

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

**AUTONOMY OF ENGLISH TEACHERS WITH REFUGEE
STUDENTS IN THEIR CLASSES**

PREPARED BY

CEREN TEK

MASTER THESIS

ANKARA - 2021

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

**AUTONOMY OF ENGLISH TEACHERS WITH REFUGEE
STUDENTS IN THEIR CLASSES**

PREPARED BY

CEREN TEK

MASTER THESIS

ADVISOR

ASSIST. PROF. GÜLİN DAĞDEVİREN KIRMIZI

ANKARA - 2021

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı çerçevesinde Ceren TEK tarafından hazırlanan bu çalışma, aşağıdaki jüri tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 11 / 01 / 2021

Tez Adı: Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes

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

İmza

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gülin DAĞDEVİREN KIRMIZI / Başkent Üniversitesi

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ceyhun KARABIYIK / Ufuk Üniversitesi

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Senem ÜSTÜN KAYA / Başkent Üniversitesi

ONAY

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. Servet ÖZDEMİR
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

Tarih: ... / ... /

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

Tarih: 28 / 01 / 2021

Öğrencinin Adı, Soyadı: Ceren TEK

Öğrencinin Numarası: 21710374

Anabilim Dalı: Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Programı: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı

Danışmanın Unvanı/Adı, Soyadı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gülin DAĞDEVİREN KIRMIZI

Tez Başlığı: Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen Yüksek Lisans/Doktora tez çalışmamın; Giriş, Ana Bölümler ve Sonuç Bölümünden oluşan, toplam 69 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 28 / 01 / 2021 tarihinde tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 13'tür. Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Kaynakça hariç
2. Alıntılar hariç
3. Beş (5) kelimeden 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:.....

ONAY

Tarih: 28 / 01 / 2021

Öğrenci Danışmanı Unvan, Ad, Soyad, İmza:

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gülin DAĞDEVİREN KIRMIZI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Assist. Prof. Gülin DAĞDEVİREN KIRMIZI for her continuous support during my study. It would not be possible for me to complete my thesis without her guidance and efforts. I would like to also thank her for support.

I would also like to show my gratitude to TÜBİTAK. Without their support, this study would not reach its goal.

I wish to thank Ministry of National Education for allowing me to conduct my study in state schools. I also would like to show my gratitude to teachers who participated in this study for their valuable contributions.

I would also like to thank to the thesis examining committee members, Assist. Prof. Ceyhun KARABIYIK and Assist. Prof. Senem ÜSTÜN KAYA for their invaluable time and suggestions.

I would like to express my gratitude to my dad, my mother, my brother and my fiancé for their never ending support and encouragement. This study was possible due to their support.

ÖZET

Ceren Tek

Sınıfında Mülteci Öğrenci Bulunan İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Özerkliği

**Başkent Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı 2021**

Bu araştırmanın amacı, sınıflarında mülteci öğrenci olan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin özerkliklerini, öğretim ve değerlendirme, okul yönetimi, mesleki gelişim ve müfredat geliştirme olmak üzere dört farklı boyutta incelemektir. Araştırmaya Ankara'daki devlet ortaokullarında görev yapan 121 İngilizce öğretmeni katılmıştır. Veriler anket ve açık uçlu sorular aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar, öğretim ve değerlendirme ile mesleki gelişimde katılımcıların genel olarak yüksek özerkliğe sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte, okul yönetimi ve müfredat geliştirmede özerkliklerinin daha düşük olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Mülteci öğrencisi olmayan İngilizce öğretmenleriyle karşılaştırıldığında, t-testi sonuçları, sınıflarında mülteci öğrenci olan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin genel özerkliğinin daha düşük olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca sonuçlar, sınıftaki mülteci öğrenci sayısının, beklentilerin aksine öğretmenlerin özerkliği ile bir ilişkisinin olmadığı da göstermiştir. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin mesleki deneyimlerinin ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin özerklikleri arasında bir ilişki olmadığı sonucuna varılmıştır. Açık uçlu sorularda öğretmenler ağırlıklı olarak verdikleri ödev miktarı, öğrencileri disipline etme ve sınıfları için kurallar ve normlar belirleme konusunda özerkliklerini kullanabildikleri halde ders kitaplarını seçemediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Dahası, çoğunluk okul yönetimine dahil olmadıklarına inandıklarını belirtmiştir. Ayrıca katılımcıların çoğu, hizmet içi mesleki gelişim programlarının içeriği konusunda özerk olmadıklarını ve ihtiyaçlarına göre bu programlara katılamadıklarını düşünmektedir. Son olarak, katılımcıların büyük çoğunluğu müfredat tasarlama sürecine dahil olmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen özerkliği, İngilizce öğretmenleri, mülteci eğitimi, mesleki gelişim.

