music teaching programs can be said to be close to each other in terms of achievements. 2018 music teaching program is a low and inadequate program in terms of achievements. Although 2018 music teaching program is partially similar to other years, it can be said that its achievements are low. 1998 music teaching program subjects were broad and well-equipped in terms of content. 2006 music teaching program subjects were good in terms of content. At the same time, it can be said that the 1998-2006 music teaching programs overlap with each other in terms of their content. The 2018 music teaching program does not have a sufficient level in terms of content. It seems to be given as simple and simplified compared to other music teaching programs. (IN7)

The views of the lecturers on the similarities and differences of the three programs are seen above. According to the opinions, the experts believe that the 1998 and 2006 programs are similar in many respects, but the 2018 program is quite different from these programs.

Question: When 1998, 2006, 2018 music teaching programs are compared, what are your thoughts on their strengths and weaknesses?

There is a weakness there because all three of these programs are made by the Council of Higher Education. Although opinions seem to be taken, opinions are not 100% reflected in the program. Even if they are reflected in 20%, the program was prepared one-handed at the rate of 80%. There is nothing good or crippling to say, but we have seen in the process whether the same is applied or not everywhere. In the 98 program, piano is 6 semesters, hearing is 3 semesters. Harmony and musical forms are weak because they are in the hearing class. Individual instrument is strong because it has 8 semesters. Folk music and art music are weak because they are periods. Music is weak because it is a historical period. Considering that an instrument will be taught in school instruments every semester, it is insufficient. Although it was made by the Council of Higher Education in 2006, a little more opinion was received from the teachers. Hearing is strong because it is 6 semesters, piano is strong because it is 8 semesters, it is more functional than 98. We were able to make these additions because we have 25% improvement right in 2006. We added them to the Turkish Folk Music and Turkish Art Music Courses as a semester practice. In 2018, the theory of piano and western music decreased to 1 year. 2018 is a worse program than 1998 in terms of course content. There is no 8th semester instrument. The school music class was abolished and replaced by piano, baglama and guitar lessons for one year. (IN2)

First of all, I do not think that the 2018 program has

strengths here. However, considering the weaknesses, I think that the piano lesson is 1 year, the vocal education lesson, the collective vocal education (choir) lesson hours are low and the students are divided into theoretical and practical courses of traditional music lessons too intensely. I think that the 1998 and 2006 programs are sufficient for traditional music lessons. In fact, I think that Turkish folk music and Turkish art music courses in the 1998 program are sufficient for a teacher candidate. Because after that, the teacher can also increase the equipment himself with the information he received in undergraduate education. We see that there are practice courses in the 2006 program, but I can say that the fact that there are too many traditional music courses in the 2018 program is the weakest aspect of the 2018 program. The part where the 2018 program is strong is the inclusion of elective courses, 1998 and 2006, but in 1998 the student could only take 4 courses. In the 2018 elective program, the student could take other courses both inside and outside the department. As a matter of fact, in each program, orchestra lessons are taught in the same way, but when we look at choir lessons in 1998 and 2006, there was only a program in which (IN6)

The 1998 program came out of nowhere and was a very different program from the past. I don't think the 1998 program has any strengths. It is only possible to talk about the possibility of devoting more time there since some music lessons such as piano and instrument are 2 hours long, but I could not find another strong direction. The 1998 program was a weak program due to obstacles such as hearing, harmony and early hours of some skill lessons such as school experience, courses that were far from analytical thinking until the last year. The 2006 program may be seen as a musically strong program in terms of some musical skills, intensity of basic piano lesson, intensity of hearing lesson, harmonics lesson, choir and orchestra. In this program, elective courses and some general culture courses remained weak. (IN11)

Experts who were consulted about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs stated that the 1998 and 2006 programs were strong in courses such as piano and hearing, but 2018 was a weak program in this respect. They found the increase in the number of Turkish Music lessons with the 2018 program as the strength of this program.

Question: Do you think there are courses that require prerequisites in the 2018 music teaching program? Which courses, if any, require prerequisites?

