

BAŞKENT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING MASTER PROGRAM

ASSESSING PRESERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' 21st CENTURY
SKILLS

PREPARED BY
AMAL MOHAMED ABDULSALAM ALMAARFI

MASTER'S THESIS

THESIS ADVISOR
ASSOC. PROF. FARHAD GHORBANDORDINEJAD

ANKARA – 2021

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLEMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı çerçevesinde Almaarfi Amal Mohamed Abdulsalam tarafından hazırlanan bu çalışma, aşağıdaki jüri tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 26 / 10 / 2021

Tez Adı: Hizmet Öncesi İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin 21. Yüzyıl Becerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi

Tez Jüri Üyeleri (Unvanı, Adı - Soyadı, Kurumu)

İmza

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Melike Ünal Gezer

.....

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Senem Üstün Kaya

.....

Doç. Dr. Farhad Ghorbandordinejad

.....

.....

.....

Gerekli Durumda

.....

Gerekli Durumda

.....

ONAY

Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürü

Tarih: / ... /

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLEMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

Tarih: 20 / 09/ 2021

Öğrencinin Adı, Soyadı: Amal Mohamed Abdulsalam Almaarfi

Öğrencinin Numarası: 21820424

Anabilim Dalı: Yabancı Diller Eğitimi

Programı: İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Danışmanın Unvanı/Adı,

Soyadı: Doç. Dr. Farhad Ghorbandoridnejad

Tez Başlığı: Hizmet Öncesi İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin 21. Yüzyıl ecerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen Yüksek Lisans tez çalışmamın; Giriş, Ana Bölümler ve Sonuç Bölümünden oluşan, toplam 97 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 20 / 09 /2021 tarihinde tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 19 dır. Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Kaynakça hariç

2. Alıntılar hariç

3. Beş (5) kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

“Başkent Üniversitesi Enstitüleri Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Usul ve Esaslarını” inceledim ve bu uygulama esaslarında belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Öğrenci İmzası: Almaarfi Amal Mohamed Abdulsalam

ONAY

Tarih: 24 / 09 / 2021

Öğrenci Danışmanı Unvan, Ad, Soyad, İmza:

Doç. Dr. Farhad Ghorbandordinejad

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my husband and children
for their generosity of time, spirit and encouragement
in facilitating my study

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I am extremely grateful to my supervisor, Assco. Prof. Dr. Farhad GHORBANDODINEJAD for his invaluable advice, continuous support, and patience during my MA study. His immense knowledge and plentiful experience have encouraged me in all the time of my academic research. I would also like to thank Dr. Senem Ustun Kayafor her kind help on my study. I would like to thank all the academic members in the ELT department. It is their support that has made my study and life in Turkey a wonderful time. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my husband and children. Without their tremendous understanding and encouragement in the past few years, it would be impossible for me to complete my study.

ABSTRACT

Amal Mohamed Abdulsalam ALMARFI

Assessing Turkish Preservice English Teachers' 21st Century Skills

Başkent University

Institute of Educational Sciences

Department of Foreign Languages

English Language Teaching

Master Program

2021

Teacher education of English language in the 21st century is facing many new challenges. The present study assessed the level of skills of the 21st century of the preservice teachers and explored whether there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores on any of the five latent variables of 21st century skills between preservice teachers in group 1 (freshmen & sophomores) and those in group 2 (juniors & seniors). The key instrument of the present study is the 21st Century Skill Assessment Questionnaire (CSAQ) developed by Ashraf, Motallebzadeh, and Arabshahi (2016). SPSS analysis was used, as well as MANOVA (Multivariate Analysis of Variance) for the analysis of data. The population of the study included the teacher candidates, preservice teachers of the ELT Department of the Faculty of Education in Baskent University in the school year of 2019 - 2020. All the population took part in the study so the size of the sample was equal to the size of the population.

Key words: Language teacher education, 21st century skills, preservice teachers

ÖZET

Amal Mohamed Abdulsalam ALMARFI

Hizmet Öncesi İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin 21. Yüzyıl Becerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi

Başkent Üniversitesi

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü

İngiliz Dili Öğretimi

Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı

2021

Çalışmaların 21. yüzyılda dil öğretmeni eğitimi yeni zorluklarla ilgilenmektedir. Bu çalışma öğretmen adaylarının 21. yüzyıl becerilerini değerlendirecek ve Grup 1'deki (birincisınıf ve ikinci sınıf) öğretmen adayları ile grup 2'deki (üçüncü ve son sınıflar) öğretmen adayları arasında 21. yüzyıl becerilerinin beş gizil değişkeninden herhangi birinin ortalama puanları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark varlığını araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmanın aracı, Ashraf, Motallebzadeh ve Arabshahi (2014) tarafından geliştirilen 21. yüzyıl beceri anketidir. SPSS kullanılacak ve verileri analiz etmek için çok değişkenli varyans analizi (MANOVA) kullanılacaktır. Araştırmanın evrenini 2019-2020 öğretim yılında Başkent Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi ELT Bölümü öğretim üyeleri oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın tüm popülasyonu, örneklemin büyüklüğüne eşit olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler : Dil öğretmeni eğitimi, 21. yüzyıl becerileri, öğretmen adayları.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Overall conceptual 21 st century skills model (Binkley et al., 2010)	15
Table 1.2 21 st Century skills	19
Table 3.1 The Descriptive Statistics of 21 st CSAQ	48
Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics of the demographic variables of the sample	49
Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics of 21 st century skills	50
Table 4.3 Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices	52
Table 4.4 Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances	53
Table 4.5 Multivariate Tests ^a	54

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ATC21S	Assessment and Teaching of 21 st Century Skills
CALL	Computer Assisted Language Learning
CBI	Content-Based Instruction
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
EBA	Educational Informatics Network
ELT	English Language Teaching (Teachers)
ELTEP	English Language Teacher Education Program
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EPS	Education Participation Scale
INSET	In-service Training
IRB	Institutional Review Board
IT	Information Technology
MLD	Modern Languages Department
MWPD	Motivation toward Web-based Professional Development
PD	Professional Development
PBL	Project-Based Learning
TBI	Task-Based Instruction
TYC	Turkish Competencies Framework
WPD	Web-based Professional Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT	vi
ÖZET	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
1. INTRODUCTION.....	12
1.1. Overview	12
1.2. Background of the Study	12
1.2.1. The 21st century skills.....	13
1.2.2. Conceptual models of 21st century skills.....	14
1.2.4. How to incorporate 21st century skills into the EFL classroom.....	17
1.3. Statement of the Problem	18
1.4. Theoretical Framework	19
1.5. Purpose of the Study	19
1.5.1. Research questions	20
1.5.2. Research hypothesis	20
1.6. Significance of the Study	20
1.7. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	20
1.8. Definitions of Key Terms.....	21
1.8.1 Definition of 21 st century skills	21
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	23
2.1. Overview	23
2.2. 21 st Century Skills	23
3. METHODOLOGY	47
3.1. Overview	47
3.2. Research Design.....	47
3.2.1. Research population and sampling.....	47
3.2.2. Data collection instrument.....	47
3.3. Data Analysis Procedure	48
4. RESULTS	49
4.1. Overview	49
4.2. Descriptive Statistics	49

4.2.1. Checking multivariate normality.....	50
4.2.2. Linearity	50
4.3. Inferential statistics	51
4.3.1. Box's test.....	51
4.3.2. Levene's Test	52
4.3.3. Multivariate tests.....	53
4.3.4. Wilks' Lambda.....	54
5. Conclusion.....	55
5.1. Overview	55
5.2. Discussion and Conclusion	55
REFERENCES.....	65
APPENDIX	77
APPENDIX-A: Data Collection Instrument	77

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

The first chapter of this study presents detailed background information about the research and statement of the problem, as well as the theoretical framework and purpose of the study including research questions and hypotheses. Finally, it presents the significance of the study, limitations, and definitions of key terms.

1.2. Background of the Study

The rapid growth of modern technology has brought out opportunities as well as challenges for the 21st century community. As all the other sectors of the society, the educational system has recently undergone global changes and faced multiple difficulties. It seems that without special skills and abilities such as critical thinking, creativity, collaborative skills, people cannot perform their duties effectively. Today our lives have been digitized (Brown, Lauder, Ashton, & Tholen, 2008) and this has its consequences on our working and educational life (Varis, 2007). According to (Lotherington & Jenson, 2011), Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has changed the way we communicate and learn language literacy. In this context of education, the learners and teachers face a global challenge in the world of the growing demands of technology in the information technology era. The main part of this new challenge is the requirement for the students to be equipped with an ability set that is required for achieving success in the educational activities, their working environments, and the overall life progress. The key subjects academically like English reading, world languages, language arts, economics, geography, mathematics, science, government, civics, and history are some of the core knowledge sets

that will be required to be mastered by every learner in their future activities (Zain, Abdullah, Adnan, & Nazri, 2020).

Also, there is a need for teachers to use these skills to improve language education. Meanwhile, students changed into a different generation with high enthusiasm to learn by using the technological devices for active participation in the knowledge construction (Nissim, Weissbluth, Scott-Webber, & Amar, 2016). According to Pearson (2016), “teaching must be equipped by continual novelty and development. Also, Pearson (2016) believes teaching and learning in the 21st century is filled with challenge and opportunity, especially when teaching students for whom English is a new language” (p. 5). In addition, the 21st century learning setting might be “a process-supporting system” that provides a context in which learners learn more effectively (Nissim et al., 2016).

According to Varis (2007), educators and education policy makers should facilitate connectivity, accelerate E-learning innovation, and promote digital literacy while implementing lifelong learning. Taylor (2009) supports that the second language learning classrooms need to incorporate new approaches for integrating content, culture, technology, and lifelong learning. Similarly, Shoffner, Oliveira, and Angus (2010) state that language classrooms require an extended understanding of what literacy is. The main answer to this demand is 21st century skills.

1.2.1. The 21st century skills

Ledward and Hirata (2011) consider the 21st century skills as a blend of content knowledge, specific skills, expertise, and literacies necessary to succeed in work and life; they think that these are more than technological literacy and include proficiency in critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and teamwork. They explain that these skills can help us a) access, synthesize, and communicate information; b) work collaboratively across

differences to solve complex problems; and c) create new knowledge through the innovative use of multiple technologies.

1.2.2. Conceptual models of 21st century skills

There are some conceptual models suggested to structure the analysis of 21st century skills. One of them was proposed by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory and the Metiri Group (Lemke, 2002). This framework categorizes four general skills with four dimensions including digital-age literacy, inventive thinking, effective communication and high productivity. First, digital age literacy, ability to use digital technology to create, manage, and evaluate information for functioning in a knowledge society. Second, inventive thinking, ability to apply information technologies in complex situations and to understand the consequences of doing so. Third, effective communication, ability to communicate with others using media and technology. Finally, high productivity, ability to prioritize, plan and manage for quality products and results. In fact, this model provides a framework to define what students need to thrive in the digital age (Lemke, 2003).

In another model developed by Cisco Systems, Intel Corporation, and Microsoft Corporation sponsored the initiative “Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills (ATC21S).” in 2010. This model defined ten universally accepted 21st century skills into four broad categories of competencies. These skills, assert ATC21S, can help schools and school systems to prepare students for success in the workplace and as global citizens. See Table 1.

Table 1.1 Overall conceptual 21st century skills model

Ways of Thinking	Tools for Working
• Creativity and innovation • Critical thinking, problem solving, decision making • Learning to learn, metacognition (knowledge about cognitive process)	• Information literacy • Information and communication Technology (ICT) literacy
Ways of Working	Living in the World
• Communication • Collaboration (team work)	• Citizenship - local & global • Life and career • Personal and social responsibility including cultural awareness and competence

The abilities people should have for work and life in the 21st century are different from those in the 20th century. This difference has come from the changes in how we communicate and interact with others. These changes make people equipped with a new set of competences that let them act, think, and network in line with the necessities of this new era.

1.2.3. The EFL classroom in the 21st century

According to Rogers (2000), many methods and approaches of second language learning came into existence during the 20th century such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) with its emphasis on main concepts as communicative competence, learner-centeredness and interaction. CLT paved the way for the emergence of new methodologies such as Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Task-Based Instruction (TBI). Educators began to criticize these methods. They believe that they are all constructed by experts and prescribed for practice. These methods of teaching languages have both pedagogic limitations, and deceptive social, cultural and political programs (Allright & Bailey, 1991; Stern & Allen, 1992).

However, in the 21st century there is a new perspective on the methodologies and approaches. Kumaravadivelu (1994) states that teachers must be able to adapt their own approach in accordance with local, contextual factors. Kumaravadivelu (2004) also mentions that teachers should generate their own situation-specific classroom techniques and,

ultimately, to construct their own theory of practice. In fact, English is considered as a global language that people use to express their local identities and to communicate intelligibly with the world (Crystal, 2006). Eaton (2010) concludes that 21st century EFL classrooms should no longer be focused on grammar, memorization and learning from rote. Rather, it should be conceived of as a space to learn to use language and cultural knowledge as a means to connect to others around the globe.