ABSTRACT

Ceren Tek

Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes

**Başkent University Institute of Educational Sciences Department of Foreign
Languages Master Program of English Language Teaching with Thesis 2021**

The purpose of this research was to investigate the autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in four different dimensions, which are teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development. 121 English teachers working in state secondary schools in Ankara participated in the study. Data were collected through questionnaires and open ended questions. The results showed that in teaching and assessment and professional development participants had generally high autonomy. However, in school management and curriculum development their autonomy were lower. When compared to English teachers without refugee students, t-test results showed that overall autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their class were lower. Furthermore, the results also showed that number of refugee students in the class did not affect the autonomy of teachers contrary to the expectations. Additionally, it was concluded that professional experience of teachers did not affect the autonomy of English teachers. In open ended questions teachers mainly stated that they could not select textbooks, even though they could use their autonomy in the amount of homework they gave, disciplining students and setting rules and norms for their classes. Moreover, majority believed that they were not involved in school management. Furthermore, most of the participants thought that they were not autonomous regarding the content of in-service professional development programmes, and they generally could not attend these programmes according to their needs. Finally, vast majority of the participants stated that they were not involved in curriculum designing process.

Keywords: Teacher autonomy, English language teachers, refugee education, professional development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ÖZET.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Problem Situation.....	1
1.2. Purpose.....	2
1.3. Significance of the Study.....	3
1.4. Limitations of the Study.....	3
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
2.1. Teacher Autonomy.....	4
2.1.1. Studies on teacher autonomy.....	6
2.1.2. Teacher autonomy in Turkey.....	8
2.1.3. Teacher autonomy and learner autonomy.....	14
2.2. Refugee Education.....	15
2.2.1. Problems refugee children face in education.....	15
2.2.2. Inclusion of refugees.....	17
2.2.3. Teachers in refugee education.....	22
2.2.4. Education of refugees in Turkey.....	26
3. METHOD.....	31
3.1. Model of Study.....	31
3.2. Sample.....	31
3.3. Data Collection Instrument.....	31
3.3.1. Questionnaire.....	32
3.4. Participants	32
3.5. Data Analysis	34
4. RESULTS.....	35
4.1 Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes.....	35

4.2. Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes.....	40
4.3. The Relationship between the Number of Refugee Students and Teacher Autonomy	42
4.4. The Relationship between the Professional Experience of English Teachers and Their Autonomy.....	43
4.5. Open Ended Questions.....	45
5. DISCUSSION.....	52
5.1. Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes.....	52
5.2. Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes.....	56
5.3. The Relationship between the Number of Refugee Students and Teacher Autonomy.....	59
5.4. The Relationship between the Professional Experience of English Teachers and Their Autonomy.....	60
6. CONCLUSION.....	62
6.1. Summary of the Results.....	62
6.2. Recommendations.....	64
REFERENCES.....	65
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX 1: Teacher Autonomy Survey.....	73
APPENDIX 2: Ministry of National Education Research Permission.....	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Dimensions of Teacher Autonomy.....	5
Table 2 Demographic Data of Participants.....	32
Table 3 Participants' Autonomy in Teaching and Assessment.....	35
Table 4 Participants' Autonomy in School Management.....	37
Table 5 Participants' Autonomy in Professional Development.....	38
Table 6 Participants' Autonomy in Curriculum Development.....	39
Table 7 Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes.....	41
Table 8 Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes.....	42
Table 9 Relationship between the Number of Refugee Students and Teacher Autonomy..	43
Table 10 Relationship between the Professional Experience of English Teachers and Their Autonomy.....	44
Table 11 Participant's Discretion in the Classroom.....	45
Table 12 Participant's Involvement in School Management.....	46
Table 13 Participant's Autonomy in Professional Development.....	48
Table 14 Participant's Involvement in Creating Curriculum.....	50

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MoNE	Ministry of National Education
HRW	Human Rights Watch
PISA	Program for International Student Assessment
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SWP	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this section problem situation, purpose of the study, the significance and the restriction of the study will be discussed.