Instrument education, piano education, hearing education, harmony, traditional Turkish music lessons should be prerequisite. It should not be accepted that the student who could not digest the basic skill should take the course that includes advanced skill. It's like waiting for a child who learns to walk to run 100 meters. (IN8)

Naturally sequential courses (individual instrument, piano) teaching practice I and II, Orchestra and chamber music I, II, III, IV (IN11)

I think there are 3 courses that require prerequisites in the 2018 program, the first is "Western Music Theories and Practices", the second is "Individual Instrument" and the third is "Piano". In addition, I think that "Western Music Theory and Practices" and "Piano" courses should be given during the undergraduate period and "Individual Instrument" course should be given during the VIII semester. (IN5)

Almost all of our experts in the subject of courses that should be prerequisite have focused on the same courses. Piano and individual instrument lessons are courses that they think should be prerequisite for all experts. In addition, they agreed that all applied courses such as hearing education, orchestra and chamber music and traditional Turkish music should be prerequisite.

Question: Do you think there are lessons that need to be added, removed or changed given the 21st century teacher skills?

It is a fact that the piano education course given for 2 semesters in the 2018 music teaching program is extremely inadequate and even the most basic behaviors are not acquired during this period. Again, in the 2018 music teaching program, it is difficult to conduct the course because the most basic behaviors are not acquired in the piano for the harmony-accompanying course given in the 3rd and 4th semesters. Continuity of the piano lesson is mandatory for 6 semesters before the harmonics and accompaniment course. In the 2018 curriculum, it is not possible to carry out Piano Education 2, 4 octave scale studies in the course content, cadence and practice, vocalization of accompanying school songs, and studies for musicality. (IN1)

A course on mobile learning should be introduced in music education. (IN4)

The program should be restructured in terms of field and field education courses, and the course hours should be increased in areas such as sound education, instrument education, piano education, and musical hearing, which students should improve themselves individually. The relevant courses should be structured in such a way that they are trained for at least two years. (IN9)

When the opinions of the instructors about the skills they should have for the 21st century teacher skills are examined, the opinion that today's teacher has higher skills related to piano is the opinion of an expert. Another expert is of the opinion that courses related to mobile learning should definitely be added to the curriculum.

Question: What do you think about the adequacy of the distribution of general culture, vocational knowledge and field education courses in the 2018 music teaching program?

I wrote a report about it. Vocational knowledge is 32%, general culture is 17%, field education is 51%. 51% is extremely inadequate. We fed some of them to general culture and vocational knowledge. We included music culture course in the general culture. We stated the special education method as professional knowledge. By doing this, even if it looks 51%, it's up to 60%. 51% is not science. Make sense of what's going on. For

example, the passing grade should be 65, at least 65%, 20% should be vocational knowledge and 15% should be general culture. The change in this ratio is related to the framework program regulation of the Council of Higher Education. We can't make any changes at this rate. It is unnecessary to explain the general culture to someone at the undergraduate level. We're already giving him the general culture of his field. Students should develop their own general culture. A rate of 17% is too much for general culture courses. (IN2)

When I look at it in terms of achievements, a very logical proportioning field education courses 112 AKTS general culture 42 AKTS vocational knowledge 86 seems very good in terms of distribution, but when we look at it in terms of achievements, there are parts of mb and ae courses that need to be changed. Similarly, we thought that reducing these courses, which should be organized in terms of content, required the student to learn more harmony and we increased the course hours and the course period. This is what we saw as the real deficiency. When we look at the past years, I see that our student quality has decreased with 800 thousand dams. I think that the students who come with 800 thousand dams are lacking in harmony and hearing. (IN6)

When asked about their opinions on the distribution of course diversity, our experts stated that this distribution was not very good and qualified, and there were more qualified distributions in the 1998 and 2006 programs, but the distribution was unbalanced, especially in the 2018 program. In this regard, some universities started to develop their own programs as of 2021 and arranged their distribution according to the distributions that a music teacher would need.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As a result of this research, in which the undergraduate programs of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education were examined, it was determined that elective and compulsory courses varied in each program, and in elective courses, the elective pool was left to universities, but in the 2006 program, there was no elective course, and the program consisted of fixed courses. When the variety of courses and the number of course hours are examined, the 2006 program comes first and this program is followed by the 1998 and 2018 programs.

