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Abstract
This article aims to arrive at an understanding of in-service language teachers’ perceptions of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors in relation to Turkish Foreign Language Education context. More specifically, the researcher aims to reveal the categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors that have been regarded more important by in-service English language teachers who work for primary, secondary and tertiary level institutions as well as reviewing the suitability and applicability of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors for the Turkish context. Adopting a quantitative and quasi-qualitative research design, this study utilized the 195 self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL as the items of the questionnaire in the form of a ‘5 point Likert-type scale’ and an open-ended question has been added as the 196th item to collect qualitative data. The means of the in-service English language teachers’ answers have been computed for the whole document and for the categories of the self-assessment descriptors via descriptive statistics involving mean and frequency analyses. As a second step, the distribution of the data has been analyzed via ‘Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness-of-Fit Test’. As the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, rather than a parametric test, has been employed in order to find out the level of differences between and among the groups of in-service English language teachers. Additionally, ‘Kruskal-Wallis H Test’ has been conducted and ‘pairwise comparisons’ have been performed as a last step in order to reveal the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL that have been attached meaningfully different importance by in-service English language teachers working for different levels of institutions. The findings of this study indicate that the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL have largely been welcomed by in-service language teachers in Turkish context.
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1. Introduction

Thanks to the encouragement provided by factors such as globalization, international and inter-continental mobility, technology, trade and economy as well as scientific research and tourism, the significance of teaching and learning foreign languages has been recognized by all the stakeholders including learners, teachers, parents, educational administrators and policy makers (Sarıçoban, 2001). As a direct consequence of the ‘global village’ phenomenon, Europe has evolved into a multilingual region and “more and more Europeans are using other languages instead of or in addition to their official ‘national’ language” (Broeder & Wijk, 2012, p. 16). In this context, the urgent necessity of training and employing qualified and successful foreign language teachers has emerged. The European Union (EU) has recognized and promoted the increasing existence of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism across the continent due to the fact that housing and employing plurilingual and pluricultural citizens will most possibly yield social, technological, and financial benefits. Accordingly, the Council of Europe (CoE) has encouraged and supported the publication of such documents as the ‘Common European Framework of Reference for Languages’ (CEFR), the ‘European Language Portfolio’ (ELP), the ‘European Profile for Language Teacher Education’ (EPLTE), the ‘European Profiling Grid’ (EPG), and the ‘European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages’ (EPOSTL) with the aim of improving and harmonizing foreign language and foreign language teacher education within Europe.

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

The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) is a document that was developed by a team of teacher educators from five different countries with the main aim of harmonizing language teacher education throughout Europe by building on existing documents published by the Language Policy Division of the CoE such as the CEFR, the ELP, and the EPLTE (Burkert & Schwienhorst, 2008; Newby, 2011; 2012a). As a first step, the project team aimed to address the content of teacher education with a view to identifying ‘core competences’. Secondly, they formulated corresponding didactic competence descriptors related to foreign language teaching; and finally, these descriptors have been embedded in a portfolio to encourage the users to reflect on their knowledge, skills and values (Newby, 2007). Since its publication in 2007, the EPOSTL has been translated into their local languages by the member states and it is currently downloadable in .pdf file format (see https://www.ecml.at/tabid/277/PublicationID/16/Default.aspx) in such languages as Hungarian, Spanish, Polish, Italian, Lithuanian, Greek, Croatian, Russian, Arabic, Romanian, Japanese, and Persian as well as English, French, and German (Newby, 2011). The EPOSTL has been defined as

...a document for students undergoing their initial teacher education. It will encourage you to reflect on your didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, helps you to assess your own didactic competences and enables you to monitor your progress and to record your experiences of teaching during the course of your teacher education (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 5).

Rather than linguistic and/or pedagogical skills, the EPOSTL is directed at didactic skills of student teachers of languages because it has been thought that the arrangement and organization of teacher education programs vary greatly among different countries. As can be understood from the definition, the EPOSTL has originally been published with student teachers of languages in mind; however, it should not go without saying that it can also be utilized in in-service language teachers’ professional development processes (Burkert & Schwienhorst, 2008; Çakır & Bağsız, 2012; Heyworth, 2013; Ingvarsdóttir, 2011; Jimbo, et al., 2010; Mirici & Hergüner, 2015; Newby, 2012b; Newby, et al., 2011; Velikova, 2013). The EPOSTL consists of ‘introduction’, ‘personal statement’, ‘self-assessment’, ‘dossier’, ‘glossary of terms’, ‘index’, and ‘users’ guide’ sections. Self-assessment section contains 195 descriptors, which can be viewed as “…a set of core competences which language teachers should strive
to attain” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 5). At the heart of the EPOSTL, 195 self-assessment descriptors have been grouped under seven general categories (namely; context, methodology, resources, lesson planning, conducting a lesson, independent learning, and assessment).

Concepts such as learner/teacher autonomy, reflection, plurilingualism, pluriculturalism, life-long learning, and alternative assessment have been highlighted throughout the EPOSTL. The fact that the EPOSTL is grounded on such consistent theories of learning and teaching as learner autonomy and reflection, social constructivist approaches (Velikova, 2013) and inter-cultural awareness as well as practical methodological issues such as introducing topics, instituting a positive atmosphere, handling a reading text, and developing an appropriate test (Heyworth, 2013) enables the users to bring theory and practice together in a systematic fashion. Furthermore, the EPOSTL makes it possible for the users to familiarize themselves with the rationale behind other European documents such as the CEFR and the ELP (Mirici & Hergüner, 2015).