There is a need to change the views of what EFL was in the 20th century to a new perspective in the 21st century. That is, nowadays EFL is more learner-centered, collaborative and technologically driven. Therefore, EFL teachers should be equipped with 21st century skills to build new and innovative frameworks and approaches and incorporate them into their EFL classrooms.

The 21st century is the era of postmodernism which provides English language teaching with new teaching purposes. English language teachers should develop activities that engage students in authentic tasks and problem-solving activities that they need to work and live in today's society. Regarding this engagement, Warschauer (2001) suggests that students should work together with their classmates and with others around the world, using a variety of technological means, and they should do complex project work involving negotiation, collaboration, goal-setting, meaningful communication, and the development of challenging products (p. 55). Thus, students should be able to develop a whole new range of

English language literacies, involving new forms of communication, reading, and writing using online technologies.

Chang and Tung (2009) proposed Project-Based Learning (PBL) to help students analyze problems, investigate possible solutions, make decisions, create designs, and solve problems instead of working alone on assignments and focusing on translation. PBL encourages students to work relatively autonomously over extended periods of time to come up with realistic products or presentations in the end. Teachers function as facilitators who do not provide the students with the correct answers but guide them in the learning process and give feedback.

English language learners need multimodal practices such as instant messaging, social networks, digital storytelling and media re-designing activities that can offer them opportunities for the development of both standard language proficiency and digital literacy and 21st skills. By doing so, students can both represent themselves, and communicate in online spaces by mixing text, image and sound. (Black, 2009).

1.2.4. How to incorporate 21st century skills into the EFL classroom

The concept of literacy should be redefined to understand the roles of teachers and learners in language classrooms in the 21st century educational environment. Dupuy (2011) expands the traditional language-based notion of literacy - the ability to read and write – to include not only the ability to produce and interpret texts, but also a critical awareness of the relationships between texts, discourse conventions, and social and cultural contexts.

Similarly, Elsner (2011) maintains that language learners must cope with different kinds of texts, being delivered on paper, screens, or live, and texts that comprise one or more semiotic systems. However, Haut (2010) states that language teachers should not only incorporate different types of texts, they should also give obvious instruction so that students

can learn to move between discourses and become aware of the intrinsic features that are represented.

On the other hand, Royce (2007) mentions that EFL classrooms need to be increasingly concerned with developing students' multimodal communicative competence. He believes teachers should focus on students' abilities in visual literacy, and develop a pedagogical metalanguage to make these abilities easy when images co-occur with spoken and written contexts.

Heberle (2010) considers the knowledge and use of language concerning the visual, gestural, audio and spatial dimensions of communication as multimodal communicative competence. This competence helps EFL learners to be well prepared for different literacy practices with native and non-native speakers of English.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Despite the rapid spread of the issues addressed as the 21st century skills, few studies have been conducted to survey teacher students' situation in language teacher education programs. The assessment criterion of the teachers has been widely left out in the current scenario of the English Language Teaching, particularly the preservice assessment of teachers. The teaching skills of the pre-service teachers and the identification of the implications and knowledge of those skills, very few studies have been conducted on the topic beforehand. The skills of the 21st century are vital for the teachers, however there is quite little literature on the assessment of those 21st century skills of the pre-service English Language Teachers. English as a foreign language, even though it is compulsory but its assessment criterion and knowledge criterion of the pre-service English Language Teachers are to-date limitedly reflected upon.

1.4. Theoretical Framework

The framework of the present study includes the three core 21st century skills as: learning, literacy, and life skills for EFL teachers.

Table 1. 2 21st Century skills

Category	skills	Items	Total
Learning skills	Critical thinking and problem solving	1-2-3-4-5-6	21
	Creativity and innovation	7-8	
	Communication and collaboration	9-10-11-12-13	
	Curiosity and inquisitiveness	31-32-33	
	Interpersonal skills	14-15-16	
	Meta-cognition	39-40	
Literacy skills	Technology literacy	29-30-46-48-49-50	16
	Information literacy	35-47	
	Media literacy	34-45	
	Environmental literacy	36	
	Financial and business literacy	37-38	
	Visualization	44	
	Civil literacy	42-43	
Life skills	Leadership	17-18-19	13
	Entrepreneurialism	20-21	
	Health and wellness	22-23	
	Global and cultural awareness	26	
	Flexibility and adaptability	24-25	
	Accountability	41	
	Social responsibility and ethics	27-28	

1.5. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assess preservice teachers' 21st century skills and provide an insight into the current level of assessments of the pre-service teachers on the skills of the 21st century. The present study aims to apply the statistical tools at disposal to create a framework of assessment of the preservice English language teachers on their skills of the 21st century via dividing them into two groups to diversify the sample size and reduce the chances of error. Teacher education is very important in the long-term improvement of the skills of the 21st century and the present study aims to assess those skills via a survey-based approach to collect and extrapolate data.

1.5.1. Research questions

Research question: Is there a statistically significant difference in the mean scores on any of the five latent variables of 21st century skills between preservice teachers in group 1 (freshmen & sophomores) and those in group 2 (juniors & seniors)?

1.5.2. Research hypothesis

Null Hypothesis: There is not a statistically significant difference in the mean scores on any of the five latent variables of 21st century skills between preservice teachers in group 1 (freshmen & sophomores) and those in group 2 (juniors & seniors)?

1.6. Significance of the Study

Teachers and educationalists believe that the current century needs a different set of skills and from people so that they can function successfully at work, as citizens and in their free time (Dede, 2007; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008). Based on this necessity, advocates of the 21st century skills movement claim that there is a need to reform in schools and educational settings.

1.7. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

There are certain limitations to this study. Firstly, the research is limited to 137 preservice EFL teachers who participated in this study. Besides, two different Likert type questionnaires were utilized in this study and they have some choices such as “strongly agree” and “strongly disagree”, thus participants choose the closest answer to their way of thinking among these choices. Except for those, they cannot give any different answers. For this reason, the limited choices are another limitation to the study.

The study has also a number of delimitations. To start with, utilizing two questionnaires as the only means of data gathering is a remarkable delimitation of this study. In addition, the data collection process of this study was performed in the 2018-2019 academic year. Due to the possibility of changes in the opinions of participants according to the academic contents of ELT departments, it is better to consider the outputs of this survey according to the present academic year. Another important delimitation of this study is its sample size. The study was performed at 5 different universities which have ELT departments. Although it was aimed to increase the participant numbers by implementing questionnaires in five different universities, the number of participants could not exceed 137 since the participation was voluntary. This study is also limited to preservice teachers in ELT training programs of universities in Ankara. Consequently, the outcomes of this research could not be generalized to all prospective EFL teachers in Turkey. Also, questionnaires could have been implemented on in-service teachers, but it was not preferred due to possible effects of other variables on the results such as experience or motivation.

1.8. Definitions of Key Terms

1.8.1 Definition of 21st century skills

1.8.1.1. Theoretical definition:

According to Larson & Miller (2011), Duncan (2009) defined 21st century skills as “skills that increasingly demand creativity, perseverance, and problem solving combined with performing well as part of a team.”

1.8.1.2. Operational definition:

In this study, 21st century skills are operationally defined as skills in terms of critical thinking, interpersonal skills, communication, and technology literacy.

1.8.2. Preservice English language teachers

1.8.2.1 Theoretical definition:

Preservice English language teachers are actually students who study in English language teacher education programs at universities. They will graduate at the end of the fourth year and be ready to work as a teacher.

1.8.2.2. Operational definition:

Preservice English language teachers are the teacher students who are studying in the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department of Faculty of Education in Baskent University, Ankara, Turkey.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Overview

The second chapter of the research introduces detailed information mainly about the 21st century skills, their models and background studies.

2.2. 21st Century Skills

Silva (2009) believes that 21st century skills have recently gained an important function in today's modern society. These skills facilitate finding and analyzing information from different sources and using this information to make decisions and create new ideas. According to Johnson and Reed (2008), the need for learning skills traces back to Socrates and the Sophists, who were "the first professional teachers". Copeland (2005) states Socratic circles continue to be used in classrooms today to take responsibility for their own learning. Johnson and Reed (2008) explain that John Dewey offered the concept of "grounded in experience" in education long ago which means students interact with the "everchanging world". A true visionary, Dewey defined an educated person as "one who thinks and reflects before acting, responds intelligently to a problematic situation and finally assesses the consequences of a chosen plan of action" (Johnson & Reed, 2008). In 1956, Benjamin Bloom defined a taxonomy of thinking that can be used to effectively create lesson

plans in any discipline. The complexities of thought identified by Bloom, and later updated by his colleagues. Anderson et.al, (2001) remain on the forefront as teachers create lesson plans with a focus on 21st century skills.

With the use of technology, the teachers and educators can tap into the experts' knowledge, capable of visualization and analysis of data with their students; linking the learning to contexts of authenticity, and taking advantage of the opportunities for the shared and electronic reflection. All of these types of educational opportunities are required to be a part of the current education programs for teachers. Preparing tomorrow's teachers solely does not depend on how well the incorporation of emergent technologies is done in the institution's coursework. It rests entirely on how better the incoming teachers are trained and taught in the art of leveraging these technologies in helping their students develop those same skills. The item of interest globally is how the practices of teaching the classroom processes can affect the learning outcomes of students and how it grows the psychosocial development of the student and with a good reason. The instructional quality has proven that it is more strongly associated with students' learning than it is with the structural aspects of school in both the developed and developing countries. Nonetheless, this breadth of skills required for the student's quality learning, alongside quality teachings, calls for vital skills and competencies that go beyond numeracy and literacy, most commonly known as 21st Century Skills. The skills of the 21st Century fall into six diverse categories, each of which is readily engageable via the use of multimedia technologies in the classroom carefully: information and media literacy; communication skills, contextual learning, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking (Kim, Raza & Seidman, 2019; Lambert & Cuper, 2008).

The official language and the academic language of Turkey is Turkish. Among all the foreign languages being offered in the Turkish Education system, currently, English is the only

language that is taught in all levels of education as a compulsory subject, having a Foreign Language (EFL) status. French and German are also offered as elective curriculum subjects in some schools. Since the introduction of the English Language into Turkey's educational system, it has gone through many phases of change, mostly influenced by socioeconomic and political factors. Globalization, along with these factors, has called for a review in the English Language policy at all the education levels in Turkey (Kirkgoz, 2007). The introduction and recognition of the English Language into Turkey's education system goes as far back as the Tanzimat Period in the 18th Century's second half, marking the beginning of the movements for westernization in the education system of Turkey. Robert College, an Anglo-American private secondary school that was founded in 1863, became the first institution to teach via English medium. The establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923 led to the westernization and modernization movements bringing closer connection with the USA and Europe, helping to accelerate the ELT speed in the country, making English precede over the other foreign languages, mostly French, which was formerly used in education, diplomacy, and art. With the advent of the 1950s, the spread of English through schooling was achieved, marking the first phase of ELT; this lasted until the late 1970s. At a secondary level education, the first-ever Anatolian high school in Turkey was opened in 1955. The students who graduated from these private and Anatolian high schools achieved a higher level of language proficiency as they exposed the students to English for a longer time than the other students. In the Turkish language-medium high and higher secondary schools, English has the role of a compulsory foreign language; however, there are inconsistencies in the instruction quality offered, the number of devoted hours to ELT, the intensity, the range of materials used for this, and the qualification of the teachers (Braine, 2014; Kirkgoz, 2007).

The Turkish Ministry of National Education, in 1997, with the cooperation from the Higher Education Council of Turkey, made a decision to make significant changes in the English Language policy of the nation in an effort for reforming the then ELT practices of Turkey. A plan was established known as “The Ministry of Education Development Project.” This plan was a significant innovation in ELT's curriculum project. The plan was initiated to promote the teaching of English in the educational institution of Turkey. At a primary education level, the reform took upon itself to integrate the primary and secondary education in a single stream, thus resulting in an extension in the primary education duration, which was previously 5 years to 8 years. Another significance of the reform introduces English for the Grade 4 and Grade 5 students, thus changing EFL's focus from solely to these secondary schools towards the primary schools as well for the provision of a more prolonged exposure to the foreign language. This led to English becoming a standardized compulsory school subject for all the students of compulsory education in 1997 and was started to be taught to the young learners of Grades 4 and 5. ELT's curriculum's main objectives for primary education are specific in terms of Grades 4-5 and Grades 6-8, respectively. The stated objectives of English in primary schools Grade 4-5 as per Ministry of Education curriculum are expressed as in:

- Raising the awareness of students to a foreign language.
- Promotion of positive attitude towards English Language Learning.
- Increasing the interest of pupils and their motivation towards the English Language.
- Establishment of classroom situations in games context, entertaining the students while learning English
- Setting up meaningful contextualized activities for learning and dialogues.
- Helping students in the development of appropriate strategies.

