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ABSTRACT

The goal of the study is to develop a scale of “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training Programme” (APTT) for finding out faculty members’ attitudes toward pedagogical teacher training programme. Two study groups (“Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Group” and “Confirmatory Factor Analysis Group”) were employed to develop the scale. The main aim of “Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Group” that consisted of faculty members is to determine the technical properties especially the construct validity and reliability of APPT scale. The aim of “Confirmatory Factor Analysis Group” that consisted of faculty members is to determine whether the factor structure acquired by APPT was confirmed or not. At the end of the analyses, it has been found that 14 items in the scale grouped under one factor. The study shows that “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training Programme (APTT)” is a valid and reliable tool. Using APPT with other data collection instruments about pedagogical teacher training and comparing the attitudes of faculty members with the attitudes of students toward pedagogical teacher training will be beneficial. The final form of the scale measures to which degree Pedagogical Teacher Training Programme is necessary and valuable for the teaching profession.
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INTRODUCTION

Teacher and teacher training which are the most important elements of education have been one of the most important issues of the education system. This is because the success of the education system largely is directly affected by the features of the teachers who will have great knowledge and put it into practice. The training of high-quality teachers also depends on a quality education system that raises the living standards of its citizens. The main determinants of the quality of an education system of a country are the teachers who are practitioners of the system (Şanal & Özen, 2018). The fact that no training model can serve above the quality of the human resource that will run that model makes the training process of teachers a key process for the quality of educational activities at schools (Ataç, 2003).

When the history of teacher training system in Turkey is examined, the most striking improvement came as the result of the foundation of "Darülmuallimin" in 1848 that aimed to train teachers for
“rüştiye” (Ottoman junior high school). When considered this year, the teacher training system in Turkey has a history of 150 years (Aydın, 1998). When teacher training institutions of the Republican era are examined, it is seen that the task of educating teachers to different stages of the formal education has been carried out by education institutions of different types and levels.

In fact, Turkey has attempted to improve the quality of future educators for decades. For this purpose, different policies have been realized and practiced to train teachers at different school levels in Turkey. These policies brought with them an extensive wide range of teacher training practices. They were, “Village teachers (1940-1954)” that trained students and taught modern agricultural methods to the villagers after they were discharged, “Substitute teachers (1961)” that were employed in place of absent teachers for a small fee, “Peace volunteers (1962-1969)” that were composed of American experts came to Turkey in 1962 and taught English until 1970, “Soldier teachers (1987…” whose jobs are teaching profession and work as a teacher to complete their compulsory military service as a teacher after having completed basic military training for a short time, “Correspondence teachers training (1974)” that aimed to offer higher education to high school graduates by making it possible for them to be a teacher during 15 weeks in three years, “Accelerated education (1975-1980)” by which that teachers were trained through 3 month long and “Pedagogical Formation (1970-…””. From time to time, these training practices were also applied in Turkey to reduce the lack of teachers as soon as possible in different periods (Akyüz, 2013; Çelebi, 2014).

Looking at the teacher training programs in today’s Turkey, two types of systems are dominant. According to the legal arrangements made by “The Council of Higher Education” (YÖK) in 2010, students who graduated from faculties of education have the right to work as a teacher. Undergraduate students who graduated from certain departments and successfully completed pedagogical formation education have the right to work as teachers as well (YÖK, 2015).

Among these teacher training practices, the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program that involves teaching pedagogy for the ones that have field education about how to teach their field was established in 1970 and ended in 1998 (Akyüz, 2004; Baki, 2009). It has been begun again partially in 2001, but entirely begun in 2010 (Azar, 2011; Bilir, 2011). The aim of the program is to provide undergraduates with teaching competency. From this point forward, formation programs began to have a great importance in teacher training (Akdemir, 2013; Bikmaz, 2015).