1.2. Council of Europe Documents in Turkish Context

As a candidate country to the EU since 1997, Turkey aims to understand and apply the most modern educational trends and reforms adopted by the EU member countries (Büyükgöze, 2015). To start with, Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE) signed the treaty at the 20th Session of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the CoE, Krakow, Poland, 15-17 October 2000 and agreed to utilize the CEFR for foreign language education curricula across the country (Mirici & Hergüner, 2015). As a member of the European Council, Turkey has embraced the policy of achieving European standards in every field, which means that implementing foreign language teacher education policies that have been elaborated by the CoE has become a must for Turkey (Mirici, 2015).

Several studies have been conducted in Turkey as to the perception and implementation of the EPOSTL and other CoE publications. Çakır and Balçikanlı (2012) investigated the contribution of the EPOSTL to language teacher autonomy and argued that the EPOSTL makes it possible to compare the contents of teacher education programmes nationwide and across Europe as well as fostering reflection, self-assessment, and awareness. Moreover, integration of the EPOSTL into teacher education programmes and using the EPOSTL as an online self-assessment tool have been advocated by Çakır and Balçikanlı (2012). Hişmanoğlu (2013) pointed to the high level of CEFR awareness and willingness for a CEFR-based English Language Teacher Education (ELTE) curriculum among pre-service teachers of English, arguing that the EPOSTL may function as a systematic tool for implementing the fundamental principles provided by the CEFR. In a similar vein, Mirici and Hergüner underscore the necessity of introducing “…the use of the EPOSTL to students in foreign language teacher training departments in Turkey” (2015, p. 2). However, according to Mirici (2015), it is not possible to speak of a widespread implementation of the EPOSTL yet although it has been embedded in the ‘Special Teaching Methods I’ courses in many English Language Teaching (ELT) departments. In a similar vein, Su Bergil (2015) aimed to define the didactic competency levels of ELT department students at Hacettepe University by carrying out a complementary study on the EPG and the EPOSTL and argued that the EPOSTL “…is a useful tool which can be used for English language teacher education in Turkey” (Su Bergil, 2015, p. vi). In another study conducted by Okumuş and Akalın (2015) with the aim of determining the views of the student teachers on the integration of the EPOSTL into Methodology (Special Teaching Methods) course, it has been observed that the participants welcomed the idea of incorporating the EPOSTL into the course and assumed that the EPOSTL would help them see their weaknesses and strengths more accurately.

As to in-service foreign language teacher evaluation in Turkey, Higher Education Council (HEC) teacher evaluation rubric has been put into use; however, Bergil and Sarıçoban (2016) draw attention to
the inadequacy of the HEC’s teacher evaluation rubric when compared to the EPG in assessing prospective English language teachers’ qualifications and argue that the “EPG has significant effects on prospective EFL teachers in that it can be proposed to use commonly in English language teacher education instead of the Council of Higher Education’s assessment form for prospective teacher education” (Bergil & Sarıçoban, 2016, p. 206).

1.3. Significance of the Study

It is not possible to refute that good education cannot be achieved without qualified teachers; therefore, proper training and education of teachers is of utmost importance for this purpose. However, the issues of what proper training and education of teachers involves, what competences a teacher should have, and what the criteria are to be employed in the process of evaluation of teachers are hard to specify. In this respect, the EPOSTL, a document that was developed for the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) of the Council of Europe (CoE), offers a viable solution in that it aims to harmonize language teacher education across Europe by building on existing documents published by the Language Policy Division of the CoE such as the CEFR, the ELP, and the EPLTE (Burkert & Schwienhorst, 2008; Newby, 2011; 2012b). When its overall impact is evaluated considering factors such as its dissemination, current use, flexibility and global effectiveness, it can be argued that the EPOSTL has generally been appreciated by all its users (Newby, et al., 2011). Its sphere of influence has even transcended Europe and the Japanese have produced two Japanese versions of the EPOSTL (JAPOSTL, JAPOTL) to be employed in pre-service and in-service teacher education, respectively (Newby, 2012b).

As to the reception of the EPOSTL in Turkish context, there have been several recently published studies (such as Bergil & Sarıçoban, 2016; Çakır & Balçıkanlı, 2012; Hişmanoğlu, 2012; Hişmanoğlu, 2013; Mirici & Hergüner, 2015; Okumuş & Akalın, 2015; Su Bergil, 2015) on the use of the EPOSTL in pre-service foreign language teacher education in Turkish context. However, the quality and quantity studies on the use of EPOSTL for in-service foreign language teachers in Turkey are far from satisfactory. Accordingly, this study aims to arrive at an understanding of in-service language teachers’ perceptions of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors in relation to Turkish FLE context. The main reason for this necessity is to specify which descriptors in the self-assessment section of the EPOSTL will be perceived as important for Turkish context and the reasons underlying this situation.

1.4. Research Questions

In-service English Language Teachers working for primary, secondary, and tertiary level institutions have been included into the study as participants and their perceptions of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors have been gathered by using a quantitative and a quasi-qualitative research design. Accordingly, this study aims to investigate the following research questions:

R.Q.1. What is in-service English language teachers’ overall perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors in Turkish context?

R.Q.2. Which categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors will be perceived as more/less important by in-service English language teachers in Turkish context?

R.Q.3. Which categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors will be perceived as more/less important by in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and/or tertiary level institutions in Turkish context?

R.Q.3.1. Are there any significant differences in the perceptions of the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL by in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and/or tertiary level institutions in Turkish context?
R.Q.4. What descriptors are missing in the EPOSTL self-assessment section according to in-service English language teachers in Turkish context?