The English Curriculum objectives of Grades 6-8 are in the expansion of the basic skills for communication that the students have attained via integrating the four skills. The curriculum of 1997 stands as a landmark in Turkey's history, as it was the first time the communicative approach concept into the ELT was introduced. The policy's primary purpose is to develop the learners' capacity of communication for preparing them in the use of the target language for communicating in the classroom activities. The curriculum did the promotion of the student-centered learning model for the replacement of the traditional learning view that was focused on the teacher. Teacher's role is stated as acting as a facilitator to the learning process of students. The teachers are expected to undertake a more excellent range of responsibilities, which includes helping the students in the development of communicative performance and the promotion of the positive attitude and values to the learning of the English Language. In the meantime, there is an expectation of the student playing an active role in learning. At a higher education level, the ELT 1997 curriculum reform went through many changes. One of the most significant impacts was upgrading the education facilities' curriculum for enhancing the teacher education quality and the offered training courses meeting the nation's need in the 21st Century. Subsequently, the teacher education departments were also redesigned after the reforms. The primary purposes are increasing the number of methodology courses and extending the teaching practice time in the primary and secondary schools, providing the pre-service teachers hands-on experience in the schools.

Additionally, integration of the young learners enhanced the need for integration of the relevant courses in the ELT at an undergraduate level in the Department of Faculties of Education. The course of Teaching English to Young Learners was introduced in the curriculum for familiarizing the prospective teachers with the ways of young learners (Braine, 2014; Kirkgoz, 2007). The English Language Teachers (ELTs) are trained and

educated in the educational faculties of different universities. The duration of education takes four years. However, if one-year intensive preparatory English entails the program, then it moves up to five years. Additional to the education faculties, the faculties of arts and science students studying the English language and literature or studying the English Philology might be entitled to be English teachers. However, they have to hold a pedagogical formation certificate as these faculties' curricula do not revolve around the teacher-training courses. While training the students English teachers, all the faculties of education follow a compulsory and standardized curriculum. Nevertheless, the students are given a degree of self-governance apropos on the carrying out of the program. The materials, selective courses, course books used, and the administered examinations vary from institution to institution (Karakaş, 2012).

The present English Language Teacher Education Program (ELTEP) has been in place and practice since 2006, when the CHE reshaped education's faculties' curricula. The curricula were shaped to be responsive towards the ever-changing demands and the needs of the educational, political, and social domains; and the requirements locally, nationally, and internationally. The newer program/present program comprises many obligatory and some elective courses, with the program components comprising teacher education, general knowledge, field knowledge, and the teaching practice. More stress is given on the practice components and the teaching methodology in the present program as compared to the former one that was in effect during 1998-2006 (Karakaş, 2012).

The world is going through rapid changes, with the technological developments, the developments in knowledge and science leading the fray. Therefore, the need is increasing to equip the individuals with the required skill-set for their effective adaptation and for them to compete in the innovative environment. 21st-century advancements have led to emerging indicators related to social and economic factors, capturing the changes in competition and

technological progress in the labour market. Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2007) pointed out that the world in the 21st Century is shaping itself via advancement in technology, the rapidly occurring societal changes, the high knowledge levels, and globalized competition. The application is possible through the development of skills like creative thinking and problem solving to clear the challenges provided by the business world. The unknown and unperceived changes that are being experienced by individuals also force the necessity of change in the economy, ultimately leading to a change in education. In the education field, the students are expected to acquire a new set of skills in the 21st Century. This new skill set was defined by Scott (2015) as the attitude, knowledge, and skills required for the ability to compete in the businesses, take part in the changing societies, cope with the workplace changes, and use advanced technologies. Though, it was noted by Oretta (2012) that the expectations of the future workplace of the 21st-century students at schools of those days could not be met sufficiently.

Similarly, it was also pointed out by Wagner (2010) that “the divide between what schools are teaching and what is required for active societal participation in a changing world has created a ‘global achievement gap’ that is leaving students unprepared for the 21st Century.” This statement can be inferred as that the students' new skill set required for their survival in the 21st Century cannot be attained by the maintenance of the practices that have existed. The new abilities of cognition and non-cognition in the 21st Century are of particular importance for academic and professional success. The skills of the 21st Century are not new; however, they have gained considerable importance through time. Many studies have been conducted in the national and international contexts on the skills of the 21st Century. (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey (2000) conducted a study and concluded that most of the

international research on the 21st-century skills are focused on the integration of these skills into the domain of education, in the evaluation of these skills, and the use of these skills in technologies such as information and communication (Kivunja, 2015b; Silva, 2009). The research studies conducted in the Turkish context are widely based on scale development. (Göksün & Kurt, 2017) In recent years, some preservice teachers' 21st century skills studies have been done in the national research. However, a wide gap is still present in the literature nationally as well as internationally. The skills of the 21st Century are vital for the students and teachers. There is a need for the education programmes for the pre-service teachers to be revised and upgraded, integrating the 21st century skills for effective teaching to the students of the future of the preservice teachers of the present. It is quite obvious that not only the teacher education programmes but also the academic setting should be designed keeping in mind these specific skills (Gelmez Burakgazi, Karsantık, Aktan, Ayaz, Büge, , Karataş, Ödün, Varol Şanlı, Tarım & Yavaşca, 2019).

The integration of technology into education for the assessment and instructional purposes was led, keeping in mind the rapid technological expansion in people's everyday lives. The teaching method has been quite successful for English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The method needs to be centered around the learner and should prove to be able to encourage and motivate the students, it needs to address the different students' varieties, and it needs to be assessing all the language skills in perfect balance, methods in which the traditional assessment cannot succeed. Resultantly, due to the increasing growth in the dissatisfaction of traditional assessment methods, the need for alternative methods and the presence of alternative methods is looked upon as a ray of hope. The alternative assessment methods like portfolios, projects, peer- and self- assessment are now looked upon as some of the effective tools in accomplishing the language teaching goals that the traditional assessment was not able to provide. In the past few decades, the education programs for

language teachers have started searching for a theory of language teaching that is based on higher practicality on the basis of practice teaching, observations, materials development, and the curriculum that fits itself in the right place in this age of digitization (Crandall, 2000). Still, there is a lack in the teacher's training, especially in the domain of technological integration, presenting and portraying unqualified and inexperienced teachers not knowing how to use technology and improve their students' language development skills (Cirit, 2015).

Multiple frameworks and definitions have been proposed about the thinking skills and thinking, an issue that is of significance in the study areas of psychology, education, and philosophy. Generally, thinking can be said as “the operating skill with which intelligence acts upon experience” (De Bono, 1987). Quality thinking development has always been of vital importance and one of the vital goals of education. Therefore, there is a need for the thinking skills to be taught to meet the 21st Century's individuals' expectations. Contextually, the development of thinking that constructs a baseline for the overall school courses is viewed as an instrument for meaningful learning of the courses and the goal itself. Ensuring learners' practical thinking is possible through specific ways like using writing activities, asking the questions that require higher-order thinking, and applying several strategies. That is why the curricula for the thinking skills are mostly based on a framework of theoretical nature and is expected to be in development with both in and out of the courses, which not only facilitates the learners for transferring thinking skills effectively into other areas of their life but also to having a positive impact on achievements academically (Akınoğlu & Karsantık, 2016).

The terminology of the “learning environment” is of special consideration. It implies that a potential space and place, like a school, library, classroom, or any other place possible where the process of learning occurs. Even though the 21st Century's learning occurs in any

place possible that is physically available, as we are in an era of technology, anything is possible via technology. The environment of learning can also be an on-line virtual environment allowing for distance learning. In other words, in the present age of the 21st Century, learning is independent of place and time. The learning environment of the 21st Century can be a process-supporting system, organizing the situation for optimal learning of the people. The systems designed have to consider the specific learning needs of every learner for supporting and promoting the positive human relationships required for an effective process of learning. Thus, it is possible for the differentiation between the socio-cultural and physical spaces, with the potential of differentiating between the virtual and physical spaces.

Nevertheless, both the spaces act as ‘learning enablers’ or the ‘facilitators’ in the socio-cultural space. The learning environment concept is looked upon by educators as a complex defining the teaching-learning substance and the process of evaluation. Many factors are included in this complex: student, teacher, learning process, assignment, manner of learning, duration of learning, interaction type between student and teacher, and the heterogeneity of the group of learners, to name a few. The correlation of these factors is widely influenced by the teacher's educational world views regarding the terminology meanings of learning, teaching, and evaluation. These educational world views have a significant influence on the character of the learning processes and environment taking place within. A dialogue is necessary between the educational dimension and the physical dimension in an environmental form to achieve the goals for a learning environment. The educational definition of the learning environment and the content area that it represents must be met for the physical design to proceed. A different experience is gaining situations to be enacted for the students, such as creating an environment that allows for multiple “changing situations” for the instructor-student/teacher-researcher to interact. Flexibility and dynamicity are the

critical components of a learning environment, making it adaptable to the ever-changing requirements of the process of teaching-learning evaluation. Flexibility in the environment facilitates for the changes in the interaction between teacher-student, allowing for performing multiple methods of teaching-learning like: peer learning, plenary session learning, and group learning, for naming a few. Of particular importance is the provision of easy access required for the learners' information: such as a closed area having a bookshelf is not an optimal design for the 21st-century learners. The designers of any learning environment must include the latest means of technology, allowing for the individual learners or multiple groups of learners to collaborate with each other and conduct more frequent dialogues with the instructors. The learning environment must be formed, keeping in mind as one that works on creating learning opportunities rather than following a singular path; it must form spaces facilitating investigation, pose questions, and allow for the students' construction skills and knowledge. The environmental design, physical design, and the education learning interaction provides insight into a new “learning-oriented design” (Nissim et al., 2016).

Knowledge in the 21st Century has become the commodity having the highest value globally. In recognition of this reality, multiple countries have developed continuous strategies for the careful planning of the appropriate investments in the human capital for improving competitiveness in the market (Kefela, 2010). The developing countries like Turkey, Poland, Brazil, South Africa, and China have initiated specific reforms to become active players and sustain their growth economically. In part with these reforms, the teacher education and teacher quality have turned into a widely debated issue as research has confirmed that the teacher quality is the factor of utmost importance in association with the student (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005). While the literature present offers a wide variety of the skills, knowledge, disposition, and the personal

characteristics as some of the most essential qualities of a teacher, Bandura, Freeman, and Lightsey (1999) emphasizes on the fact that the belief of teachers in their ability to instruct the students and influence the performance of the student are the most important indicators of any effective instruction. One of these beliefs that are quite effective on students' outcomes and the instructional practices is the teacher's efficacy. In consistency with the self-efficacy's general information, the teacher's self-efficacy is known as the teacher's belief for the execution of the course of action required for the successful accomplishment of the specified tasks in any given context. Multiple research findings have a close relationship between the teacher's efficacy level and the many important behaviors of teachers and the instructional variables. Teachers having a stronger efficacy sense are known to exhibit higher planning levels, enthusiasm, and organization, tend to be more open to any new ideas, higher commitment to teaching, and spending higher time teaching in the subject areas. On the other hand, teachers having a lower sense of efficacy were found to be displaying a more authoritarian teaching style and were holding more pessimistic views regarding the motivation of students. It was also reported that a lower level of sense of efficacy hinders teachers in the efficient performance of tasks that are typically expected of the teachers (Yüksel, 2014).

Teachers' education programs are crucial for the teachers' preparation in the provision of opportunities and the challenges concerning the students in facing the indefinite future. Many countries have worked on reforming the country's education system and in the reconstruction of the curriculum to change the traditional pedagogic practices of the teachers to those teachings that are required for the learning and teaching in the 21st Century. There is an expertise required by the teachers in the professional problem-solving and being knowledgeable about the technological academic content knowledge for the development of 21st-century skills in the students via teaching (Ball, Thames, and Phelps, 2008).

Nevertheless, many of the preservice teacher preparation programs are focused on the development of only generalized skills, resulting in the ineffectiveness in the bridging of the gap between practice and theory in the classroom teaching of the real environment, becoming challenging to learn for them. It was claimed by (Levine, 2006) that the stage of preservice teacher education is the crucial stage in the ultimate goal of having qualified teachers, the quality of the future is solely dependent on the quality of the teaching force. Therefore, the core purpose of any teacher education must aim for enabling the pre-service teachers in the development of a higher repertoire of all the techniques for education that will enable them in the building of flexible and evolving strategies in response to multiple scenarios of learning and teaching most commonly met in a classroom environment.