1.1. Problem Situation

As UNICEF Turkey 2018 Humanitarian results show Turkey has the largest registered refugee population in the world with almost 4 million refugees (UNICEF, 2018). It is in the highest rates in the history of the country with the civil war in Syria. However, Turkey also hosts refugees from many different countries. According to the report of United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, there are 164,351 Afghans, 142,576 Iraqis, 37,732 Iranians, 5,518 Somalis and 11,515 from other countries around the world (UNHCR, 2018). Moreover, 1.7 million of the refugees are children. Therefore, this situation also brings major education problems.

As of January 2019, the number of the refugee children who are in the school is 645,000. However, these children are placed in schools without having any orientation and this brings major adaptation problems. Furthermore, refugee children who are in Turkish schools, their quality of learning are limited due to language barriers (Dorman, 2014). As they do not know any or limited Turkish, they may have difficulties understanding lessons. Moreover, refugee students may require further language support for them to comprehend lessons. However, if teachers do not know any common language with refugee students, they cannot give the support required. Only 96,841 students are in temporary education centres and receive Turkish language education according to Directorate General of Migration Management. This means, remaining refugee students do not have any prior education regarding Turkish.

In addition to their existing language barrier with Turkish, the refugee children try to learn another language in English lessons. This situation brings difficulties for both the students and the teachers. They have no common language, yet the teachers try to teach a third language. However, the required education for diverse classrooms is not given to the teachers before they start their profession. Nevertheless, in recent years inclusive education courses have been implemented in teacher training education. It becomes a challenging situation for them to deal with and maintain their autonomy as well. Teachers need more

autonomy to adapt their lessons considering the needs and interests of their students, but giving not enough autonomy to teachers in their profession is an on-going problem in the Turkish educational system (Öztürk, 2011).

1.2. Purpose

New curriculum that Ministry of National Education (MoNE) has published in 2018 shows that new approach is taken towards English language learning, and the aim is second language acquisition. However, Işık (2008) stated that in spite of the efforts spent on foreign language education in Turkey, low proficiency level is still a serious problem. He believes the reason for this may be the long-standing traditional language teaching habits, the deficiencies in foreign language education planning and the inadequacies or mistakes in the methods, activities, materials and assessment and evaluation they have caused. While the numbers of refugee children in state schools are rising, the teachers are not given required education regarding diverse classrooms. Teaching English and maintaining their autonomy is even challenging in non-diverse classrooms and it is expected from English teachers to manage both teaching English in diverse classrooms and maintaining their autonomy. Furthermore, the teachers need to be aware of the methods and techniques they would use for an effective teaching for both Turkish and refugee students. They need the certain education and professionalism considering the seriousness of the situation. Forghani-Arani, Cerna and Bannon (2019) states that a high degree of professionalism is needed to choose and change teaching methods for different student groups. These are the educational needs of different student groups, objectively evaluating the portrayal of diversity in teaching materials, and continuous reflection and assessment of own practice and its influence on diverse students.

The aim of this study is to investigate the autonomy of the teachers with refugees in their classes. The levels of these classes are Grade 5,6,7, and 8. The autonomy of the teachers will be investigated under teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development. Hence, this study will explore different areas of teacher autonomy. Therefore, it is expected that this study would make a contribution to the field. This study would make contribution in the development of immersion programs and professional development of English teachers in inclusive education.

1.3. Significance of the Study

As it was stated before, UNICEF Turkey 2018 Humanitarian results show Turkey has the largest registered refugee population in the world with almost 4 million refugees (UNICEF, 2018). Furthermore, 1.7 million of the refugees are children. Therefore, the education of refugee children is a significant issue for the future of refugee children. Most of the studies in education field are concerned with refugee students and their adaptation to the education system in Turkey. There are not many examples of studies about teachers and their thoughts and feelings. The studies are mainly about the education of the Syrian refugee children, temporary education centres, experiences of educational stakeholders, experiences of the refugee children in terms of education and Syrian refugee children's learner autonomy (Culbertson & Constant, 2015; Aras & Yasun, 2016; Erçakır-Kozan, B., 2019; Erden, O., 2017; Bozkurt, N., 2017). Among these Khalil's (2018) study is investigating the autonomy of English teachers in state secondary schools. However, it does not refer to the refugee children problem in the education system in Turkey. Therefore, this study is expected to shed light on the aspect of teaching in a class with refugee students who have language barrier and no orientation beforehand most of the time.