2. Method

The aim of this research is to arrive at an understanding of the perceptions of in-service English Language Teachers on the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors in relation to Turkish Foreign Language Education (FLE) context. Accordingly, a questionnaire in the format of a ‘5 point Likert-type scale’ (1: unimportant, 2: of little importance, 3: moderately important, 4: important, 5: very important) has been employed with the aim of gathering relevant quantitative data. In addition, an open-ended question has also been included in the questionnaire, which renders this study quasi-qualitative. The mean scores of the in-service English language teachers’ answers for the 195 items forming the self-assessment section of the EPOSTL and for the categories of the self-assessment descriptors have been analyzed using descriptive statistics via SPSS statistical package version 23. The findings have been given in numbers and tables and the results have been discussed.

2.1. Sample/Participants

The technique of ‘convenience sampling’ (Dörnyei, 2007; Nunan, 1992) has been adopted in this study in that the participants have been selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher. The participants of the study comprises of in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and tertiary level institutions in Isparta, a city in the southern part of Anatolia. For primary and secondary levels, English language teachers working for state schools in Isparta and for tertiary level, English language instructors working for Isparta Suleyman Demirel University have been contacted and a total of 75 teachers/instructors have agreed to participate in this study. In the first part of the questionnaire, demographic data of the participants have been obtained.

Table 1. Distribution of Participants in terms of Type of School They Work at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Institution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. summarizes the distribution of in-service English language teachers in terms of the type of school they work at. As can be seen, 18 (24 %) of the in-service English language teachers work at primary level schools, 32 (42.7 %) of the in-service English language teachers work at secondary level schools, and 25 (33.3 %) of the in-service English language teachers work at a tertiary level institution.

2.2. Instrument(s)

In line with the aim of this research, a quantitative and quasi-qualitative research design has been employed by the researcher to arrive at an understanding as to in-service English language teachers’ perceptions of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors. As Dörnyei has stated, “quantitative research involves data collection procedures that result primarily in numerical data which is then analyzed primarily by statistical methods” (2007, p. 24). Questionnaires are commonly used in quantitative
research and this study employs a questionnaire in the format of a ‘5 point Likert-type scale’ with the aim of gathering relevant quantitative data. In addition, for the quasi-qualitative dimension of the study, an open-ended question has been included at the end of the questionnaire for the in-service English language teachers to write down any missing descriptors for Turkish context.

The first section of the questionnaire aims to collect demographic information about the participant in-service English language teachers. The second section of the questionnaire contains 195 self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL in a table and the cells next to each descriptor have been arranged in the format of a ‘5 point Likert-type scale’. The wording of the descriptors within the EPOSTL follows the pattern of ‘I can …’; however, as the aim of this study is to arrive at an understanding of in-service English language teachers’ perceptions of the document rather than encouraging in-service English language teachers to assess themselves, the wording of the questionnaire has been slightly modified. More precisely, instead of ‘I can …’ pattern, gerund phrases (Ving) have been employed in the wording of the descriptors. Additionally, in-service English language teachers are asked to express their opinion by putting a cross (X) for each of the items into the appropriate cell in the table.

In the final part of the questionnaire, in-service English language teachers are encouraged to add any other competence descriptors that, in their opinion, have not been covered by the questionnaire in relation to their particular context. As the participants of the study are in-service English language teachers, the questionnaire was not translated into Turkish; however, the researcher explained the rationale and content of the EPOSTL as well as the concepts that have been frequently employed throughout the EPOSTL before the participants started filling in the questionnaire. In addition, the researcher was present while the in-service English language teachers filled in the questionnaire to answer any questions and clear any misunderstandings.

The EPOSTL has been developed by a team of teacher educators and aims to harmonize language teacher education across Europe. Although the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL have been applied and evaluated by various previous researchers, the reliability level of the data collection instrument has been re-evaluated for the context in which the present study has been conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Reliability Coefficient of Data Collection Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 2., the reliability level of the data collection instrument is .988, which indicates that the data collection instrument has a high reliability as scales in social sciences are to have at least .70 reliability statistics.

2.3. Data Collection Procedures

Throughout the process of data collection, the researcher contacted in-service English language teachers in person and explained the importance and necessity of their participation in the study. The questionnaire consists of 15 pages and there are more than 3000 words to be read and processed by the in-service English language teachers. The completion of the questionnaire by an in-service English language teacher took nearly one hour on average; therefore, some of the teachers the researcher had contacted refused to participate in this study due to the bulkiness of the questionnaire. As a result, the total number of in-service English language teachers in this study from primary and secondary level schools is 50 although the researcher has contacted more than 100 English language teachers. As to the
tertiary level, the total number of in-service English language teachers is 25. As the researcher himself works for Suleyman Demirel University, he contacted his colleagues working for the School of Foreign Languages and the ELT Department of the Faculty of Education.

2.4. Data Analysis

Following the process of data collection, the data has been analyzed by using SPSS statistical package version 23. Descriptive statistics such as mean and frequency (percentages) have been employed with the aim of describing the data and presenting statistical information as to the participant in-service English language teachers’ demographic background. In the second part of the questionnaire, in-service English language teachers have been asked to give their opinions by putting a cross (X) into a cell in the table which contains the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors and the cells have been organized in the format of a ‘5 point Likert-type scale’. In-service English language teachers’ perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors is aimed to be specified considering their ratings. For the first four (including the sub-research question) research questions, the means of the in-service English language teachers’ answers have been computed for the whole document and for the categories of the self-assessment descriptors employing mean and frequency analyses because descriptive statistics is to be employed in order to expose “…general tendencies in the data and the overall spread of the scores” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 213).