Additionally, the training of teachers in the 21st Century aligns with the innovation in education policies, which require the development of educational skills and enable the teachers to integrate the skills of the 21st Century, meeting the global economic demands. Teacher education was defined by Freeman (2001) as “the sum of experiences and activities through which individuals learn to be language teachers.” The process is possible via courses in the curricula (known as theory) and internalizing these courses via experience (known as practice). A sufficient theory-practice balance acts as an enabler for the preservice teachers in the development of all the effective skills required in becoming professional teachers. Additionally, Rotherham & Willingham (2009) suggested that it is necessary for the schools to take part in the reconstruction of the instructional methods and the teaching materials for the teaching and development of 21st-century skills into the students. The 21st-century education provides a much higher emphasis on the attainment of necessary skills in learning. The present sustained learning model does not meet the contemporary students' demands and needs as originally the curriculum was not structured to meet the demands of the changing society. The present education must also aim in developing a newer generation of people

who have the ability to acquire the skills and knowledge for harnessing the digital technologies' power and widen the opportunities they have to gain the 4Cs (Critical Thinking, Collaboration, Creative Thinking, and Communication) (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). The educational field scholars have become aware of the growing need in the modification and reconstruction of the systems of education to develop the mandatory skills, knowledge, and outlooks required for the satisfaction of the 21st Century (Bedir, 2019b).

The skills required by the people of the 21st Century regarding professional life, self-actualization, and citizenship completely differ from the ones that were prevalent in the 20th Century. The adaptation of the people who have spent much of their life in the 20th Century, integrating into the 21st Century, can be quite a challenging task, as 21st century skills are completely different and with the addition of new communication and information technologies, the 21st Century. With the constant changes in the development of telecommunication and computers, the work done by machines has increased as opposed to the work done by the people. Preparing the 21st-century students to adapt into their professional life, social values, and life has become a complicated task. The advent of globalization, migration, changing markets, international competition, technology, and the global political and environmental changes have added to the newer urgency on the acquisition of knowledge and skills required by the students to be successful in the present age (Saavedra & Opfer, 2012). Skills like creativity, problem-solving, critical thinking and cooperation constitute the type of universal literacy required for survival in the 21st Century. In Turkey, the Ministry of National Education renewed the curriculums in 2017, incorporating the skills and competencies known as the 21st Century skills in the renewed curriculum.

Regarding this, the skills required by the students to be academically, professionally, socially, and personally successful nationally and internationally have been defined in the

Turkish Competencies Framework (TYC). The TYC has defined that there are eight vital competencies required. The skills and competencies that are required to be imparted into the students are:

- I. Mother Tongue Communication Skills
- II. Foreign Language Communication Skills
- III. Digital Competency
- IV. Basic Science/Technology and Mathematical Competencies
- V. Learning the process of learning
- VI. Entrepreneurship and Taking Initiative
- VII. Competencies related to social and citizenship domains
- VIII. Awareness and Expression of Culture

Furthermore, the MNE took the initiative and launched the “Project of Increasing Opportunities and Improving Technology (FATİH)” in 2010 for the provision of equal opportunities in instruction and education and in making more effective usage of the information technologies for enhancing the technological opportunities in the teaching-learning processes in a way for the activation of higher senses. The FATİH project targeted information technology integration into the teaching-learning process and directly correlated it with many skills of the 21st Century like media, information, and technology skills. With all these changes and transformations in education, the learners' characteristics and the teachers have changed completely. The teachers are required to teach these skills of the 21st Century to the students for the students' survival in the present age. However, before that, the teachers must have those skills and know the effective ways of imparting those skills to the students (Tican & Deniz, 2019).

Students of the 21st Century have expectations over them in mastering the content, all the while synthesizing, producing, and evaluating the information from multiple sources, as well as having outstanding problem solving, interpersonal communication, and critical thinking skills. This nature of powerful learning creates a demand for teachers that are well suited and well prepared to address the learners' needs (Darling-Hammond, 2006). The instruction and teacher quality have started to be seen as key factors for students' performance, directing their attention to teachers' education. In multiple countries, the teachers' education programs have been redesigned based on good teaching practices and contemporary theories. Keeping up with these changes, an education reform movement was started in Turkey in 1999. In part of this movement, all the education programs for teachers with the inclusion of teaching English as a Foreign Language program were all restructured. This reform's basic drive was bringing standardization and uniformity to teachers' training and certification (Seferoğlu, 2006). Nevertheless, there is still quite little information on the competency levels of teaching on the graduate level and how they envision themselves in teachers' future roles (Yüksel, 2014).

Silva (2009) believes that the skills of the 21st century are not new, but they are “newly important”. The main reason why this happened is that today's workers need to be able to “find and analyze information from multiple sources and use this information to make decisions and create new ideas.” This necessity traces back to Socrates and the Sophists. According to Copeland (2005), the use of Socratic circles engages students in the art of dialogue and inquiry in our modern classes, also they accept the responsibility for their learning.

Multiple researchers have focused on the skills of the 21st century. Many studies show that the teaching and learning skills of the 21st century are expected to be known by the teachers in the past five years (Bedir, 2019a; Ganayem & Zidan, 2018; Norahmi, 2017;


Urbani, Roshandel, Michaels, & Truesdell, 2017). the teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) need the skills for reshaping the students with the new curriculum's learning environment, aiming for developing the education program for EFL teachers for the skills of the 21st century, the 'Rainbow' framework and the 5E Instruction Model by Bruner (Exploration, Elaboration, Engagement, Explanation, Evaluation) were examined by Kivunja (2015a).

2.3 New Learning Paradigm

Globalization, technology development, and Digital Economy have made teachers and educators become mindful about the usefulness of their pervasive educational practices. Regarding this, they began to change the curriculum for preparing Digital Economy learners. This necessity has contributed to the rise of the Modern Learning Model (Kivunja, 2015), which claims the abilities of the 21st century need to be introduced to students today.

This model introduces four factors of critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and communication that rule the 21st century skills.

Figure 1. Model for New paradigms of Learning (Kivunja, 2015)



The figure illustrates the four skills known as the Cs (Critical thinker, Communicator, Collaborator, and Creator). These skills identify the key factors that make people proficient in their professions. This theory focuses on critical thinking, collaboration, communication, and creation that contribute to the growth and learning of pre-service teachers.

A newer learning paradigm via definition of the moral purpose of education and the productive roles of the workplace in the 21st century were revealed by Kivunja (2015). The conclusion of the study was that the 4Cs skills (Communicators, Critical Thinkers, Collaborators, and Creators) provide the vital skills for the students' achievement in survival in the real world. The skill training, teacher education program, and the teaching ability of the 21st century were investigated by (Urbani et al., 2017). The focus of the study was on the elements of the skills of the 21st century (Critical Thinking, Collaboration, Creativity, Information Media and Technology Skills). An approach consisting of a mixed-method was employed for indicating the applied, personal, and professional development abilities of the in-service and pre-service teachers. The collected data was from the four compulsory courses attended by the pre-service teachers in California. Results showed that the synchronized integration in the development, modeling, and assessment of the skills of the 21st century were most effective in the teaching of pre-service teachers' teaching methods.

Furthermore, Häkkinen, Järvelä, Mäkitalo-Siegl, Ahonen, Näykki, & Valtonen (2017) conducted a study that showed the learning and teaching skills via reviewing the current and previous case studies. The study used four comprehensive frameworks: Evaluating and teaching for the skills of the 21st century, partnership between P21 skills for the 21st century skills, European Union Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning 2008, OECD DeSeCo. A cloud-based system was employed for the evaluation and monitoring of the teacher-students' tasks skills. In another study conducted by (Bedir, 2019a) on the education program of pre-service ELT for the investigation of a need for the preparation of an instruction design

principle of the learning skills of the 21st century and the application of the 4Cs (Communication, Creative thinking, Critical thinking, and Collaboration) into the classroom. The study revolved around a sequential three-phased mixed method. Collection of the data was achieved from 124 English Language teachers between the age of 22-24 from the Faculty of Education in Turkey. The study results showed that the development framework of twelve-week has a positive impact on the revision of curricula and the integration of the teachers into the 4Cs.

In a study by (Norahmi, 2017) the thoughts of students related to the teachers' competence in the 21st century were investigated. The implications of the study were that the teachers' role and the character of students have a key role in the attainment of the skills of the 21st century. A survey was conducted for the examination of the four criteria of teachers' competency (personality, professionalism, social relations, and pedagogy) along with their ability to use technology in the classrooms. Data collection was achieved from the University of Palangka Raya's students. Open-ended questions were used in the sixty questionnaires distributed for analysis of calculated responses in relation to the opinions of students of the teachers of the 21st century and the competency of teachers. It was revealed by the results that the teachers should be active and participate in the usage of technology, and discussing the global issues in daily life interaction to better know the 21st century demands. (Ganayem & Zidan, 2018) conducted an investigation of the technology education and cultural diversity and the styles of learning of the students (asynchronous and synchronous), ICT skills level, and the teacher training. The focus of the study was on the online collaborative learning, communication technology, and the online learning styles. The study employed a descriptive quantitative method for the study, with the research questionnaire consisting of four categories majorly: role of instructor in the development of skills of the 21st century, skills of ICT, demographic questions, and the preferable learning and communication style.

Collection of the data was achieved from 99 students from multiple colleges and cultures from Israel. It was concluded from the study that the students of TEC have higher ICT skills and they require the skills of the 21st century for the knowledge and for success in work and life. In a cross-cultural study conducted by Tafazoli, Gómez Parra, & Huertas (2018) about the awareness and attitudes of the EFL teachers, 317 language students and 318 EFL teachers were assessed. The assessment was done on the basis of their attitudes towards Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). The study did a comparison on the education level, the gender, and age in two countries Iran and Spain. Results of the study showed no significant difference amongst the attitudes of the Iranian and Spanish towards the CALL. Though in a study by Öz, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz (2015) a similarity was revealed between the attitudes of foreign and CALL learning. The attitude towards the Computer-Assisted Language Learning (Scale A-CALL having 4 major components) and the Attitudes towards the Foreign Language (Scale A-FLL, having 31 statements) were collected from the 123 university students from Turkey. In another study from Greece by (Karkoulia, 2016) Web 2.0 tools usage was investigated in the EFL teaching.

The questionnaire was designed for 135 teachers of EFL. The study concluded that a majority of the EFL teachers carry a positive attitude towards the Web 2.0 technology. (Tsourapa, 2018) also conducted a study similar to (Karkoulia, 2016) and found consistency in the results. The focus of the study was on the view of teachers on the development of the skills of the 21st century in teaching EFL. The research provided a major contribution in whether the skills of the 21st century are vital for the development, and the obstacles present in integrating the tools of technology. A close-ended questionnaire was used for data collection from 121 EFL teachers from Greece. The results of the study showed that the teacher who had a more positive outlook and attitude are the ones that are more willing for the usage of technological devices for education in class.

The pandemic of 2019-20 (COVID-19) caused a lot of closures, with the universities, schools, and colleges all closing due to the pandemic and the educational system was changed globally (Setiawan, 2020). That is why, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) committed for the programs of distance learning, the applications for open education, and the platforms that were accessible for the learners and the teachers to use at home (UNESCO, 2020). Similarly, in Turkey the system of distance education was implemented on the Education Informatics Network (EBA) system, a portal dealing exclusively with digital education. Different forms of materials for education are presented to the teachers, parents, and the students on this digital education portal (Mahmut, 2020). The Institutions for Higher Education also started using the digital and distance learning methods in a synchronous and asynchronous manner in Turkey (Tufan & Kayaaslan, 2020). Han (2016) conducted a study and suggested substitutional platforms such as the distance learning system that enabled for a new environment for learning in the educational institutions. That is why, the awareness and attitude of the teacher is one of the central issues in implementing newer technologies and bringing about the skills of the 21st century in a diversified context. The effect of attitude on success and performance of teachers in the process of teaching and learning in their classes (Chu, Reynolds, Tavares, Notari, & Lee, 2017). Therefore, the EFL teachers' awareness level and their attitude, and their preparation in meeting the needs of the students according to the 21st century is quite important and worth investigating. In this regard many studies have been conducted that conclude that the EFL teachers have an overall attitude of positivity towards the use of skills of the 21st century, however there is quite a fewer research on it regarding Turkey (Baz, 2016) that might indicate whether there is a positive attitude towards the use of technology amongst the teachers regarding skills of the 21st Century (Şahin & Han, 2020).

Albahlal (2019) investigated the role of 21st century skills in the educational systems, particularly in the English language learning setting. This study showed that the specialists have shifted in their presentation of the 21st century skills. Also, this study introduced the steps and strategies for integrating 21st century skills into English language learning.

Bedir (2019b) reported ELT pre-service teachers' beliefs and perceptions on 21st century learning especially Critical, Creative thinking, Collaboration, and Communication skills (4Cs). English teachers held a negative attitude towards the integration of 4Cs into the national curriculum, yet positive perception about professional development for 4Cs. (Rakhmawati & Priyana, 2019) studied how to integrate 21st century skills in the English textbooks for senior high school. The outcomes indicated that there are skills incorporated into the textbooks.