When the field education courses of the programs are examined, the biggest change is seen in musical hearing and piano lessons. Although there were no major changes in 1998 and 2006 programs and improvement studies were carried out, both courses were reduced to two semesters in 2018 program. This situation, according to expert opinions, caused students to be unable to prepare a sufficient basis for other lessons and their teacher competencies were incomplete. Şahin and Güven (2022), in their study measuring the attitudes of individuals who received piano education in 2006 and 2018 music education undergraduate programs, concluded that the attitudes of students who received education in the 2018 program were negative and found themselves inadequate. Atalay and Kumtepe (2022) Atalay and Kumtepe (2022) emphasized the importance of the hearing

education course in terms of including psychomotor goals, thanks to applied goals such as being able to hear intervals, reading solfege and writing musical dictation along with cognitive goals. It can be said that these psychomotor goals contribute to many lessons in the music department. While the choir course had a similar place in the 1998 and 2006 programs, it was reduced to two semesters in the 2018 program, and the course, which was included in the program as choir and management, was not included in the new program. Bozkaya (2000, p. 131) stated that the choir lesson should be a course in which both the student's collective singing skills develop and the art consciousness matures with works with different style characteristics. The reduction of the choir lesson, which is so important for a music teacher, to two semesters and the lack of education on management were also found to be quite negative in line with expert opinions.

When the three education programs were examined in terms of general culture courses, it was concluded that the basic courses did not change significantly in any program, but distance education was started as of 2018. This has been a big and useful step as part of the developing technology and digital literacy, and it has enabled students to devote more time to practical work during the day. In line with the expert opinions, it was concluded that the contents of the courses in the general culture dimension in the programs should be updated according to today's conditions and courses such as community service practice and mobile learning should definitely be added to the program. According to the results of Tuncer and Çeliköz's (2021) study, examining students' attitudes in the distance education process, although students were undecided that distance education would be the education of the future, the studies examined in this field show that distance education is becoming more widespread and important day by day. This shows that distance education has become permanent in our lives.

Another result obtained from the research is related to the vocational knowledge content of 1998, 2006 and 2018 programs. Accordingly, while the vocational knowledge courses in the 1998 and 2006 curricula are almost the same, the 2018 curriculum is more comprehensive in terms of the number and hours of courses. However, this situation may cause the credits of the courses to be divided and the load of the student to increase compared to the past. Öztürk and Bulut (2021) found similar results in their research on the vocational knowledge course contents of 1998, 2006 and 2018 music education programs. In this respect, these two studies support each other.

As a result, although the 1998, 2006 and 2018 programs are similar in some respects, the hourly distribution of the courses and even the period they are in the program affect the quality of education. Raising teachers who will raise the new generation is a very serious and responsible job. At this point, the investment to be made in the future should be well planned and ensured. In the light of all these examinations, it was concluded that the 1998 and 2006 curricula responded more to the competencies that a teacher should have, while the 2018 curriculum was not accepted by any expert. Many