For the sub-research question (see R.Q.3.1.), the distribution of the data has been analyzed via ‘Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness-of-Fit Test’ and it has been found that the distribution of the data is not normal. Therefore, rather than a parametric test, a non-parametric test has been employed in order to find out the level of differences between and among the groups of in-service English language teachers. Moreover, as the in-service English language teachers have been classified into more than two groups, ‘Kruskal-Wallis H Test’ has been conducted and ‘pairwise comparisons’ have been performed as a last step in order to identify the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL that have been attached meaningfully different importance by in-service English language teachers working for different levels of institutions.

3. Results and Discussion

In this part of the article, the research questions will be dealt with separately under sub-headings. In addition, the results of the analyses for each research question will be provided and their implications will be discussed.

3.1. What is in-service English language teachers’ overall perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors in Turkish context?

The EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors consist of 7 main categories, 31 sub-sections, and 195 descriptors and they are centered on concepts such as reflection, self-assessment, interculturality, lifelong learning, autonomy, and plurilingualism. Many of these concepts are quite new and innovative in the field of Foreign Language Teaching. It has been hypothesized by the researcher that many of the participants who have not attached sufficient importance to their professional development may have unsatisfactory or no acquaintance with these concepts, and therefore; their overall perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors would be meaningful. Table 3, below clearly shows that in-service English language teachers’ overall perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors has been positive.
As can be seen in Table 3., in-service English language teachers’ overall perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors is 4.13 out of 5. In other words, in-service English language teachers’ overall rating of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors is nearly 83% and, in line with the wording of the questionnaire, in-service English language teachers have regarded the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors ‘very important’. It would not be wrong to assume that in-service English language teachers who have participated in this study welcomed the core principles of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors and perceived them in a positive manner. This does not come to mean that in-service English language teachers always practice the principles suggested by the EPOSTL in their classes as teachers “…sometimes do not practice what they preach” (Graves, 2009, p. 122). However, for in-service English language teachers, being aware of what is useful and what is not useful in their classroom practices is something that deserves appreciation. In-service English language teachers who have participated in this study may not be practicing the principles of the EPOSTL in their classes and they may have welcomed the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors possibly owing to ‘social desirability bias’ (Dörnyei, 2007). Anyway, the findings clearly indicate that their theoretical viewpoint is compatible with the rationale of the EPOSTL.

### 3.2. Which categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors will be perceived as more/less important by in-service English language teachers in Turkish context?

The second research question of this study aims to identify the categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors that have been perceived as more/less important by in-service English language teachers in Turkish context. Table 4. below shows the importance attached to each category in ascending order. The category of ‘independent learning’ has been regarded as the least important and ‘conducting a lesson’ has been seen as the most important. Between these two, the ascending order of the other categories is ‘assessment’, ‘context’, ‘resources’, ‘methodology’ and ‘lesson planning’.

### Table 4. Importance Attached to Categories of the EPOSTL in Ascending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error of Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c6</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c7</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c3</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c2</td>
<td>4275</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c4</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c5</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c1: Context, c2: Methodology, c3: Resources, c4: Lesson Planning, c5: Conducting a Lesson, c6: Independent Learning, c7: Assessment)

Although all categories of the EPOSTL have been regarded as ‘very important’ (at least 4.02 out of 5.00), the actual in-class performance has been seen as the most important skill of a language teacher by in-service language teachers while developing independent learning skills of the learners has been
considered as the least important. Understandably, the most direct indicator of a language teacher’s performance is his/her way of ‘conducting his/her lesson’; however, it should not be overlooked that skills such as being aware of the peculiarities of a particular ‘context’, the ‘resources’ available, and the appropriate ‘assessment’ procedures among others contribute to an effective instruction to a great extent.

3.3. Which categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors will be perceived as more/less important by in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and/or tertiary level institutions in Turkish context?

In-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and tertiary level institutions have been included within the study. As can be seen in Table 5, the most important category of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors for all groups is ‘Conducting a Lesson’ whereas the least important category for in-service teachers working for primary level schools is ‘Context’; for those working for secondary level schools is ‘Assessment’; and for in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions is ‘Independent Learning’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>sub section</th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>c2</th>
<th>c3</th>
<th>c4</th>
<th>c5</th>
<th>c6</th>
<th>c7</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c1: Context, c2: Methodology, c3: Resources, c4: Lesson Planning, c5: Conducting a Lesson, c6: Independent Learning, c7: Assessment)

In line with the wording of the questionnaire, the categories of ‘Context’ and ‘Assessment’ have been regarded ‘important’ while the other categories have been considered ‘very important’ by in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions. The ages of the students in primary level institutions in Turkey range from 5 years old to 14 years old; therefore, the characteristics of the context needs to be recognized and paid attention to by the teachers working at primary level schools.
because learners’ ages, interests, motivations, and cognitive and affective needs are covered by the descriptors within the category of context. On the other hand, the categories of ‘Lesson Planning’ and ‘Conducting a Lesson’ have been perceived to be relatively more important than the others by in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions, which implies that a properly planned and implemented period of instruction is the indicator of a competent teacher. However, all the other descriptors listed below the other categories are the building stones for effective and successful instruction.

As to the findings related to in-service English language teachers working for secondary level schools, the order of categories from the least to the most important is as follows: ‘Assessment’, ‘Independent Learning’, ‘Context’, ‘Methodology’, ‘Resources’, ‘Lesson Planning’, and ‘Conducting a Lesson’. It should be noted that all categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors have been regarded ‘very important’ (ranging from 4.1 to 4.26 out of 5) by teachers working for secondary level schools. Brown (2004) maintains that assessment is an integral part of teaching; however, it can be assumed from the findings that assessment has not been given due significance by in-service teachers from secondary level schools owing to the fact that ‘Assessment’ is the least important and ‘Conducting a Lesson’ is the most important categories for teachers from secondary level schools.