1.4. Limitations of the Study

The study was conducted in Ankara, Turkey. The data was gathered in one and a half month in state schools. Unfortunately, the lack of time and Covid-19 pandemic restricted the selection of the cities and the number of participants. Hence, only the schools in central districts were visited. These central districts were Yenimahalle, Çankaya and Altındağ. Therefore, the participants may be limited regarding the representativeness. Furthermore, in data collection process the schools were closed due to pandemic and the other central districts that were supposed to be included in the study could not be visited.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section will provide information on the concept of teacher autonomy, different definitions and dimensions of the term. Furthermore, the studies in and out of Turkey regarding teacher autonomy will be reported.

2.1. Teacher Autonomy

Over the years, the idea of teacher autonomy has considerably evolved and continues to grow. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Benson and Huang (2008) claim that there is little consensus over its meaning and importance. However, the definition of teacher autonomy in the literature has referred to the teachers' control, including freedom from external control (Smith, 2000). Little (1995, p. 175) notes that:

“Genuinely successful teachers have always been autonomous in the sense of having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their teaching, exercising via continuous reflection and analysis the highest possible degree of affective and cognitive control of the teaching process, and exploiting the freedom that this confers.”

In a similar sense Tort-Moloney (1997) defines an autonomous teacher as a teacher who is aware of why, when, where and how pedagogical skills can be acquired in the teaching practice itself (as cited in Smith, 2000). Short (1994, p.11) defines teacher autonomy “as a dimension of empowerment, refers to teachers' beliefs that they can control certain aspects of their work life” and these certain aspects includes “scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning”. Benson and Huang (2008) discuss that teacher autonomy is generally associated with professional independence or the level of teacher discretion given by curricula and institutions. Webb (2002) describes teacher autonomy as teacher power and mentions that “teachers exercise their autonomy in the face of accountability systems that aim to reduce or eliminate their independent decision-making.” Furthermore, Aoki (2000) suggests that teacher autonomy includes “the capacity, freedom, and/or responsibility to make choices concerning one's own teaching” (as cited in Smith, 2003, p. 2).

Another aspect of teacher autonomy is control. Pearson & Moomaw (2005) define it as teachers' understanding on whether they manage themselves and their work environment. Powell and McGowan (1996) also refer to teacher autonomy with teachers' discretion over

their working environments and their own professional development (as cited in Benson and Huang, 2008).

The autonomy of teachers is a multifaceted notion and cannot be condensed into a single concept and Smith and Erdogan (2008) summarize these different dimensions in Table 1.

Table 1 Dimensions of Teacher Autonomy (Smith & Erdogan, 2008, p. 84-85)

In relation to professional action:	
A. Self-directed professional action	i.e. ‘Self-directed teaching’
B. Capacity for self-directed professional action	i.e. ‘Teacher autonomy (capacity to self-direct one’s teaching)’
C. Freedom from control over professional action	i.e. ‘Teacher autonomy (freedom to self-direct one’s teaching)’
In relation to professional development:	
D. Self-directed professional development	i.e. ‘Self-directed teacher-learning’
E. Capacity for self-directed professional development	i.e. ‘Teacher-learner autonomy (capacity development to self-direct one’s learning as a teacher)’
F. Freedom from control over professional development	i.e. ‘Teacher-learner autonomy (freedom to self-direct one’s learning as a teacher)’

Possible elements of teacher autonomy are on the left side of the table are, and mutually distinctive alternative expressions to those elements are on the right. Moreover, it can help to see the relation between learner autonomy and teacher autonomy.

Pearson and Hall (1993, p. 175) believe there are two dimensions regarding teacher autonomy: (a) curriculum autonomy which refers to the “selection of activities and materials and instructional planning and sequencing”, (b) overall teaching autonomy which concerns with “classroom standards of conduct and personal on-the-job decision making”. In a similar sense, Friedman (1999) describes four areas of teachers’ work autonomy: (a) student teaching and assessment, (b) school mode of operating, (c) staff development, and (d)

curriculum development. The dimension of student teaching and assessment deals with evaluation of the student achievement, creating norms of student behaviour, organizing physical environment, varied teaching emphasis on mandatory curriculum. School mode of operating involves establishing school goals and vision, budget distribution, school policies in terms of student admission and class composition. Staff development points out choosing the content, pacing, and procedures of the in-service training of teachers. Lastly, curriculum development mentions introducing new curricula and making important changes on it.