universities switched to their own curriculum in 2021 before the 2018 education program gave its first graduation, and the standard of education across the country disappeared again. In this respect, the boards should interview the academicians, and the courses, credits, hours and places in the program should be well determined in line with the needs of the teachers and the needs of the age. It should not be forgotten that we are in a digital age, and the digital literacy of music teachers should definitely be taken into consideration. A good future will only be possible with a good education, and a good education will only be possible with a good curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Akarsu, A. H., Yilmazer, A., & Geçit, Y. (2020). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen eğitimi programlarının yapısı: 2006-2018 programlarının karşılaştırılması. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (56), 23-60.
- Akdemir, A. S. (2013). Türkiye’de öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının tarihçesi ve sorunları. *Turkish Studies- International Periodical for the languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(12), 15-28.
- Aran, Ö. C., & Derman, İ. (2020). Fen bilgisi öğretmenliği lisans programının farklı ülkelerin fen bilimleri yeterlikleri açısından incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(3), 723-749.
- Arduç, M. A., Taşkın, G., & Mutlu, F. (2020). Türkiye’de 2018 yılında uygulamaya konulan fen bilgisi öğretmenliği lisans programının 1998 ve 2006 lisans programları ile karşılaştırılması. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 55, 71-94.
- Arıkan, R. (2007). *Araştırma teknikleri ve rapor hazırlama*. (6. Baskı). Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- Atalay, Z. C. & Kumtepe, M. A. (2022). İşitme eğitimi ile çalgı eğitimi ders kitaplarının devrimsel hedefler bakımından incelenmesi, *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences (IJOESS)*, 13(49), 1042-1052.
- Ballantyne, J., & Packer, J. (2004). *Music Education Research*, 6(3), 299-312.
- Bozkaya, İ. (2000). *Eğitim fakülteleri güzel sanatlar eğitimi bölümlerinde uygulanmakta olan yeni müzik öğretmenliği lisans programı üzerine bir değerlendirme*. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(1), 125-133.
- Bozpolat, E., & Tanrıverdioğlu, S. (2020). 2007 ve 2018 Okul öncesi öğretmenliği lisans programlarının karşılaştırmalı analizi. *Turkish Studies - Educational Sciences*, 15(6), 3989-4010.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2020). *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (29. baskı). Pegem Akademi.
- Çelik, Ş. N., & Kasap, S. (2019). Türkiye’de Uygulanan İngilizce Öğretmen Yetiştirme Programları Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Değerlendirme. *YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (YYU Journal of Education Faculty)*, 16(1), 1010-1031.
- Çoban, A. (2010). Türkçe öğretmenliği lisans programlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Studies (Elektronik)*, 5(3), 958-976.
- Dağtekin, A., & Zorluoğlu, S. L. (2019). Güncellenen fen bilgisi öğretmenliği lisans programı hakkındaki akademisyenlerin görüşleri. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(1), 36-53.
- Demir, N., Akbaş, E. E., & Gök, M. (2021). Yenilenen ilköğretim matematik öğretmenliği lisans programı ile ilgili öğretim elemanı görüşleri. *YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (YYU Journal of Education Faculty)*, 18(1), 70-105.
- Demirel, Ö. (2021). *Kuramdan uygulamaya eğitimde program geliştirme*. (30. Baskı). Pegem Yayınevi.
- Deregözü, A. (2020). Geçmişten günümüze almanca öğretmenliği lisans programlarına ilişkin karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma. *Diyalog Interkulturelle Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, 143-161.
- Gökçe, N. N. (2019). *Müzik öğretmeni yetiştirme programı hakkında, öğrencilerin, müzik öğretmenlerinin ve öğretim üyelerinin görüşleri* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Güler, C. (2022). *Finlandiya, Çin, Hollanda ve Türkiye’de uygulanan ilköğretim yabancı dil (İngilizce) eğitim programlarının karşılaştırılması* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Kalyoncu, N. (2004). *Müzik öğretmeni yeterlikleri ve güncel müzik öğretmenliği lisans programı*. (Ed. B. Arslan), 510-525.
- Kara, N., Demir, M. K., Arcagök, S., & Şahin, Ç. (2018). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin mesleki gelişimleri açısından sınıf eğitimi lisans programının yeterliliği. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(19), 1061-1082.
- Karabacak, N. (2022). 2018 sınıf öğretmenliği lisans programı revizyonunun uygulayıcıların gözünden incelenmesi. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 12(2), 574-607.
- Karakaya, F., Adıgüzel, M., Çimen, O., & Yılmaz, M. (2020). 2018 biyoloji öğretmenliği lisans programının öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(1), 122-135.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (20. Baskı). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaymacı, S. (2012). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenliği lisans programlarının içerik değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 2(1), 45-61.
- Küçükahmet, L. (2007). 2006-2007 öğretim yılında uygulanmaya başlanan öğretmen yetiştirme lisans programlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(2), 203-218.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.
- Ocak, İ., & Onur, B. (2019). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci: Giriş, eğitimde bilimsel yöntemleri*. (G. Ocak, Dü.). Pegem Akademi.
- Özmen, Z. K. (2019). 2018 sınıf öğretmenliği lisans programının değerlendirilmesi. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 9(2), 521-548.
- Öztürk, B., & Bulut, F. (2021). 1998-2018 yılları arasında uygulanan müzik öğretmenliği lisans programlarındaki