In a similar fashion, the order of categories from the least to the most important for in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level schools is as follows: ‘Independent Learning’, ‘Assessment’, ‘Lesson Planning’, ‘Resources’, ‘Context’, ‘Methodology’, and ‘Conducting a Lesson’. The mean of scores for the category of ‘Independent Learning’ is 3.91 out of 5 (78 %), implying that it has been regarded ‘important’ while the other categories have been regarded ‘very important’ by in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level institutions. Accordingly, the learners attending tertiary level schools are expected to be more autonomous with more advanced self-studying skills and they need to take part in projects and portfolio works supported by virtual learning opportunities and extra-curricular activities. Taking this requirement into account, it is surprising that the category of ‘Independent Learning’ has been perceived relatively less important by in-service English language teachers.

3.4. Are there any significant differences in the perceptions of the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL by in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and/or tertiary level institutions in Turkish context?

As can be seen in Table 6., significant and meaningful differences in terms of their perceptions between in-service English language teachers working for tertiary and secondary level institutions on descriptors 8, 75, and 79; between in-service English language teachers working for tertiary and primary level institutions on descriptors 34, 69, and 123; and between in-service English language teachers working for secondary and primary level institutions on descriptor 67 have been identified as a result of the analyses conducted. More precisely, in-service English language teachers working for secondary level institutions attached meaningfully more importance to the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors 8, 75, and 79 than those working for tertiary level institutions; in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions attached meaningfully more importance to the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors 34, 69, and 123 than those working for tertiary level institutions; and in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions attached meaningfully more importance to the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptor 67 than those working for secondary level institutions.
Table 6. Differences in the Perceptions of the Self-Assessment Descriptors of the EPOSTL by In-service English Language Teachers Working for Primary, Secondary, and/or Tertiary Level Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Sample1-Sample2</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Test Statistic</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Adj. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>tertiary-secondary</td>
<td>12.852</td>
<td>5.191</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>tertiary-primary</td>
<td>19.137</td>
<td>6.447</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>secondary-primary</td>
<td>14.599</td>
<td>5.918</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>tertiary-primary</td>
<td>14.956</td>
<td>6.146</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>tertiary-secondary</td>
<td>16.460</td>
<td>5.407</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>tertiary-secondary</td>
<td>14.024</td>
<td>5.452</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>tertiary-primary</td>
<td>15.799</td>
<td>6.384</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. shows the comparison of differences in the perceptions of the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL by in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary, and/or tertiary level institutions. First of all, descriptor 8 (under the category of ‘Context – Aims and Needs’ in the EPOSTL) is formulated as “I can take into account the cognitive needs of learners (problem solving, drive for communication, acquiring knowledge etc.)” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 16). Although both groups of teachers consider it ‘very important’, this descriptor is 4.2 out of 5 important for in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions whereas it is 4.63 out of 5 important for those working for secondary level institutions. Such cognitive needs of learners as problem solving and acquiring knowledge are meaningfully less important for in-service teachers working for secondary level institutions. Nevertheless, in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions should not disregard the fact that all learners have cognitive needs that are to be catered for, though in differing aspects and levels. More specifically, tertiary level students also need to develop their problem solving skills and they have a great desire to communicate.

Descriptor 34 (under the category of ‘Methodology – Speaking/Spoken Interaction’ in the EPOSTL) is as follows: “I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and help them to use stress, rhythm and intonation” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 22). In-service teachers working for primary level institutions consider this descriptor ‘very important’ with an average grade of 4.17 out of 5 while in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level institutions regard this descriptor ‘important’ with an average grade of 3.32 out of 5 (see Table 7.). Although intelligibility rather than native-like proficiency in speaking is seen satisfactory by some professionals (Jenkins, 2000), suprasegmental features of phonology such as stress, rhythm and intonation, as has been highlighted by descriptor 34, should not be disregarded.

Another descriptor that features a meaningful difference between two groups of in-service English language teachers is descriptor 67 (under the category of ‘Methodology – Grammar’ in the EPOSTL), formulated as “I can deal with questions learners may ask about grammar and, if necessary, refer to appropriate grammar reference books” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 27). In-service teachers working for secondary level institutions consider this descriptor ‘important’ with an average grade of 3.78 out of 5 whereas in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions regard this descriptor ‘very important’ with an average grade of 4.33 out of 5. Learners of all ages may ask questions about grammar; however, primary level students are more unlikely than learners of other levels and ages to ask questions about grammar since such an attitude is at odds with the cognitive development of young children. In cognitive terms, children are not capable of performing such formal operations until the age of 11 (Brown, 2007). Additionally, employing metalinguistic explanations and
deductive/explicit grammar teaching techniques will not work with primary level learners and such a skill would possibly be needed more often by in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level institutions.

Another descriptor that embodies a meaningful difference between two groups of in-service English language teachers under the category of ‘Methodology - Grammar’ in the EPOSTL is descriptor 69 formulated as “I can evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities, which support learning and encourage oral and written communication” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 27). Although both groups of teachers consider it ‘very important’, this descriptor is 4.08 out of 5 important for in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions whereas it is 4.61 out of 5 important for those working for primary level institutions. Rather than teaching grammar for the sake of itself, language teachers need to relate grammar to real-life communicative examples because “grammar includes all language skills, and the main objective of teaching grammar is to open the doors to the actual use of the target language for communicative purposes” (Sançoban, 2001, p. 37). Therefore, the interrelationship between grammar and the context should be built for learners at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels.