In fact, students attending the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program in Turkey are the ones that did not choose teaching as a first profession and then decided to be a teacher for various reasons. “Pedagogical Formation Certificate Programs” go on in Turkish universities where YÖK has approved the opening and later determines the content of the program. Students attending Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program take courses that are in parallel to courses in education faculty programmes. These courses are composed of both theoretical and applied courses. “Introduction to Education”, “Instructional Principles and Methods”, “Measurement and Evaluation in Education”, “Educational Psychology” and “Classroom Management” are core theoretical courses while “Special Teaching Methods”, “Instructional Technologies and Material Design” and “Teaching Practice” are core applied courses and the programme includes some elective courses. The programme lasts almost a year consisting of two academic semesters or at least seven weeks zip programmes with 25 credits (YÖK, 2015).

One of the most important criteria to ensure teacher competencies is an interest towards the profession. The level of interest demonstrates the positive or negative dimension of attitude. A student teacher with high interest in teaching profession improves a positive attitude toward the profession (Özen, 2017). Student teachers' attitudes toward their vocation are usually related to the belief that they like and adhere to their profession. In addition to that, they are aware of the fact that the profession is necessary and important, therefore they should develop themselves continuously. The attitudes of teachers towards their profession affect their emotions, thoughts and behaviours. In addition, the fact that they fulfil their profession ardently and become a successful teacher results from their attitudes toward the
profession, which is of great importance in terms of developing positive attitudes and qualified teacher training (Temizkan, 2008). Faculty members’ attitudes toward the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Programs are also important because they train future educators.

Reviewing the studies in the field, it is obvious that in studies conducted towards the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program, mostly, teacher candidates’ attitudes toward the “Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program” are analysed (Şenel, 1999; Eraslan & Çakıcı, 2011; Şen & Göğüş, 2011; Özkan, 2012; Dündar & Karaca, 2013; Polat, 2013; Yapıcı & Yapıcı, 2013; Altinkurt, Yılmaz & Erol, 2014; Aykaç, Bilgin, & Toraman, 2015; Önder & Tagay, 2015; Aydin & Aslan, 2016; Taşpınar, Ünal, & Aydin, 2016; Ulubey, Aydin, & Toraman, 2016). In some of these studies, the conclusion reached is that student teachers attending the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program developed positive attitudes towards the profession of teaching (Eraslan & Çakıcı, 2011; Dündar & Karaca, 2013; Altinkurt et al., 2014; Aykaç et al., 2015) while Yapıcı & Yapıcı (2013) and Taşpınar et al. (2016) in their studies found out that student teachers produced more negative metaphors towards teacher concepts. However, research on attitudes of the Faculty Members who lecture within the Pedagogical Formation Training Certification Program towards the programme is limited. Therefore, this study is important in terms of determining the attitudes of faculty members towards the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Programs.

THE PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

In this study, its aim was to develop a scale of “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training” (APTT) that determines the faculty members’ attitudes toward Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program including the psychometric properties (validity and reliability) of the scale. In keeping with this aim, there was an attempt to find out a) the “Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis” results of “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training” scale (APTT) and b) the reliability test results of “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training” scale (APTT).

METHODOLOGY

The aim was to develop a scale for finding out faculty members’ attitudes toward “Pedagogical Teacher Training”. Researchers also investigate how to develop it and describe the psychometric properties (validity-reliability) of this scale.

Participants

The scale development group of this research is composed of two groups. There are different explanations about the sample size for scale development in the literature review. For example, there should be at least 10 cases for each item in the instrument being used Marascuilo & Levin (1983) as cited in Velicer & Fava (1998) the subjects-to-variables ratio should be no lower than 5 as mentioned by Gorsuch (1983) as cited in MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang & Hong (1999) and Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999) who recommends at least 150 - 300 cases, more toward the 150 end when there are a few highly correlated variables, as would be the case when collapsing highly multicollinear variables. In this study, the sample size for both groups (“Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Group”, “Confirmatory Factor Analysis”) was reached as much as possible by taking into account the literature review above.

Group 1

The main aim of “Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Group” that consisted of 196 faculty members who work at universities in different cities of Turkey was to find out the construct validity and reliability of APPT scale.