Erdoğan (2019) investigated the integration of 4Cs skills of the 21st century into four language skills in EFL classes. The researcher suggests exercises for teachers to improve these skills in EFL classes. Howlett & Zainee (2019) studied students' perceptions of mobile devices in the context of autonomous learning in an organization with 21st century learning skills. Halverson (2018) tested language teacher's understanding of 21st century skills and how these skills can affect English language teaching and learning.

Rafiq & Hashim (2018) tried to discover 21st century skills upgraded through the Augmented Reality Game (ARG) and recognized the advantages of APG in English as a Second Language (ESL) learning. Lubis (2018) investigated the English teacher's perceptions towards the levels of 21st century skills in the integration of ICT into the English classrooms. The researcher discovered that they have positive perception on the advantages of the integration, yet this centered more around the technical levels, not the communicative and functional ones.

Muhamad & Seng (2019) examined teachers' perspectives on 21st -century learning skills in English as a second language classroom. The discoveries demonstrated the need for additional introduction to 21st -century learning build so the implementation would be more effective. Menggo, Suastra, Budiarsa, & Padmadewi (2019) performed needs analysis of Academic-English speaking material in promoting 21st Century Skills. Their study showed that material design must have the option to advance 21st - century skills. Motalebzadeh, Ahmadi, & Hosseinnia (2018) examined the relationship between 21st -century skills, EFL learners' speaking, and writing skills. The data analysis showed that 21st -century skills had a huge relationship with understudies writing and speaking. (RAO, 2019) studied the need to develop soft skills among the English language learners in the 21st century. This study showed how Task-Based Learning (TBL) can be a significant option in the foreign language classroom these days empowering the understudies to reactive, interface with one another, learn by doing and build up their language knowledge through communicative tasks, supplanting the conventional, teacher-centered exercises.

Saleh (2019) in a qualitative examination, explored the conceptions, usage, and challenges of critical thinking in the FL classroom. This study uncovered that the majority of the participants executed critical thinking in various parts of their teaching, and the improvement of this kind of thinking for 21st - century EFL learners is a need. Ali, Harun, Mahir, Massari, Saad, and Simkin, (2018) developed a new model which is a guide for crafting Problem Based Learning cases explicitly for languages. The key findings introduced were the five interrelated parts in PBL-LcCRAFT that have helped the practitioners to craft cases and the symbiosis between these five segments with the 21st -century skills (for example knowledge, creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking and communication skills). Tuzlukova, Al Busaidi, Burns and Bugon (2018) did research to examine English teachers' understanding of 21st -century skills. Findings discovered that teachers know the

significance of using critical thinking skills in their classrooms; however, they need to uphold their performance both at an institutional level and their professional development.

In a study on Thai teachers' perceptions of the concept of 21st -century skills with two research questions (1) how they identify their readiness to function as teachers of the 21st -century and (2) how they assess their capabilities to use the 21st -century skills in their classes. Findings showed that there are some groups of teachers who are happy to adjust and change themselves. Also, they comprehend the idea of 21st -century skills, that they are fit for integrating 21st -century competencies into their classrooms (Wattanaavorakijkul, 2019).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Overview

In the third chapter of this study, methodological steps used in this research are presented first. Later on, the research population and instruments used for measuring the variables of the study are also introduced. Lastly, the validity and reliability of the questionnaires are also given place in this section.

3.2. Research Design

The research method for this study is a quantitative survey design. A quantitative survey design delivers a quantitative account of the population, by the study of the sample population. The survey design help the researchers in the answering of three different types of questions: (1) descriptive questions; (2) Relationship between the variables related questions; or in the cases of a survey design being repeated again in a longitudinal study; (3) the predictive relationship between the variables in a time range questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The present study was a descriptive questions survey study.

3.2.1. Research population and sampling

The population of this study is all the teacher students who were studying in the ELT Department of Faculty of Education in Baskent University in the school year of 2019-2020, Ankara, Turkey. Sample size includes all the population. So, the size of the population and the sample size are the same.

3.2.2. Data collection instrument

The first instrument for data collection which was employed was the questionnaire developed by (Ashraf et al., 2016). The questionnaire encompassed two sections. First section was designed to raise six major questions that required short answers regarding the age, gender, English language proficiency level, school name, language learning experience,

and the level of education of the participant. Second section of the 21st Century Skill Assessment Questionnaire (CSAQ) consisted of 50 items. The questionnaire comprised 50 items that were scored according to a Likert-type scale of five points ranging from (1) "Not at all/Never" to (5) "Entirely/Always". The questionnaire was adopted as it had multiple open-ended questions that increased the avenues for future research as well. The internal consistency of the whole questionnaire was examined with the Cronbach Alpha reliability estimate. The Cronbach Alpha estimated the reliability of the whole test as 0.82 in this study. The Descriptive Statistics of 21st CSAQ is shown in Table 3

Table 3.1 The Descriptive Statistics of 21st CSAQ

Areas of statements	Items	Percentage
Critical thinking	1-2-3-4-5-6-31-32-33 (9)	18%
Interpersonal skills	7-8-39-40 (4)	8%
Communication	9-10-11-12-13-14-15-16-26-27-28 (11)	22%
Technology literacy	29-30-34-35-36-38-44-45-46-47-48-49-50 (13)	26%
Leadership	17-18-19-20-21-37-41-42-43 (9)	20%

3.3. Data Analysis Procedure

Using Google forms, an online data gathering study was designed including the demographic information of participants. The survey was conducted online with maximum privacy protection. Emails were sent by the researcher for the responses requested from the participants. All the emails had an informal cover letter informing the purpose of study and their right to the participants. There was also a web link included to design surveys for participants' convenience. SPSS, Version 22 was used for the analysis of the data. For Question 1, MANOVA tests were used for the analysis of data. Two samples of data, one from Group 1, that included the freshmen and sophomores, and another from Group 2, that included the juniors and seniors, was collected.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Overview

In the fourth chapter of the study, answers of the participants turn into data and the gathered data are analyzed for obtaining the results of the study. Firstly, demographic questions and participants' answers to questionnaires are examined descriptively. Later, the answers to the research question is revealed in this section.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics:

Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics of the demographic variables of the sample

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	total
Gender	1*	23	26.7	26.7	26.7	86
	2**	63	73.3	73.3	100.0	86
	* male ** female					
Age	1*	58	67.4	67.4	67.4	86
	2**	28	32.6	32.6	100.0	86
	* between 18-21 ** 22 and more					
Experience	1*	64	74.4	74.4	74.4	86
	2**	22	25.6	25.6	100.0	86
	* yes ** no					
Group	1*	45	52.3	52.3	52.3	86
	2**	41	47.7	47.7	100.0	86
	* freshmen & sophomore ** junior & senior					
proficiency	2*	13	15.1	15.1	15.1	86
	3**	51	59.3	59.3	74.4	86
	4***	22	25.6	25.6	100.0	86
	* intermediate ** upper intermediate *** advanced					

The descriptive statistics of the demographic variables (the table shown above) indicates that there are 23 males (26.7 per cent) and 63 females (73.3 percent) in the sample, giving a total of **86 respondents**. Because of the unequal group sizes, and the small size of males, it was inappropriate to run the gender analyses. The Table 4 also shows that the age range of 58 students (67.4 per cent) are between 18-21 and the other 28 students (32.6 percent) are 22 and more. While 64 students (74.4 per cent) expressed that they had the

experience of participating in the English language learning courses, 22 participants (25.6 percent) said they didn't attend any language courses before. There is nearly equal size of participants in two different groups of freshmen and sophomore (45 students, 52.3 per cent), and junior and senior (41 students, 47.7 per cent). The participants reported their levels of English proficiency as intermediate (13 students, 15.1 per cent), upper intermediate (51 students, 59.3 percent), and advanced (22 students, 25.6 percent). Nobody reported their levels of proficiency as lower intermediate.

Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics of 21st century skills

	<i>N</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Skewness</i>		<i>Kurtosis</i>	
	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
Learning Skills	79	21	66	49.60	7.69	-.747	.271	1.448	.535
Literacy Skills	79	16	55	35.48	7.53	-.320	.271	.833	.535
Life Skills	80	13	41	27.17	6.12	-.087	.269	-.384	.532
Valid N (listwise)	73								

4.2.1. Checking multivariate normality


To test for multivariate normality, Mahalanobis distance was calculated using the Regression menu. "Mahalanobis distance is the distance of a particular case from the centroid critical value with a score of 16. of the remaining cases, where the centroid is the point created by the means of all the variables" (Tabachnick, Fidell, & Ullman, 2007). This analysis showed that one case had a score that exceeded the critical value with a score of 16.28 that is not too high from the critical value of 13.82.

4.2.2. Linearity

To test the presence of a straight-line relationship between each pair of our dependent variables, a matrix of scatterplots between each pair of our variables, separately for our

groups of freshmen and sophomores” and “juniors and seniors”. The output generated from this procedure is shown below.

Figure 4.1: Linearity of the dependent skills



4.3. Inferential statistics:

The procedure for performing a one-way multivariate analysis of variance to explore group differences in our set of dependent variables i.e. learning skills, literacy skills, and life skills is described below.

4.3.1. Box’s test:

The output box labelled Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices shows whether our data violates the assumption of homogeneity of variance covariance matrices. Because the Sig. value is larger than 0.001, our study has not violated the assumption. (Tabachnick et al., 2007) warn that the Box’s M can tend to be too strict when you have a large sample

size. In our study, the Box's M Sig. value is 0.81; therefore, we have not violated this assumption.

Table 4.3 Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Box's M	3.089
F	.491
df1	6
df2	36445.963
Sig.	.815

Tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Group

4.3.2. Levene's Test

Levene's test indicates whether we have violated the assumption of equality of variance for that variable. To test this, we look at the Sig. values whether they are significant (less than .05). In our study, none of the variables recorded significant values; therefore, we can assume equal variance.

Table 4.4 Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Learning Skills	Based on Mean	.009	1	71	.927
	Based on Median	.003	1	71	.956
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.003	1	68.760	.956
	Based on trimmed mean	.007	1	71	.932
Literacy Skills	Based on Mean	.181	1	71	.672
	Based on Median	.252	1	71	.617
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.252	1	70.727	.617
	Based on trimmed mean	.211	1	71	.648
Life Skills	Based on Mean	.010	1	71	.921
	Based on Median	.008	1	71	.931
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.008	1	68.765	.931
	Based on trimmed mean	.006	1	71	.938

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Group

4.3.3. Multivariate tests

Multivariate tests of significance indicate whether there are statistically significant differences among the groups on a linear combination of the dependent variables. OF-tests for Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace and Pillai's Trace are identical (1156.915).

Table 4.5 Multivariate Tests ^a

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.981	1156.915 ^b	3.000	69.000	.000	.981
	Wilks' Lambda	.019	1156.915 ^b	3.000	69.000	.000	.981
	Hotelling's Trace	50.301	1156.915 ^b	3.000	69.000	.000	.981
	Roy's Largest Root	50.301	1156.915 ^b	3.000	69.000	.000	.981
Group	Pillai's Trace	.022	.514 ^b	3.000	69.000	.674	.022
	Wilks' Lambda	.978	.514 ^b	3.000	69.000	.674	.022
	Hotelling's Trace	.022	.514 ^b	3.000	69.000	.674	.022
	Roy's Largest Root	.022	.514 ^b	3.000	69.000	.674	.022

a. Design: Intercept + Group

b. Exact statistic

4.3.4. Wilks' Lambda

Our data analysis obtained a Wilks' Lambda value of .978, with a significance value of 0.674. This is not less than .05; therefore, there is not a statistically significant difference between group 1 and group 2 in terms of their 21st century skills.

Since we didn't obtain a significant result on this multivariate test of significance, this indicates that there is no need to investigate further in relation to each of our dependent variables by analyzing the tests of between-subjects' effects, and the effect size.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Overview

The last chapter of this study introduces general concepts of the study first. The results of the data analysis and answers of the research questions are discussed and a conclusion is drawn, as well. Lastly, the implications of the present research and recommendations are included for further research.

5.2. Discussion and Conclusion

The Digital Age coincided with the beginning of the 21st century. In this age of unexpected technology growth and information explosion, learning foreign languages needs new skills for effective communication. Language learners bring their individual differences such as different backgrounds, achievement levels. Learning styles and strategies for language classes. Although these factors affect their learning highly, the new century technology has changed their ways of learning. Regarding this, language teachers need to move away from the traditional methods of teaching and bring new and innovative techniques into the classroom to teach the language skills more efficiently (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). This age changes all aspects of our lives, especially in academic settings. 21st century skills such as critical thinking, personal improvement, awareness raising are new trends in second language learning. These skills are effective not only in improving the proficiency level of language learning, but also in motivating language learners to direct their own learning through indirect ways of practicing the target foreign language. Teachers as well as students need to use the new technological skills of this new era to have effective classrooms. So, understanding this generation of the Digital Age is necessary for educators to plan standards and curriculum (Prensky, 2001).