Descriptor 75 under the category of ‘Methodology - Culture’ in the EPOSTL, worded as “I can evaluate and select a variety of texts, source materials and activities which make learners aware of similarities and differences in sociocultural ‘norms of behaviour’” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 29), also bears meaningful differences. More specifically, in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions consider this descriptor ‘important’ with an average grade of 3.52 out of 5 whereas in-service English language teachers working for secondary level institutions regard this descriptor ‘very important’ with an average grade of 4.22 out of 5. Similarly, descriptor 79 under the same category, formulated as “I can evaluate and select activities which enhance the learners’ intercultural awareness” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 29), has also been regarded less important by teachers working for tertiary level institutions. This descriptor is 3.56 out of 5 important for in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions whereas it is 4.22 out of 5 important for those working for secondary level institutions. Furthermore, descriptor 123 (under the category of ‘Conducting a Lesson – Content’ in the EPOSTL), formulated as “I can relate the language I am teaching to the culture of those who speak it” (Newby, et al., 2007, p. 40), has been regarded less important by in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions. Strictly speaking, in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions consider this descriptor ‘important’ with an average grade of 3.64 out of 5 whereas in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions regard this descriptor ‘very important’ with an average grade of 4.33 out of 5. Although the concept of ‘culture’ has mainly been integrated into the category of ‘Methodology’ as a further sub-section within the EPOSTL, it has also been deployed across the document owing to its significance in learning a second/foreign language. In a similar fashion, the importance of culture in language learning has been highlighted by Brown as follows:

A language is a part of a culture, and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven so that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture. The acquisition of a second language … is also the acquisition of a second culture (2007, pp. 189-190).

In short, foreign/second language learning should be regarded as a process of enculturation and the current model of education should aim to develop the Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) of learners by promoting their awareness of cultural differences, providing them with practical strategies to tackle these differences (Alptekin, 2002). The fact that in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level institutions regard these three culture-related descriptors less important than their secondary and primary level institution working counterparts is disappointing because international mobility is easier for and more common in tertiary level learners thanks to opportunities such as Erasmus Student Exchange Program.
Table 7. Comparison of Differences in the Perceptions of the Self-Assessment Descriptors of the EPOSTL by In-service English Language Teachers Working for Primary, Secondary, and/or Tertiary Level Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Level of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. What descriptors are missing in the EPOSTL self-assessment section according to in-service English language teachers in Turkish context?

The total number of the self-assessment descriptors in the EPOSTL is 195 and almost every aspect of a language teacher’s profession has been tried to be covered. Nevertheless, the researcher has aimed to investigate if there are any competencies that have not been covered by the descriptors and included an open ended question as the 196th question into the questionnaire. It has also been thought that this open-ended question would add a quasi-qualitative dimension to the study. The question has been formulated as “Are there any other competences for your context that have not been covered by this questionnaire? What are they?” and enough time and space has been allotted for the in-service English language teachers to express their ideas. Unfortunately, out of the 75 in-service English language teachers who have participated in this study, only 12 bothered to write their opinions. More precisely, 4 of the in-service English language teachers have only written ‘No, there are not’; 2 of the in-service English language teachers referred to the sufficiency of the descriptors by writing ‘It’s detailed enough’ and ‘It has been perfectly prepared’. Another 3 in-service English language teachers have written ‘I wish the questionnaire hadn’t been so long’, ‘There are lots of similar, unimportant questions and I didn’t like your questionnaire’, ‘There are a lot of similar questions, so it is very boring’, implying the bulkiness of the questionnaire. Of the remaining 3 in-service English language teachers, one has written ‘Multiple choice tests. Evaluation of multiple choice tests.’, possibly suggesting that descriptors related to designing and evaluating multiple choice tests are missing within the EPOSTL. Another in-service English language teacher has written ‘Preparing materials are very difficult for teachers. So universities should organize and prepare materials for us.’. The self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL have been classified under 7 categories and the title of the 3rd category is ‘resources’, containing 11 descriptors. Additionally, descriptors that touch on material design and use have also been integrated into other categories. In response to the in-service English language teacher’s proposal, it can be argued that centrally prepared and distributed materials may not fit the specific requirements of a context, which
means that teachers need to be able to design and adapt materials that meet the requirements of the context they work in. Finally, the last in-service English language teacher has expressed his/her opinion broadly as follows:

‘In my opinion, using a language in a natural environment is very important. No other way can replace the natural environment. This is called natural acquisition. If we want to learn a foreign language effectively and speak fluently, we have to go to a country where this language is spoken. At least we must contact with the native speakers. If these opportunities are not available, we must benefit from the media resources. Besides if people need to learn a foreign language for their business, somehow they will learn it.’

Rather than offering additional descriptors for the EPOSTL, this in-service English language teacher refers to the importance of exposure in language learning, the difference between EFL and ESL settings as well as learning and acquisition dichotomy. Moreover, the in-service English language teacher suggests that by making use of media resources, the lack of exposure can be tried to be compensated; however, the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors already include descriptors related to virtual learning environments under the category of ‘Independent Learning’. Finally, the in-service English language teacher seems to refer to the importance of motivation, which has also been covered by the EPOSTL. To be more precise, a language teacher’s role in motivating his/her students has been highlighted throughout the EPOSTL.

When the remarks of in-service English language teachers have been reviewed, it can be understood that they have not offered any reasonable additional descriptors for their context. Accordingly, this implies that the EPOSTL does not lack any potential descriptors and the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL are comprehensive enough for Turkish context.