Of all faculty members, 96 of them were female and the other 100 were male. Faculty members from different status were represented in the sample: Professor (36), associate professor (30), assistant professor (99), research assistants (21), teaching assistant (7), and instructors (3). As for period of service of the faculty members, 77 people have been working in their institutes for 1-10 years, 63 for

Faculty members’ philosophy of doctor are as followed: faculty members from faculty of arts and sciences (29) (e.g. faculty members in fields such as physics, chemistry, literature, history and so on), field educational sciences (73) (e.g. faculty members in fields such as physics, chemistry, literature, history teaching and so on), educational sciences (94), faculty members that train candidate teachers through pedagogical teacher training education (183), and faculty members that did not train candidate teachers through pedagogical teacher training education (13).

Group 2

This group was used to discover if the factor structure acquired by APTT as a result of “Confirmatory Factor Analysis” was confirmed. The participants of this group were the faculty members that work at universities in different cities of Turkey. This group was composed of 154 faculty members.

Of all faculty members, 71 were female and 83 were male. Faculty members from different status were represented in the sample: “Professor (26)”, “Associate Professor (22)”, “Assistant Professor (83)”, “Research Assistants (15)”, “Teaching Assistant (5)”, and “Instructors (3)”. As for the service period of the faculty members, 61 of them have been working in their institutes for 1-10 years, 48 people for 11-20 years, 41 people for 21-30 years, and 4 members who worked for 31 years and above. Different departments were represented in the sample: “Educational Administration and Supervision (14)”, “Curriculum and Instruction (32)”, “Guidance and Psychological Counselling (11)”, “Primary Education (31)”, “Special education (11)”, “Science Education (17)”, “Social Sciences Education (11)”, “Fine Arts Education (5)”, other departments (22).

Faculty members’ philosophy of doctor are as follows: faculty members from faculty of arts and sciences (25) (e.g. faculty members in fields such as physics, chemistry, literature, history and so on), field educational sciences (65) (e.g. faculty members in fields such as physics, chemistry, literature, history teaching and so on), educational sciences (64), faculty members that train candidate teachers through pedagogical teacher training education (141), and faculty members that did not train candidate teachers through pedagogical teacher training education (13).

Scale Development Process

In this study, the steps of the scale development have been followed in the literature of Crocker and Algina (1986), Cohen and Swerdlik (2013), and DeVellis (2014). In this study, scale development steps listed below are as follows: Determining the target audience (faculty members) and objective of the scale (determining faculty members’ attitudes toward pedagogical teacher training programme); Specifying the nature and scope of the features (attitude) intended to be specified in the scale; Writing test items for these features; Revision of the items and turning them into a form; Determining how to score the items and how to analyse the data; Doing a trial application; Determining how to score and analyse the items; Presentation of the real scale based on the results acquired.

Data Collection Instrument

As a data collection instrument, “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training” (APTT) scale was used in the study with the purpose of finding out faculty members’ attitude toward Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program. The literature on Pedagogical teacher training, attitudes, and beliefs was reviewed. Then, the scale was presented to the field experts for their opinions on it. As a result, the scale with 29 items to be rated in 5 levels “strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree” was generated. 15 items were extracted from the scale and 14 items remained as a result of the analysis. These 14 items demonstrated a single factor structure for the scale. The highest score to be received from the
scale is 70, while the lowest score is 14. Items 1, 2, 3 and 9 on the scale are scored by coding reversely. These items confirm that undergraduate students other than education faculties receive pedagogical teacher training. The left items of the scale show that Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program is inappropriate and undergraduate students from only education faculties should become a teacher. When items 1, 2, 3 and 9 on the scale are scored reversely, all the items of the scale show a congruity. Obtaining high score from the scale demonstrates that there is a negative attitude toward pedagogical teacher training program and this program should not be offered because of its creating a feeling of unfairness for the graduate students from faculty of education. Obtaining low score from the scale demonstrates that there is a positive attitude toward Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program.