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was performed to investigate the differences between group 1 (freshmen and sophomores) and group 2 (juniors and seniors) in their levels of 21st century skills. Three dependent variables were used: Learning skills, Literacy skills, and life skills. The independent variable was the grade of students. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. There was no significant difference between group 1 (freshmen and sophomore) and group 2 (juniors and seniors) on the combined dependent variables, $F(3, 69) = .514$, $p = .67$; Wilks' Lambda = .98; partial eta squared = .02.

Göksün & Kurt (2017) considered in the research article, the investigation of the pre-service teachers' uses of 21st -century skills. The research question selected by the researchers is similar to the current research design based on the utility of 21st -century learner and teacher skills by the pre-service teachers and to ascertain whether the gender differences between the teachers' impact on their ease of learning the skills of the 21st century. The participants included male pre-service teachers were 866, while female participants were 1581. The similarity in the unequal sample size based on gender was found between the current research and the research of (Göksün & Kurt, 2017). The current research includes participants 23 males and 63 females in the sample, with a total of 86 respondents. The current research refrained from conducting a gender analysis because of the unequal group sizes, however the study of (Göksün & Kurt, 2017) demonstrated while analyzing the variables of gender, university and department, that 21st -century teacher skills and 21st -century learner skills use by pre-service teachers differentiated individually.

The similarity is found between the selected age group of (18-23) years in (Aslan & Zhu, 2017) and the current research with the selected age group between (18-21). In the

current research, some 64 out of 86 students reported participating in the English language learning courses, while 22 students reported that they did not attend language learning courses before. In the research by Aslan and Zhu (2017), however, the focus is on the pre-service teachers' use of ICT in teaching practices. While the results of the current study show that 74.4 percent of students participated in the English language learning courses. Aslan and Zhu (2017) summarized that pre-service teachers use ICT in their teaching practice to a moderate extent.

Koçoğlu (2011) discussed in the research the English proficiency of the pre-service teachers. The teachers' self-reported English proficiency is positively correlated with teachers' perceived efficacy. The literature of the research, however, reported the self-perceived efficacy of 100 Venezuelan EFL teachers, the current research is related to the English proficiency of the Turkish pre-service teachers. In the research by Koçoğlu (2011), Turkish pre-service teachers' sense of self-efficacy was analyzed. The results showing a range of scores are similar to the current research which reports English proficiency as intermediate (13 students, 15.1 percent), upper-intermediate (51 students, 59.3 per cent), and advanced (22 students, 25.6 percent). Nobody reported their levels of proficiency as lower intermediate but (Koçoğlu, 2011) concluded that despite the scores ranging from average and above average even advanced level of English proficiency, the students had a reasonably high level of perceived efficacy.

Additionally, the research by Teo, Kabakçı Yurdakul, and Ursavaş (2016) informs that there is a difference in digital nativity by gender, age, the use of computer and technology competence. Males and young pre-service teachers reported a high score in the DNAS (Digital Native Assessment Scale), and there are no reported differences in these groups. However, the current research on digital natives suggested differences of perception between young and old users of technology. The age dependency is a critical factor because digital

natives, by definition, are those who grew up with technology, are accustomed to multitasking, rely on instant gratification and rewards. Furthermore, besides age, there are other factors included in the recent studies, and they are related to students' engagement with technology, experience and breadth of technology use.

MANOVA was conducted in the current research study to assess whether the differences exist between the mean scores in any of the five variables of 21st -century skills. The assumptions of MANOVA were determined for normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance matrices and the homogeneity test results (Uzuntiryaki et al., 2004). The assumptions were not violated in the current research. Multivariate normality checked the Mahalanobis distance was calculated using the regression menu. This is widely used in cluster analysis and classification techniques. **RESULTS**

The analysis of the current research showed that one score that is 16.28 exceeded the critical value of Mahalanobis distance that is 16, but that is not high from the critical value of 13.82. The research by (Cakir et al., 2015) about the pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions about using Web 2.0 in education also utilized MANOVA, and the results of the study revealed significant differences between the pre-service and in-service teachers' perception on dependent measures. The current study, however, reveals no violation of assumptions.

The test of linearity is a required correlation and linear regression analysis. In good research in the regression model, there would be a linear relationship between independent and dependent variables. In the current research, the straight-line relationship between each pair of dependent variables for the groups of freshmen and sophomores and juniors and seniors. The figure of the linearity model is given in the result section of the research

The inferential statistics is opposed to descriptive statistics because while descriptive statistics describe data, for example, a chart or graph, inferential statistics allows the researchers to make relevant predictions and inferences from that data. In the domain of inferential statistics, the data obtained from samples are used to generalize statements about a population. To make inferences in the current research, the performance of multivariate analysis of variance to further explore the differences in setting the research set of groups, i.e. learning skills, literacy skills and life skills is done.

Box's M test is a multivariate statistical test which is employed to ascertain the equality of multiple variance-covariances matrices. The test is used to check the assumption of homogeneity of variances and covariances in MANOVA and linear discriminant analysis. The output box is used in the current research to check whether it violates the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. The Sig. value is higher than .001; the study did not violate the assumption. According to (Tabachnick et al., 2007) that in case of large size of the sample, Box's M can be strict but the Box M's Sig. Value is .81, and therefore the assumption is not violated.

Levene's test is employed to test if multiple samples have equal variances. The possibility of having equal variances across samples is called homogeneity of variance. The analysis of variance assumes that variances are equal in groups or samples. This test is used to confirm that assumption. The researcher made use of the Levene's test as a predictor of whether the assumption of the equality of variance is violated. To assess this, we look at the Sig. Values to check their significance (less than .05). In our study, no variable recorded significant values, and therefore equal variance is noted.

Multivariate tests of significance are an indication of the statistically essential differences between the groups on a linear combination of the dependent variables. The

researcher noted that OF-tests for Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace and Pillai's Trace are identical (1156.915).

Wilk's Lambda is an assessment of the differences between two or more groups for multiple variables at once. The analysis of the current research obtained a Wilk's Lambda value of 0.978 and a significant value of 0.674. This value is not less than 0.05, and no significant difference is observed between group 1 and group 2 while evaluating their 21st - century skills.

Saltan & Arslan, (2017) is similar in the context that comparison is drawn between both in-service and pre-service teachers' self-confidence on the adaptation of technology as it relates to their teaching experience, content expertise, usage of technology and gender. However, the study sample size is larger because it includes 388 pre-service and 211 in-service teachers. Furthermore, the study also differs in the selection of subjects. While the current study is focused on English teachers, the subjects chosen in (Saltan & Arslan, 2017) are science, mathematics, information and communications technology (ICT) and classroom teachers. The similarity is found between the use of the tool for statistical analysis, such as Sample T-test and MANOVA.

Another study by Uzuntiryaki, Bilgin, and Geban (2004) the same MANOVA tool was used to explore the differences between male and female pre-service teachers in terms of their learning style preferences and technology adoption. The six learning styles were taken as dependent variables and gender as an independent variable. However, in the current study, there were three dependent variables: learning skills, literacy skills and life skills and the independent variable was the grade of students. The results of the study by Uzuntiryaki et al. (2004) affirms that there was no significant difference observed between males and

females in terms of learning styles. Still, the current study did not pursue gender difference analysis because of the unequal samples.

Öz (2015) aimed in the research article to assess EFL pre-service teachers' technological and pedagogical content knowledge. A questionnaire was distributed among the recruited participants, i.e. 76 undergraduate students of an ELT program. The students were asked to complete the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge Scale (TPACK). This study differs from the current study in the results that gender differences were found to be significantly aligned with technological knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Furthermore, the difference is also present in the fact that (Öz, 2015) findings were based on qualitative data while the current study relied on quantitative data.

Kurt, Mishra and Kocoglu (2013) considered the recent advances in the field of education. The technological prowess is considered essential for the language teachers to promote successful language learning. The study aimed at examining the TPACK development of Turkish pre-service teachers of English. The sample size of the study is small, that is 22 pre-service teachers when compared to the sample of teachers of the current study. Further, the sample did not aim for the analysis based on gender difference. The study further is a living study in which a 12 weeks' course was designed to help pre-service teachers develop their TPACK that is also not part of the current study methodology based on quantitative analysis.

Kömür (2010) assesses the relationship between pre-service teachers' content knowledge, their perceived efficacy and their practical experience. This study did not differ in scope to the current study but at the end of their teaching practicum figured out the strengths and weaknesses of pre-service English teachers in their real classroom experiences. The scope of the two studies differs because the current study is about the assessment of pre-

service English teachers 21st -century skills. The real classroom experience is not included in the current study, but both quantitative and qualitative data is part of the study by Kömür, (2010). While only quantitative analysis is part of the current study research methods.

Arcagok & Yimaz, (2020) aimed to understand the pre-service teachers' perception of intercultural communication. The scope of the study though differs from the current research; there is an essential variable of gender which shows that the intercultural sensitivities of the preschool EFL teachers did not reveal significant gender differences. Furthermore, a one -way ANOVA test was conducted which investigated whether the working in an NGOs of the pre-service teachers differed concerning increasing their intercultural sensitivity. The results indicate that it differs significantly concerning working in any NGO.

Üstündağ et al, (2017) gave in the research article the description of digital literacy, i.e. considered to be the "survival skills in the digital era." The indicator of the progress of humanity in the twenty-first century is their adaptation to the new technological input. The importance of digital literacy in the 21st century cannot be denied. Therefore, it becomes crucial for the education sector to integrate technological skills in pre-service teacher's training to shape the future of education in Turkey. The research scope and area of investigation that is digital literacy as part of the 21st -century skills for education is a similar concern of the current study and study of Üstündağ et al, (2017). Turkish Ministry of National Education since 2010 aimed to increase the digital technological opportunities in schools with the FATİH project. The current research, however, did not include the students' perception in the technological integration in schools and concerned with the pre-service teachers acquiring 21st -century skills.

Furthermore, the digital literacy scale developed by Ng'ethe, Namusonge, & Iravo (2012) is utilized in the research while there is not the inclusion of any digital literacy scale in the current research. Additionally, the pre-service science teachers were considered as part of the research with 979 junior and senior pre-service teachers. However, in the current study, only English pre-service teachers, including sophomore, freshman and junior and senior, were recruited. The sample size of the current research is also small when compared to the sample size of the research of (Üstündağ et al., 2017).

Koçoğlu, (2011) employed in the research article 90 English language pre-service teachers from a university in Turkey and similar to the sample size and the professional achievement of the teachers in the current study. However, the variables of the research that is emotional intelligence and teacher efficacy did not align with the current research scope. The current research considered demographics of the pre-service teachers and division into two groups to answer the research questions.

Kartal & Afacan (2017) in the research study included 591 pre-service teachers from Turkey rural city. The current research includes a small sample size, i.e. 86 respondents when compared with the research study. The small sample size was employed because Box'sM can be strict in case of large size of the sample, therefore, in order not to violate the assumption, the small sample size was selected in the current research. Additionally, the demographic variables of the participants, i.e. gender, age and grade, are similar in the research by Kartal & Afacan (2017) and current research.

Bedir's (2019b) research is similar to the scope of current research where pre-service teachers of ELT were employed as participants. Still, in this research, the perception of participants on 21st -century learning skills was considered. Further, it was part of the study by Bedir (2019b) that the perception of teachers about 21st -century learning was aligned

with the integration of technology into classroom teaching. However, the current research did not consider the perception of teachers about the 21st -century skills defining features through a questionnaire and survey.

The assessment of the 21st -century skills of pre-service English teachers was done through the current study. The relevant research was selected to comment upon the similar and dissimilar threads in the current research and the selected literature. The discussion on the tool of statistical analysis was brief to address the study results and further to see if the selected literature supports the results on the current research scope.

5.3. Suggestions for further studies

In relevance with the limitations of this study, suggestions for further research include the following points:

- 1) Since the sample of the study was limited, further studies can conduct more.
- 2) The sample included only language learners of a teacher education program, other learners can also be included.
- 3) The study was based only one university, further studies can conduct more.
- 4) This study used a quantitative research design, other papers can also use quantitative research approaches that will allow the measurement of the discussed issues.