4. Conclusions

As a direct result of advances in transportation, technology, communication tools, and trade, the importance of learning foreign languages have become greater than ever before. Becoming bilingual or even multi-lingual offers countless benefits to individuals and nations in social, cultural, educational, occupational, political and financial terms among many others. Accordingly, learning foreign languages has become a top priority for many individuals who wish to function more effectively in the global economy. It should be acknowledged that there are a myriad of complex and interdependent variables such as the educational policy-makers’ decisions, the peculiarities of the context, teachers, students, and materials available that play a role in the process of foreign language teaching and learning. Among these, the determinant factor, arguably, is the language teacher (Cochran-Smith, 2010). In line with this, the urgent necessity of learning foreign languages has also been recognized by the educational policy-makers of the governments and the importance and necessity of training competent and successful foreign language teachers has come to the fore.

Training competent language teachers, however, is not a straightforward undertaking as it encompasses many other multifaceted and challenging aspects to consider. These aspects can be summarized as:

- language teachers need to be more aware of the importance of on-going professional development,
- the process of language teacher development needs to be attached the same, if not more, importance as the process of language teacher training,
- the theories and models of language teacher education should be appreciated and internalized by teacher trainers,
-the curriculum for second language teacher education should be designed skillfully and implemented effectively,

-practicum and micro-teaching procedures should be conveyed properly so that in-service language teachers can transform their theoretical base into actual practice,

-innovations in language teacher education should not be ignored,

-training reflective and autonomous teachers should become one of the aims of language teacher education,

-the procedures of pre-service and in-service language teacher evaluation should be paid due attention with a specific view to intricacies inherent in the process of evaluation,

-the supervision of language teachers needs to be conducted in an effective manner, and

-the competencies a language teacher is expected to master need to be clearly defined and stated.

The potential benefits and urgent necessity of accommodating plurilingual and pluri-cultural citizens have already been recognized by the EU and the whole process of foreign language education has been reorganized and restructured across the continent. As a result, it has been proposed that European citizens should be taught at least two foreign languages from an early age besides their first language (Kelly & Grenfell, 2004). Accordingly, several projects and publications that aim to improve and update foreign language learning and teaching have been released. These include the EPLTE, the EPG, the ELP, the CEFR, and the EPOSTL.

The aim of this study is, as has been aforementioned, to arrive at an understanding of in-service language teachers’ perceptions of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors in relation to Turkish Foreign Language Education context. To begin with, the findings for the first research question show that in-service English language teachers’ overall perception of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors is 4.13 out of 5. Put differently, in-service English language teachers’ overall rating of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors is nearly 83% and, in line with the wording of the questionnaire, in-service English language teachers have regarded the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors ‘very important’. Interpreting this finding as in-service language teachers practice the principles of the EPOSTL in their classes would definitely be a far-fetched argument; however, it clearly indicates that in-service language teachers in Turkish context, in general, have welcomed the principles suggested by the EPOSTL and they are informed of modern trends and concepts in the field of language education.

The aim of the second research question is to reveal the order of importance attached to the categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors by in-service English language teachers in Turkish context. From the least to the most important, the order of the categories is ‘Independent Learning’, ‘Assessment’, ‘Context’, ‘Resources’, ‘Methodology’, ‘Lesson Planning’, and ‘Conducting a Lesson’. The findings of the second research question clearly show that all categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors have been regarded as ‘very important’ in line with the wording of the questionnaire.

The participants of this study include in-service language teachers working for primary, secondary and tertiary level institutions. Accordingly, the third research question aims to identify the order of importance attached to the categories of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors by in-service language teachers working for primary, secondary and tertiary level institutions. It has been observed that the most important category of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors for all groups is ‘Conducting a Lesson’ whereas the least important category for in-service teachers working for primary level schools is ‘Context’; for those working for secondary level schools is ‘Assessment’; and for in-service teachers working for tertiary level institutions is ‘Independent Learning’.
The category of ‘Independent Learning’ includes sub-sections such as learner autonomy, homework, projects, portfolios, virtual learning environments and extra-curricular activities. Accordingly, tertiary level learners are expected to be more competent and autonomous in terms of their self-study skills and use of virtual learning environments. However, in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level institutions have undervalued the role of independent learning as they have regarded it as the least important category. This comes to mean that in-service English language teachers working for tertiary level institutions believe that spoon-feeding rather than scaffolding their learners is more effective. This conflicts the view that learners become more autonomous as they grow older and more competent.

In accordance with the sub-research question, the researcher has looked into whether there are any significant differences in the perceptions of the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL by in-service English language teachers working for primary, secondary and tertiary level institutions. It has been found that in-service English language teachers working for secondary level institutions attached meaningfully more importance to the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors 8, 75, and 79 than those working for tertiary level institutions; in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions attached meaningfully more importance to the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors 34, 69, and 123 than those working for tertiary level institutions; in-service English language teachers working for primary level institutions attached meaningfully more importance to the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptor 67 than those working for secondary level institutions.

The fourth research question aims to find out what descriptors are missing in the EPOSTL self-assessment section for Turkish context and it has been located at the end of the questionnaire in the form of an open-ended question. However, none of the in-service English language teachers who have participated in this study have offered any missing descriptors for the context in which they function; therefore, it can be argued that the scope and content of the EPOSTL is satisfactory for Turkish context.