- meslek bilgisi derslerine yönelik bir inceleme. *TURAN: Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi*, 13(52), 150-155.
- Sağdıç, M. (2020). 2018 yılı coğrafya öğretmenliği lisans programının alan bilgisi, genel kültür ve pedagoji dersleri açısından analizi. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 22(1), 130-144.
- Saraç, A. G. (2006). Program ve müzik eğitimi. *Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6, 111-118.
- Stebler, M. Z., & Aykaç, N. (2019). 2018 Türkçe öğretmenliği lisans programının öğretim elemanlarının görüşleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmesi. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 116-138.
- Şahin, E. (2020). *2006 ve 2018 sosyal bilgiler öğretmenliği lisans programlarının analizi ve akademisyen görüşleri* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Amasya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Amasya.
- Şahin, S., & Güven, E. (2022). Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının 2006 ve 2018 programlarında bulunan piyano derslerine yönelik tutum ve görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 53, 518-539.
- Tokcan, H., & Tangülü, Z. (2019). 2006 ve 2018 sosyal bilgiler öğretmenliği lisans programı üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir analiz çalışması. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 23, 97-119.
- Tonga, D. (2020). Son yirmi yılda Türkiye’de sosyal bilgiler öğretmenliği lisans programları. *Bolu İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(3), 1547-1564.
- Tuncer, Z. & Çeliköz, N. (2021). Uzaktan eğitimle uzaktan ders alan öğrencilerin uzaktan eğitime yönelik tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *International Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences*, 7(39), 598-605.
- Türkmen, U. (2022). *Müzikte bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. 4. Bölüm “Araştırma” (1. Baskı), (Ed. E. F. Türkmen). İzge Yayıncılık.
- Uçan, A. (2018). *Müzik eğitimi: Temel kavramlar-ilkeler-yaklaşımlar ve Türkiye’deki durum*. (Genişletilmiş 4. Baskı). Arkadaş Yayınevi.
- Ulubey, Ö., & Başaran, S. (2019). Evaluation of 2018 initial teacher training programs. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 9(2), 263-300.
- Variş, F. (1997). *Eğitimde program geliştirme, teori ve teknikler* (7. Baskı). Alkım Kitapçılık Yayıncılık.
- Yaman, İ. (2018). 2006 ve 2018 İngilizce öğretmenliği lisans programları üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir değerlendirme. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 76, 149-164.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (Genişletilmiş 6. Baskı), Şeçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yurdakal, İ. H. (2018). Değişen sınıf öğretmenliği lisans program içeriğinin incelenmesi. *Ulakbilge Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(29), 1483-1499.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2007). *Öğretmen yetiştirme ve eğitim fakülteleri (1982-2007) (öğretmenin üniversitede yetiştirilmesinin değerlendirilmesi)*. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjziaPXg-X7AhXcQPEDHXVGAvcQFnoE-CA8QAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.yok.gov.tr%2FDocuments%2FYayinlar%2FYayinlarimiz%2Fogretmen-yetistirme-ve-egitim_fakulteleri.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1MP6aqN3GvstjgEuWU4B7n
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2018). *Öğretmen yetiştirme lisans programları*. https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Kurumsal/egitim_ogretim_dairesi/Yeni-Ogretmen-Yetistirme-Lisans-Programlari/AA_Sunus_%20Onsoz_Uygulama_Yonergesi.pdf (17.10.2022)
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı. (1998). *Eğitim fakültesi öğretmen yetiştirme lisans programları*. <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/egitim-fakultesi-ogretmen-yetistirme-lisans-programlari-mart-1998.pdf> (17.10.2022)
- Zelyurt, H. (2021). 2018 okul öncesi öğretmenliği lisans programının önceki programlarla karşılaştırılması. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(2), 1452-1479 (17.10.2022)