REFERENCES

- Akınoğlu, O., & Karsantık, Y. (2016). Pre-Service Teachers' Opinions on Teaching Thinking Skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 9(2), 61–76.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2016.925a>
- Albahlal, F. S. (2019). The Integration of 21st Century Skills into English Language .Learning *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 6(3), 144–154.
- Ali, S. M., Harun, H., Mahir, N. A., Massari, N., Saad, N. S. M., & Simkin, K. (2018). Meeting the demands of the 21st century english language learning through pbl-lccraft. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 18(2).
- Allright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom CUP*. A.
- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Longman. <https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=JPkXAQAAMAAJ>
- Arcagok, S., & Yimaz, C. (2020). Intercultural sensitivities: A mixed methods study with pre-service EFL teachers in Turkey. *Issues in Educational Research*, 30(1), 1–18.
- Armstrong, S., & Warlick, D. (2004). The New Literacy: The 3 Rs Evolve into the 4 Es. *Technology & Learning*, 25(2), 20.
- Ashraf, H., Motallebzadeh, K., & Arabshahi, M. (2016). On the design, validation, and reliability of the 21st century skills questionnaire in an EFL context. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 6(2), 1–19.
- Aslan, A., & Zhu, C. (2017). Investigating variables predicting Turkish pre- service teachers' integration of ICT into teaching practices. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(2), 552–570.
- Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What

- makes it special. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389–407.
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. (1999). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Springer.
- Baz, E. H. (2016). Attitudes of Turkish EFL Student Teachers towards Technology Use. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 15(2), 1–10.
- Bedir, H. (2019a). Developing a Framework for the Integration of 21st Century Learning and Innovation Skills into Pre-Service ELT Teachers' Practicum. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 6(4), 828–843.
- Bedir, H. (2019b). Pre-service ELT Teachers' Beliefs and Perceptions on 21st Century Learning and Innovation Skills (4Cs). *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 15(1), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.547718>
- Binkley, M, Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., & Ripley, M. (2010). Defining 21st century skills and assessments (Draft White Paper 1). Melbourne, Australia: Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills. *Cms. Education. Gov. Il/NR/Rdonlyres/19B97225-84B1-4259-B423-4698E1E8171A/115804/Defining21stcenturyskills*.
- Binkley, Marilyn, Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., & Rumble, M. (2010). Draft white paper 1: Defining 21st century skills. Available Online Also at: <Http://Cms. Education. Gov. Il/NR/Rdonlyres/19B97225-84B1-4259-B423-4698E1E8171A/115804/Defining21stcenturyskills. Pdf> [Accessed in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia: April 15, 2015].
- Black, R. W. (2009). English language learners, fan communities, and 21st century skills. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(8), 688–697.
- Braine, G. (2014). *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum, and Practice*. Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=nP2PAgAAQBAJ>
- Brown, P., Lauder, H., Ashton, D., & Tholen, G. (2008). *Education, globalisation and the*

knowledge economy, a commentary for the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP). TLRP.

- Cakir, R., Yukselturk, E., & Top, E. (2015). Pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions about using Web 2.0 in education. *Participatory Educational Research*, 2(2), 70–83.
- Chang, S. Y., & Tung, C.-A. (2009). Incorporating 21 st Century Skills into Business English Instruction. *Education Week*, 28(27), 1–14.
- Chu, S. K. W., Reynolds, R. B., Tavares, N. J., Notari, M., & Lee, C. W. Y. (2017). 21st Century skills development through inquiry-based learning. *Singapore: Springer Singapore*. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981>.
- Cirit, N. C. (2015). Assessing Elt pre-service teachers via web 2.0 tools: Perceptions toward traditional, online and alternative assessment. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 14(3), 70–81.
- Copeland, M. (2005). *Socratic Circles: Fostering Critical and Creative Thinking in Middle and High School*. Stenhouse Publishers.
<https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=rPGPIQ8RgC0C>
- Crandall, J. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 34–58.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
<https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=335ZDwAAQBAJ>
- Crystal, D. (2006). *The Fight for English: How language pundits ate, shot, and left*. Oxford University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L, & Bransford, J. (2007). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*. Wiley.

<https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=H0uUGKrESDUC>

Darling-Hammond, Linda. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. (2006). Constructing 21st-Century Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285962>

Dede, C. (2007). Transforming education for the 21st century: New pedagogies that help all students attain sophisticated learning outcomes. *Commissioned by the NCSU Friday Institute, February*.

Duncan, A. (2009). Statement from US Secretary of Education Arne Duncan on results of NAEP Arts 2008 assessment. *Washington, DC: US Department of Education*. Retrieved November, 10, 2013.

Dupuy, F. (2011). *Business for the 21st century: towards simplicity and trust*. Springer.

Eaton, S. E. (2010). *Global Trends in Language Learning in the 21st Century*. ERIC.

Elsner, D. (2011). Developing Multiliteracies, Plurilingual Awareness & Critical Thinking in the Primary Language Classroom with Multilingual Virtual Talkingbooks. *Online Submission*, 20, 27–38.

Erdoğan, V. (2019). *Integrating 4C skills of 21st century into 4 language skills in EFL classes*.

Freeman, D. (2001). Second language teacher education. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, 72–79.

Ganayem, A., & Zidan, W. (2018). 21st Century Skills: Student Perception of Online Instructor Role. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning & Learning Objects*, 14.

Gelmez Burakgazi, S., Karsantık, Y., Aktan, T., Ayaz, M. A., Büge, B. C., Karataş, F., Ödün, S., Varol Şanlı, Ş., Tarım, B., & Yavaşca, O. (2019). Equipped or not? Investigating pre-service teachers' 21st century skills. *Asia Pacific Journal of*

- Education*, 39(4), 451–468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1671803>
- Göksün, D. O., & Kurt, A. A. (2017). The Relationship Between Pre-Service Teachers' Use of 21st Century Learner Skills and 21st Century Teacher Skills. *Education & Science/Eğitim ve Bilim*, 42(190).
- Gülru Yüksel, H. (2014). Becoming a teacher: tracing changes in pre-service English as a foreign language teachers' sense of efficacy. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(3), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.15700/201409161104>
- Häkkinen, P., Järvelä, S., Mäkitalo-Siegl, K., Ahonen, A., Näykki, P., & Valtonen, T. (2017). Preparing teacher-students for twenty-first-century learning practices (PREP 21): a framework for enhancing collaborative problem-solving and strategic learning skills. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(1), 25–41.
- Halverson, A. (2018). *21st Century Skills and the "4Cs" in the English Language Classroom*.
- Han, T. (2016). *21st CENTURY SKILLS FOR EFL LEARNERS*.
- Haut, M. (2010). *Teachers' enactment of multiliteracies in the English language arts*.
- Heberle, V. (2010). Multimodal literacy for teenage EFL students. *Cadernos de Letras*, 27, 101–116.
- Howlett, G., & Zainee, W. (2019). 21st CENTURY LEARNING SKILLS AND AUTONOMY: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF MOBILE DEVICES IN THE THAI EFL CONTEXT. *Teaching English with Technology*, 19(1), 72–85.
- Johnson, T. W., & Reed, R. F. (2008). *Philosophical Documents in Education*. Pearson/Allyn and Bacon. <https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=AiwuSgAACAAJ>
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2008). Language education and multiliteracies. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 1, 195–211.
- Karakaş, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English Language Teacher Education Program in

- Turkey. *ELT Weekly*, 4.
- Karkoulia, K.-C. (2016). Teachers' attitudes towards the integration of Web 2.0 tools in EFL teaching. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning*, 7(1), 46.
- KARTAL, T., & AFACAN, Ö. (2017). Examining Turkish pre-service science teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) based on demographic variables. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 14(1), 1–22.
- Kefela, G. T. (2010). Knowledge-based economy and society has become a vital commodity to countries. *International NGO Journal*, 5(7), 160–166.
- Kim, S., Raza, M., & Seidman, E. (2019). Improving 21st-century teaching skills: The key to effective 21st-century learners. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 14(1), 99–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499919829214>
- Kirkgoz, Y. (2007). English Language Teaching in Turkey. *RELC Journal*, 38(2), 216–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688207079696>
- Kivunja, C. (2015a). Exploring the Pedagogical Meaning and Implications of the 4Cs “Super Skills” for the 21st Century through Bruner’s 5E Lenses of Knowledge Construction to Improve Pedagogies of the New Learning Paradigm. *Creative Education*, 06(02), 224–239. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2015.62021>
- Kivunja, C. (2015b). Unpacking the Information, Media, and Technology Skills Domain of the New Learning Paradigm. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 166–181.
- Koçoğlu, Z. (2011). Emotional intelligence and teacher efficacy: A study of Turkish EFL pre-service teachers. *Teacher Development*, 15(4), 471–484.
- Kömür, Ş. (2010). Teaching knowledge and teacher competencies: A case study of Turkish preservice English teachers. *Teaching Education*, 21(3), 279–296.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2004). Accent without attitude. *Multicultural Forum*, 15(1), 1–3.

- Kumaravadivelu, Bala. (1994). The postmethod condition:(E) merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27–48.
- Kurt, G., Mishra, P., & Kocoglu, Z. (2013). Technological pedagogical content knowledge development of Turkish pre-service teachers of English. *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, 5073–5077.
- Lambert, J., & Cuper, P. (2008). Multimedia Technologies and Familiar Spaces: 21st Century Teaching for 21st Century Learners. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(3), 264–276. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/25318>
- Larson, L. C., & Miller, T. N. (2011). 21st century skills: Prepare students for the future. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 47(3), 121–123.
- Ledward, B. C., & Hirata, D. (2011). An overview of 21st century skills. Summary of 21st century skills for students and teachers, by Pacific Policy Research Center. Kamehameha Schools. *Research & Evaluation, Honolulu*.
- Lemke, C. (2003). *Standards for the Modern World: Preparing Students for Their Future*. International Society for Technology in Education.
- Lemke, J. (2002). Becoming the village: Education across lives. *Learning for Life in the 21st Century*, 34–45.
- Levine, A. (2006). Educating school teachers. *Education Schools Project*.
- Lotherington, H., & Jenson, J. (2011). Teaching multimodal and digital literacy in L2 settings: New literacies, new basics, new pedagogies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 226.
- Lubis, A. H. (2018). ICT integration in 21st-century Indonesian English language teaching: Myths and realities. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 1, 237882.
- Luna Scott, C. (2015). *The Futures of Learning 2 : What Kind of Learning for the 21st Century?*

- Mahmut, Ö. (2020). Educational Policy Actions by the Ministry of National Education in the times of COVID-19 Pandemic in Turkey. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 28(3), 1124–1129.
- Menggo, S., Suastra, I., Budiarsa, M., & Padmadewi, N. N. (2019). Needs Analysis of Academic-English Speaking Material in Promoting 21stCentury Skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 739–754.
- Motallebzadeh, K., Ahmadi, F., & Hosseinnia, M. (2018). Relationship between 21stCentury Skills, Speaking and Writing Skills: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 265–276.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11319a>
- Muhamad, M., & Seng, G. H. (2019). Teachers' perspective of 21stcentury learning skills in Malaysian ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 6(10), 32–37.
- Ng'ethe, J. M., Namusonge, G. S., & Iravo, M. A. (2012). Influence of leadership style on academic staff retention in public universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(21).
- Nissim, Y., Weissblueth, E., Scott-Webber, L., & Amar, S. (2016). The Effect of a Stimulating Learning Environment on Pre-Service Teachers' Motivation and 21stCentury Skills. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(3), 29.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v5n3p29>
- Norahmi, M. (2017). 21st-century teachers: The students' perspectives. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 7(1), 77–96.
- Oretta, C. (2012). 21stCentury Skills Practices and Programs: A Case Study at an Elementary School. ERIC.
- Öz, H. (2015). Assessing Pre-service English as a Foreign Language Teachers'

- Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *International Education Studies*, 8(5). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n5p119>
- Öz, H., Demirezen, M., & Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Willingness to communicate of EFL learners in Turkish context. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 37, 269–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.12.009>
- Pearson. (2016). *English Learners in 21st-Century Classrooms* (pp. 2–37).
- Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. On the Horizon: NCB University Press*, Vol. 9 No. 5. October.
- Rafiq, K. R. M., & Hashim, H. (2018). Augmented Reality Game (ARG), 21st century skills and ESL classroom. *Journal of Educational and Learning Studies*, 1(1), 29–34.
- Rakhmawati, D. M., & Priyana, J. (2019). A Study on 21st Century Skills Integration in the English Textbook for Senior High School. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 4(1), 9–16.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The need to develop soft skills among the English language learners in the 21st century. *Research Journal of English*, 4(2), 286-292.
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458.
- Rogers, J. (2000). Communities of practice: A framework for fostering coherence in virtual learning communities. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 3(3), 384–392.
- Rotherham, A. J., & Willingham, D. (2009). *21st century skills: The challenges ahead*.
- Royce, T. D. (2007). Multimodal Communicative Competence in Second. *New Directions in the Analysis of Multimodal Discourse*, 361.
- Saavedra, A. R., & Opfer, V. D. (2012). Learning 21st-Century Skills Requires 21st-Century Teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(2), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209400203>

- Şahin, H., & Han, T. (2020). EFL Teachers' Attitude Towards 21stCentury Skills: A Mixed-Methods Study. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 20(2).
- Saleh, S. E. (2019). Critical thinking as a 21stcentury skill: conceptions, implementation and challenges in the EFL classroom. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*.
- Saltan, F., & Arslan, K. (2017). A comparison of in-service and pre-service teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge self-confidence. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1311501.
- Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(4), 369–378.
- Setiawan, A. R. (2020). *Scientific Literacy Worksheets for Distance Learning in the Topic of Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19)*.
- Shoffner, M., de Oliveira, L. C., & Angus, R. (2010). Multiliteracies in the secondary English classroom: Becoming literate in the 21stcentury. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 9(3), 75–89.
- Silva, E. (2009). Measuring skills for 21st-century learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(9), 630–634.
- Stern, H. H., & Allen, J. P. B. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (Vol. 5). Pearson Boston, MA.
- Tafazoli, D., Gómez Parra, M., & Huertas Abril, C. A. (2018). A cross-cultural study on the attitudes of English language students towards Computer-Assisted Language Learning. *Teaching English with Technology*, 18(2), 34–68.