Analysis of Data

The data acquired from the study were analysed using statistical software. In order to calculate the validity and reliability of APTT, “Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) test”, “Bartlett Sphericity test”, “Varimax Rotation”, “Anti-Image Correlation”, “Cronbach Alpha Coefficient”, and “Confirmatory Factor Analysis” procedures were realized (Büyüköztürk, 2013; Özdamar, 2013).

FINDINGS

Psychometric properties of APTT (validity and reliability)

“Exploratory Factor Analysis” was conducted to examine construct validity of “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training” scale. In order to find out whether or not the data were suitable for factor analysis, “Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) Test” and “Bartlett Sphericity Test” were conducted. In addition, “Varimax Rotation” method was used to determine if there are sub-dimensions in the scale and which items formed these sub-dimensions (Büyüköztürk, 2013; Özdamar, 2013). Before factor analysis, item total correlations were measured. Items numbered 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21 and 27 whose correlation values were below 0.300 were removed from the scale as the values of these items lowly contribute to the faculty members’ attitude toward APTT which will be explained by the scale. In the factor analysis, it is pointed out that each factor should be composed of three items at a minimum. It has been seen that items 3 and 17 made up a factor together, whereas items 28 and 29 made up another factor together. Therefore, those four items were removed from the scale. A total of 15 items were removed from the scale. The psychometric properties about the remaining 14 items are given in Table 1.
Table 1

*Exploratory Factor Analysis and the results of Reliability Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>of Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Anti-Image Correlation</th>
<th>Correlation Loading in Factor Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0,784</td>
<td>0,950</td>
<td>0,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0,694</td>
<td>0,914</td>
<td>0,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>0,764</td>
<td>0,944</td>
<td>0,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>0,719</td>
<td>0,936</td>
<td>0,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>0,769</td>
<td>0,917</td>
<td>0,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>0,876</td>
<td>0,968</td>
<td>0,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td>0,797</td>
<td>0,927</td>
<td>0,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M16</td>
<td>0,869</td>
<td>0,932</td>
<td>0,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18</td>
<td>0,748</td>
<td>0,957</td>
<td>0,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M22</td>
<td>0,802</td>
<td>0,915</td>
<td>0,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M23</td>
<td>0,727</td>
<td>0,914</td>
<td>0,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M24</td>
<td>0,863</td>
<td>0,938</td>
<td>0,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M25</td>
<td>0,915</td>
<td>0,939</td>
<td>0,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M26</td>
<td>0,878</td>
<td>0,928</td>
<td>0,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO = 0,935

Bartlett Sphericity ($\chi^2$) = 3514.520; df=91, p<0.01

Variance accounted for Single Factor = 73,820 %

Cronbach Alpha = 0,960

The construct validity of APTT was identified with the help of principal component analysis. This analysis is also composed of “Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO)” and “Bartlett Test”, which were conducted to make sure that the assumptions of principal components analysis were met by the data set. As seen in Table 1 above, “KMO” value was found to be 0.935. This value should be over 0.50 at a minimum. The acquired “KMO” value shows that the data set is suitable for analysis. The “Bartlett Test” result was [$\chi^2$=3514.520; df=91 (p<0.01)]. The meaningful value was found lower than 0.05. In other words, it means that factor analysis can be realized.

The results of exploratory factor analysis acquired revealed that item-total correlations range from 0.719 to 0.915. The scale explains 74% the variance in the faculty members’ attitude toward Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program under one dimension and this value is at an acceptable level (Büyüköztürk, 2013). It has been found in the “Exploratory Factor Analysis” that the scale showed only one dimension. Therefore, the “Varimax Rotation” method was not conducted (Büyüköztürk, 2013; Özdamar, 2013). As in Figure 1 below, the scree plot graph verifies that the scale is composed of a single dimension.
As a result of the items extracted from the scale, the remaining 14 items were grouped under a single dimension. The numbers left (1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26) were renumbered as (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14). The final form of APPT scale tests the attitude of faculty members toward pedagogical teacher training program. “Tukey Nonadditivity test” was conducted whether or not the scale is collectable. The results were given in Table 2.