The findings and results of this study clearly indicate that the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL have in general been welcomed by in-service language teachers in Turkish context. This conclusion substantiates the findings of previous studies (such as Bergil & Sarıçoban, 2016; Çakır & Balçıklanlı, 2012; Hişmanoğlu, 2012; Hişmanoğlu, 2013; Mirici & Hergüner, 2015; Okumuş & Akalın, 2015; Su Bergil, 2015) that have been conducted in Turkish setting with pre-service English language teachers as participants.

To be more specific, Okumuş & Akalın (2015) argue that pre-service English language teachers are in favor of incorporating the EPOSTL into their Methodology courses as the EPOSTL helps them become more aware of their instructional practices and promotes self-assessment. In a similar vein, Mirici & Hergüner conclude that “…the use of the EPOSTL is helpful in developing student teachers’ metacognitive strategies as autonomous learners” (2015, p. 1) and underline the function of the EPOSTL as a self-assessment tool that encourages the users to reflect on their progress and potential for further learning. Likewise, Çakır & Balçıklanlı (2012) believe that the EPOSTL is a useful self-assessment tool and the EPOSTL may be employed with the aim of complementing the current ELT curriculum as the EPOSTL systematically deals with the content of the ELT curriculum and functions as an effective reflection tool. In her PhD dissertation, Su Bergil (2015) conducted a complementary study on the EPOSTL and the EPG with the aim of defining the didactic competency levels of 38 prospective English language teachers studying at Hacettepe University. Su Bergil (2015) advocates the implementation of the EPOSTL in the process of English language teacher education throughout Turkey. Moving one step further from her conclusion, it would be justified to argue that the EPOSTL can also be presented to in-service English language teachers in order to make them become more familiarized with such concepts as plurilingualism, ICC, self-assessment, learner and teacher autonomy, etc.
Although the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL have largely been welcomed by in-service English language teachers in Turkish context, some categories of the EPOSTL such as ‘conducting a lesson’ have been considered comparatively more important than such categories as ‘independent learning’ and ‘context’. This result is compatible with the findings of a previous study (Su Bergil, 2015) that employed pre-service English language teachers as participants in that Su Bergil (2015, p. 172) also observed that the most important category was ‘conducting a lesson’ and the least important category was ‘independent learning’ for pre-service language teachers. Therefore, the actual in-class performance of a teacher is regarded as more decisive by in-service language teachers who participated in this study, too. However, it should be noted that the self-assessment descriptors listed below other categories (such as ‘lesson planning’ or ‘methodology’) also pave the way for a successfully and efficiently conducted lesson, which can be interpreted as all the categories with all the self-assessment descriptors are equally important. As an example, the category of ‘independent learning’, regarded as the least important in Su Bergil (2015) and in this present study, covers descriptors related to such aspects as learner autonomy, virtual learning environments and portfolios, the importance of which for current trends in ELT literature cannot be refuted.

The fact that the category of ‘conducting a lesson’ has been considered as the most important does not come to mean that the other six categories are viewed as ‘unimportant’. Needless to say, other categories of the self-assessment descriptors of the EPOSTL such as ‘resources’ and/or ‘assessment’ contribute greatly to ‘conducting a lesson’ that is effective and fruitful. Understandably, in-service English language teachers have regarded the actual in-class performance more important than the other causative factors without ignoring the relative value of them. The underlying reason for this tendency is possibly that in-service teachers are most of the time supervised and evaluated in terms of their in-class instructional performance and their way of “conducting a lesson” functions as a showcase of their overall performance. Such a way of thinking may be the outcome of ‘negative washback effect’ in that the supervisors observe and evaluate in-service language teachers in terms of their success in conducting their lessons and, in return, in-service teachers attach more importance to their way of conducting a lesson than other didactic skills such as lesson planning or using resources. Nevertheless, the profession of language teaching cannot be limited to just observable in-class performance of the teacher as it requires many other competences such as ‘understanding the characteristics of the context’, ‘planning a lesson’ or ‘conducting reliable and valid assessments’. Therefore, ‘conducting a lesson’ is only the visible part of the iceberg in the profession of language teaching and the value of other didactic competences should not be dismissed.

The basic way of attaining high quality in education is introducing harmonization and standards to the process of pre-service teacher education, the benefits of which can only be enjoyed in the long-term. On the other hand, if the improvements are wished to be observed in a shorter-term, in-service language teachers’ professional development procedures should be bettered by providing them with effective in-service trainings (INSETs). In line with this, Hişmanoğlu (2013) reports that a series of seminars entitled ‘Training of English Teachers’ and covering topics such as the CEFR, new English language curricula, and portfolio assessment in language learning have been conducted throughout Turkey; however, INSETs, administered nationwide by the Chair of INSET Department and district wide by INSET Offices (Şahin, 2006), are insufficient in terms of their frequency, number, methodology, organization, and content as well as highlighting the lack of coordination and cooperation between the MoNE and the ELT departments of the Education Faculties at the universities (Küçüksüleymanoğlu, 2006). In spite of these shortcomings, Mirici & Demirbaş (2013) suggest that seminars, symposiums, and conferences need to be organized in cooperation with the MoNE, national contact persons, portfolio developers, academics, and teachers so that the stakeholders have the opportunity to communicate their ideas and broaden the viewpoint in terms of the development, implementation, and dissemination of the EPOSTL.
Furthermore, postgraduate students majoring in the field of Foreign Language Teaching need to be informed of the current foreign language teaching policies and concepts adopted internationally (Mirici, 2015). As a final remark, Turkey is to design and update its foreign language education structure in view of shared objectives, educational policies, and planned reforms of the EU to accelerate and reinforce the accession negotiations. Having undertaken many of the regulations, strategies, and legislation by the EU’s responsible commissions, Turkey has still some way to achieve harmonization with the EU (Büyükgöze, 2015).
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