- Taylor, A. M. (2009). CALL-based versus paper-based glosses: Is there a difference in reading comprehension. *Calico Journal*, 27(1), 147–160.
- Teo, T., Kabakçı Yurdakul, I., & Ursavaş, Ö. F. (2016). Exploring the digital natives among pre-service teachers in Turkey: a cross-cultural validation of the Digital Native Assessment Scale. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 24(6), 1231–1244.
- Tican, C., & Deniz, S. (2019). Pre-service Teachers' Opinions about the Use of 21stCentury Learner and 21stCentury Teacher Skills. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.8.1.181>
- Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsourapa, A. (2018). Exploring teachers' attitudes towards the development of 21st century skills in EFL teaching. *Research Papers in Language Teaching & Learning*, 9(1).
- Tufan, Z. K., & Kayaaslan, B. (2020). Crushing the curve, the role of national and international institutions and policy makers in COVID-19 pandemic. *Turkish Journal of Medical Sciences*, 50(SI-1), 495–508.
- Tuzlukova, V., Al Busaidi, S., Burns, S., & Bugon, G. (2018). Exploring teachers' perceptions of 21st century skills in teaching and learning in English language classrooms in Oman's higher education institutions. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 6(1), 191–203.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Education: From disruption to recovery*. UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>
- Urbani, J. M., Roshandel, S., Michaels, R., & Truesdell, E. (2017). Developing and modeling 21st-century skills with preservice teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 44(4), 27–50.

- Üstündağ, M. T., Güneş, E., & Bahçivan, E. (2017). Turkish adaptation of digital literacy scale and investigating pre-service science teachers' digital literacy. *Journal of Education and Future*, (12), 19–29.
- Uzuntiryaki, E., Bilgin, I., & GEBAN, Ö. (2004). The relationship between gender differences and learning style preferences of pre-service teachers at elementary level. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26(26).
- Varis, T. (2007). New technologies and innovation in higher education and regional development. *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, 4(2), 8.
- Wagner, T. (2010). *The global achievement gap: Why even our best schools don't teach the new survival skills our children need-and what we can do about it*. ReadHowYouWant. com.
- Warschauer, M. (2001). Millennialism and media: Language, literacy, and technology in the 21st century. *AILA Review*, 14(1), 49–59.
- Wattanavorakijkul, N. (2019). Challenges Faced by Thai Tertiary Teachers in Designing and Delivering English Courses in the 21st Century. *Thaitesol Journal*, 32(1), 33–54.
- Yost, D. S., Sentner, S. M., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An examination of the construct of critical reflection: Implications for teacher education programming in the 21st century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(1), 39–49.
- Yüksel, H. G. (2014). Teachers of the future: Perceived teaching competences and visions of pre-service English language teachers. *International Journal of Human Sciences./ Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v11i2.2920>
- Zain, A. M., Abdullah, H., Adnan, J. N. I., & Nazri, N. D. M. (2020). Integrating 21st Century Skills in an English Language Summer Camp for Upper Secondary School Students: Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia's Experience. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, 49–62.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX-A: Data Collection Instrument

21st Century Skills Questionnaire

21. Yüzyıl Beceri Anketi

Student's name (optional):

Öğrencinin adı (isteğe bağlı):

Gender: ☐ male ☐ female

Cinsiyet: ☐ erkek ☐ kadın

Age: ☐ between 18-21 ☐ 22 and more

Yaş: ☐ 18-21 ☐ 22 ve daha fazla

Foreign language class experience: ☐ Yes, how long..... ☐ No

Yabancı dil sınıfı deneyimi: ☐ Evet, ne kadar..... ☐ Hayır

Levels of EFL proficiency: ☐ Lower Intermediate ☐ Intermediate

☐ upper intermediate ☐ Advanced

İngilizce yeterlilik seviyeleri: ☐ Alt Orta ☐ Orta

☐ üst orta ☐ Gelişmiş

1. When faced with a problem I know how to apply knowledge to solve them.

(Bir sorunla karşılaştığında, bunları çözmek için bilgiyi nasıl uygulayacağımı biliyorum).

☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)

☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)

☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)

☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)

☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

2. When faced with a difficult problem, I tend to get discouraged easily.

(Zor bir sorunla karşılaştığımda kolayca cesaretim kırılır).

☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)

☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)

☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)

☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)

☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

3. After I've made a decision, I find myself wishing I had chosen differently.

(Bir karar verdikten sonra kendimi farklı seçmiş olmak isterken buluyorum).

☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)

☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)

☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)

☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)

☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

4. I'd prefer to let other people make difficult decisions for me.

(Başkalarının benim için zor kararlar vermesine izin veririm).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

5. When others get stuck, I am able to think of new solutions to problems.

(Diğerleri takıldığında sorunlara yeni çözümler üretebiliyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

6. I can generate good ideas based on logic and facts.

(Mantığa ve gerçeklere dayanan iyi fikirler üretebilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

7. I believe that creativity is fundamentally driven by luck and accident.

(Yaratıcılığın temelde şansa bağlı ve tesadüfen olduğuna inanıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

8. I can make new and creative suggestions and solutions in groups.

(Gruplar halinde yeni ve yaratıcı öneriler ve çözümler üretebilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

9. I'm patient during a consultation and try not to jump to conclusions too quickly.

(Bir danışmanlık görüşmesi sırasında sabırlıyım ve sonuçlara çok hızlı varmaya çalışmam).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

10. I'm willing to spend time with others.

(Başkalarıyla zaman geçirmeye hazırım).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

11. I undermine any of others' personal beliefs.

(Başkalarının kişisel inançlarını önemsemem).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

12. I speak in a way that others could understand.

(Başkalarının anlayabileceği şekilde konuşurum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

13. While speaking, I give my addressee enough time to ask questions.

(Konuşurken karşımdakine soru sorması için yeterli zaman tanırım).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

14. If I don't understand someone's explanation the first time, I ask for clarification.

(İlk seferde birisinin açıklamasını anlamıyorsa, açıklama isterim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

15. I have no difficulty putting my thoughts and feelings into words to express to others.

(Düşüncelerimi ve duygularımı başkalarına ifade ederken kelimelere dökmekte zorluk çekmem).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

16. When other people become emotional around me, I know how to react.

(Diğer insanlar çevremde duygusal hale geldiğinde nasıl tepki vereceğimi biliyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

17. I can easily get people to follow my lead.

(İnsanları kolayca takip edebilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

18. People look at me for help when things go wrong in the organization.

(Organizasyonda işler ters gittiğinde insanlar bana yardım eder).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

19. I feel that I inspire other people - I influence how they think, act, and accomplish goals.

(Diğer insanlara ilham verdiğimi hissediyorum - hedeflerini düşünme, hareket etme ve başarıma biçimlerini etkiliyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

20. I prefer my own way of doing things.

(Bir şeyleri kendi yöntemlerimle yapmayı tercih ederim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

21. I view mistakes as learning opportunities.

(Hataları öğrenme fırsatları olarak görüyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

22. I care about my fitness.

(Formda olmayı önemsiyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

23. I am calm and cool without any stress and depression.

(Stres ve depresyon olmadan sakin ve soğuk kanlıyım).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

24. I can adapt myself to different roles, job responsibilities, schedules, and contexts.

(Kendimi farklı rollere, iş sorumluluklarına, programlara ve bağlamlara uyarlayabilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

25. I can work effectively in a climate of ambiguity and changing priorities.

(Belirsizlik ve değişen koşullarda etkili bir şekilde çalışabilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

26. I learn from and work collaboratively with individuals representing diverse cultures including those of foreign languages.

(Yabancı diller de dahil olmak üzere farklı kültürleri temsil eden bireylerden öğrenir ve onlarla işbirliği içinde çalışırım).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

27. I act responsibly with the interests of the larger community

(Daha geniş bir topluluğun çıkarlarına karşı sorumlu davranıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

28. I behave in a respectable professional manner when dealing with other people.

(Diğer insanlarla uğraşırken saygılı bir şekilde davranıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

29. I use computers as a tool to research, organize, evaluate, and access the information.

(Bilgisayarları bilgiyi araştırmak, düzenlemek, değerlendirmek ve bilgiye erişmek için bir araç olarak kullanıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

30. I use mobile phones, media players, GPS, etc. as a tool to communicate with others and to access the information.

(Cep telefonlarını, medya oynatıcıları, GPS, vb. diğer insanlarla iletişim kurmak ve bilgiye erişmek için kullanırım).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

31. Simple explanations leave me with a lot of questions to ask.

(Basit açıklamalar bana birçok soru sordurur).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

32. When I come across something puzzling, I like to try to find a solution.

(Şaşırtıcı bir şeyle karşılaştığımda bir çözüm bulmaya çalışıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

33. I curiously enjoy learning about unfamiliar subjects.

(Bilmediğim konuları öğrenmekten merakla öğrenmekten zevk alırım).

34. I understand and utilize the most appropriate media creation tools, characteristics, and conventions.

(En uygun medya oluşturma araçlarını, özelliklerini ve sözleşmeler).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

35. I know where and how to find information efficiently and effectively using appropriate sources like, journals, encyclopedias, database or so.

(Uygun bilgileri kullanarak nerede ve nasıl etkili ve verimli bilgi bulabileceğimi biliyorum, dergiler, ansiklopediler, veri tabanı gibi kaynaklar).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

36. I understand the environment in which I live, particularly as relates to air, climate, land,

food, energy, water and ecosystems and the factors that may damage or survive them.

(Yaşadığım ortamı, özellikle hava, iklim, toprak, gıda, enerji, su ve ekosistemler ile bunlara zarar verebilecek veya hayatta kalabilecek faktörleri bilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

37. I'm responsible for day-to-day decisions about my money.

(Paramla ilgili günlük kararlardan ben sorumluyum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

38. I do my financial jobs using credit cards and on-line gateways.

(Finansal işlerimi kredi kartları ve çevrimiçi ağ geçitleri kullanarak yapıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

39. I have a good memory for words and names and easily remember to do my tasks.

(Kelimeler ve isimler için iyi bir hafızam var ve görevlerimi yapmayı kolayca hatırlıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

40. I know how to control my thoughts and learning activities.

(Düşüncelerimi ve öğrenme faaliyetlerimi nasıl kontrol edeceğimi biliyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

41. I can manage time to control and perform all my intended programs and get the best results.

(İstenen tüm programları kontrol etmek ve gerçekleştirmek için zamanı yönetebilirim ve en iyi sonuçları alırım).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

42. I understand the rights and responsibilities of citizenship at local, state, national, and global levels.

(Yerel, il, milli ve küresel seviyelerdeki vatandaşlık haklarını ve sorumluluklarını anlıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

43. I know the purpose and function of each of the three branches of government and the Constitution.

(Hükümetin ve anayasanın her üç kolunun amacını ve işlevini biliyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

44. I can demonstrate, interpret, recognize, and understand information presented through

visible actions like objects and symbols.

(Nesneler ve semboller gibi görünür nesneler aracılığıyla sunulan bilgileri gösterebilir, yorumlayabilir, tanıyabilir ve anlayabilirim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

45. I prefer electronic (written or audio) form of books and magazines.

(Elektronik (yazılı veya sesli) kitap ve dergi biçimini tercih ederim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

46. I follow the daily news and events through the internet.

(Günlük haberleri ve olayları internet üzerinden takip ediyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

47. I use the electronic mail (e-mail) rather than postal mail to communicate with others.

(Başkalarıyla iletişim kurmak için posta yerine elektronik posta (e-posta) kullanıyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

48. I prefer the distance education rather than attending schools.

(Okullara gitmek yerine uzaktan eğitimi tercih ediyorum).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

49. I prefer on-line exams rather than personal/ usual school exams.

(Kişisel / olağan okul sınavları yerine çevrimiçi sınavları tercih ederim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

50. I prefer to use audio-visual recorded clips rather than note taking in my classes.

(Derslerimde not almak yerine görsel-işitsel kaydedilmiş klipler kullanmayı tercih ederim).

- ☐ Entirely/ Always (Tamamen / Her zaman)
- ☐ Mostly/often (Çoğunlukla / sık sık)
- ☐ Partly/ Sometimes (Kısmen / Bazen)
- ☐ Rarely/ Hardly ever (Nadiren / Neredeyse hiç)
- ☐ Not at all/ Never (Hiç / Asla)