Table 2
Cronbach’s Alpha and Additivity Test Results for APPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Variance Root</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>Nonadditivity</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 above shows that the reliability value of the scale is 0.960. In view of scales, 0.70 and higher values of “Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient” indicate high reliability (Özdamar, 2013). This factor shows high reliability level and is also additive in view of scoring (Tukey Nonadditivity p>.05).

Considering the results of “Exploratory Factor Analysis” of APPT, confirmatory factor analysis was realized in order to find out whether it is confirmed or not. The model acquired from the analysis is showed in Figure 2.
As is seen in Figure 2 above, the values of Chi-square and degree of freedom acquired from “Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)” were $\chi^2 = 112.08$, (df=53, $p<.01$), and $\chi^2/\text{sd} = 2.11$ value was obtained. That the value acquired from the selected samples is less than 3 shows a perfect match (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993; Sumer, 2000; Kline, 2005). Therefore, it may be said that the match between the data set and the model acquired in CFA is perfect. The other goodness of fit values acquired from CFA are given in Table 3.

Table 3

Fit indexes acquired from CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>$\chi^2/\text{sd}$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111.07</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 above shows that “RMSEA” value is 0.056 and it is at an acceptable level as “RMSEA” value between 0 and 0.05 shows ideal consistency level. That the “AGFI” value is over 0.80 and the “RMR” value is below can be considered acceptable for consistency with authentic data (Anderson & Gerbing, 1984; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988). Table 3 above shows that “AGFI” value is 0.930 and “RMR” value is 0.060. In view of these values, it may be said that they are at an acceptable level.

According to the results of “Confirmatory Factor Analyses” explained above, it may be said that one-component structure of APTT was confirmed.

**DISCUSSION**

It has been known for a long time that the most important and dynamic element in determining the quality of education is the teachers themselves. The quality of education depends on the teacher to be educated in teacher education programmes (Orakcı, 2015). Turkey has had a lot of experiences in teacher training. In the early years of the Republic, short term programs such as “Reserve Office Teacher” that enabled soldiers to serve as village teachers after being discharged, “Absentee Higher Education Center” enabled teachers to be trained in summer months through short courses and “Accelerated Teacher Training Program” where many teachers were trained through 3 months long were applied (Akyüz, 2004). The problem of quantity in the early years of the Republic has become the problem of quality in terms of teaching profession in Turkey. From time to time, policy makers have
promised undergraduate students other than the graduates from the faculty of education to become a teacher through pedagogical teacher training programmes.

Throughout the years of 2006-2010, pedagogical teacher training programmes were applied in the form of non-thesis master’s programs. Since 2010, these programmes have been given over a very short time frame just like a short course. During the early years, education faculties did not want to offer these programmes and they were applied under the control of the faculty members except the ones from education faculties.

In recent years, faculty members that work at education faculties have given up the tendency not to provide training for undergraduate students within the scope of pedagogical teacher training programme. Moreover, they have come to terms with it. Are these judgments correct or are they just speculations? The answer for it can be given through scientific researches. Above all, this requires the collection of data for it. Therefore, the study has aimed to develop a data collection instrument.

As a result of this study, the fact that the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program allowed students who graduate from faculties other than faculties of education to become teachers through pedagogical formation is generally considered as a negative situation and some of the items in the scale show that teacher training should be done only through faculty of education. These are as follows: “If I were authorized, I would lift Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program in practice.” (item 5), “I would say that the implementation must be ended if I were asked what I thought about Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program.” (item 6) and “It is unfair that those who have Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program to become a teacher have the same rights as those from faculty of education.” (item 7). The fact that faculty members think negatively about the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program can be resulted from the nature and importance of the teaching profession. This finding overlaps with the finding of the study by Köse (2017). Özoğlu (2010) also emphasized in his study that whether or not Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program is satisfactory for teacher competence in the education world is still main problem, which led to the belief that pedagogical formation education will not be professionally sufficient for students to be a teacher.

Teaching profession is a profession that guides societies. As Topçu (2016) said, the direction of the education and the teacher determines the direction of the society. Just as every profession requires field of specialization and duration, so does teaching profession. The way to be a teacher is to complete teacher training programs in faculty of education. Making it possible for those who graduate from faculty of arts and sciences to be a teacher may provide limited benefits for a short term. However, these limited benefits can cause key issues in the long term. Therefore, opening the way for graduates of faculties other than faculties of education to become a teacher should not be authorized and pedagogical formation programs should be lifted for a long term.

To sum up, the task of teacher training should be undertaken by faculties of education with the main aim of training teachers. Opening paths for those who want to be a teacher through pedagogical formation education programs may lead to very serious public worries about training qualified teachers as the requirement and competencies for teachers have been ignored.

CONCLUSION

In this study, a data collection instrument that aims to find out faculty members’ attitudes toward pedagogical teacher training was developed. The scale determines to which degree that having a Pedagogical Teacher Training Programme is necessary and valuable for the teaching profession. A total of 15 items were removed from the scale because their correlation values were low and some of these items failed to comply with the rule that each factor should be composed of three items at a minimum. It was determined that the remaining 14 items form only one factor in terms of the validity and reliability of the scale. The remaining 14 items forming only one factor were renumbered. The reliability value of the scale is above 0.95. The scale accounts for 74 % of the variance in attitude toward pedagogical teacher training. This value is at an acceptable value for the scale development studies in social sciences.
One-factor structure model acquired as a result of “Exploratory Factor Analysis” was also confirmed in “Confirmatory Factor Analysis”.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The scale that measures the value and necessity of Pedagogical Teacher Training Programme for the teaching profession in terms of faculty members can be used in other studies, which will enhance the validity and reliability of the scale with the help of the findings of additional studies. In review of literature, there have been studies that aim to determine the attitudes of students receiving “Pedagogical Teacher Training” (Aydin & Aslan, 2016). There have also been studies that collect data using a scale (Ulubey et al., 2016). Using APTT with other data collection instruments about pedagogical teacher training and comparing the attitudes of faculty members with the attitudes of students toward pedagogical teacher training will make contribute to the field literature. When the applications are considered in Turkey, the belief that pedagogical teacher training programme will be applied in the future is dominant. Therefore, the studies examining the issue in detail and focusing on the role of this training on teacher training are recommended.
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The Scale of Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training Programme (APTT)

Dear participant,

This scale was prepared to determine aims to develop a scale of “Attitude toward Pedagogical Teacher Training” (APTT) that determines the faculty members’ attitudes toward Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program.

You are expected to read each statement (item) in the scale and depending on how much you agree with it you are expected to mark an appropriate choice for you (“Disagree Strongly”, “Disagree Slightly”, “Agree”, “Agree”, “Agree Strongly”) with an X. The data collected will only be used for a scientific study. It is important to openly express your opinions for the reliability of the study. Therefore do not write your name on the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pedagogical formation training is the right of every undergraduate.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>That fact that pedagogical formation training has a wider audience makes me happy.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If I have the authority, I enable the pedagogical formation training to become more widespread.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Each undergraduate student can receive pedagogical formation training.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If have the authority, I abolish pedagogical formation training.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If I were asked my opinion about pedagogical formation training, I would say the application would be finalized.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is unfair that those who do not have aim to become teachers have the same rights as the education faculty students.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is unfair that every undergraduate becomes a teacher.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is possible to internalize the teaching profession with pedagogical formation training.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pedagogical formation training threatens the future.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel uncomfortable that my child will be trained by a teacher trained in pedagogical formation training in the future.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pedagogical formation training is unnecessary because it serves to take certificate for money.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Education faculty students feel the sense of injustice about pedagogical formation training.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pedagogical formation training reduces teacher quality in teacher education.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>