Breen (2007, p. 1069) believes that as migration rates increase, working conditions and professional development of English teachers will be highly affected. He states teachers face with a difficult choice:

“Either we perceive ourselves as a teacher of language unconnected to wider social, cultural, and political processes and, thereby, participate in the marginalization of our profession, or we accept the formative role we play in these processes and confront the possibilities for beneficial change in the intercultural work that we do.”

Breen also argues that changes in theory and research, and technological developments bring challenges to teachers. It puts teachers into a position where their duty is to implement these theories rather than contributing to them. He also supports the idea that teachers need to be responsible for their professional development, consequently, development programs need to include “professional autonomy, accountability, and responsibility” (p.1079).

2.1.1. Studies on teacher autonomy

For teacher autonomy, there are a variety of studies conducted. A study carried out in the USA by Webb (2002) examined teachers’ exercise their autonomy in a public elementary school in Washington. He criticized the policies in the USA that give little freedom to the teacher to alter the curriculum according to the needs of the students and the state accountability system that limits their independent decision making. Participants were five teachers and a head teacher and observation and semi-structured interviews were conducted for data collection. The results showed that participants applied autonomy to modify compulsory curriculum and assessment programs. The teachers identified the needs of their students’ needs and used their autonomy to adjust the curricular policies and improve student achievement. To identify the needs of the students, when practicing autonomy, the participants used their professional experience, earlier teacher education, and teacher questioning.

In another study, Pearson and Moomaw's (2005) study concentrated on the relationship between teacher autonomy and job satisfaction, motivation, and burnout. The data was obtained through a questionnaire from 171 participants who were elementary, middle, and high school teachers. It was found that as if teachers practice more curriculum autonomy, their stress regarding work also decreased. However, the relationship between autonomy on curriculum and job satisfaction were little. The results showed that autonomy does not vary across teaching level (elementary, middle, high school). Moreover, it was found that teachers desired autonomy in decision making in their school and authority over their work environment.

Similarly, Benson (2010) carried a case study with four Hong Kong secondary school teachers and their experiences on constraints regarding teacher autonomy in English language teaching. The findings indicated that teachers' daily decisions about teaching and learning are mainly regulated by "Schemes of Work", which specify the content to be taught, and also the pace that the teachers will cover it. He stated that "Schemes of Work" and the system of monitoring constrained the teachers' capacity to make their own decision. Moreover, the content of system-wide English language curriculum standards, syllabuses and public exams also limited the autonomy of teachers. In this situation, the teachers reported that they create their own space for autonomy by adapting or completely ignoring the objectives defined in the "Schemes of Work".

Prichard and Moore (2016) studied the different variables and their effects on teacher autonomy, coordination, and collaboration. According to the results, the most powerful aspect that affected teacher autonomy was program complexity. Besides, it was stated that compared to smaller programs, if programs had more students, teachers had less curricular autonomy. It was also mentioned that teachers who had fewer students had more autonomy in choosing what to teach. Teachers in programs outside higher education had less autonomy compared to the programs in universities.

In another study, Hong and Youngs (2016) examined curricular autonomy of teachers in South Korea. 12 teachers in Seoul, Korea were interviewed concerning curriculum issues in Korea. Teachers in the study expressed that they needed more curricular autonomy. Teachers argued that they could modify the curriculum in line with the demands of their students and they believed that they needed to have more autonomy rather than government controlled curriculum. However, according to the study, teachers were not permitted to make

alterations on the curriculum, such as when and what to teach, they had to follow certain standards. Only 20% of participants believed that new curriculum gave them more autonomy than before. The results also showed that new changes in curriculum which allowed being more flexible resulted in less job satisfaction.

Additionally, Mustafa and Cullingford (2008) studied teacher autonomy and centralised education in the context of textbook in Jordan. One factor that affected teacher autonomy was shortage of materials that could be used in teaching. Another aspect was lack of training and participants expressed that they did not have the appropriate training before becoming teachers in terms of pedagogy. They further commented that there were not enough training programs for teachers and they did not have the sufficient knowledge about teaching techniques and methods. Moreover, they stressed the lack of coordination between Ministry of Education and teachers regarding teacher training courses. Teachers also stated that overcrowded classes negatively affected their autonomy. They argued that it was difficult to teach according to students' needs in an overcrowded class in inadequate time. Moreover, teachers' workload, which is disproportionate, caused difficulties. Lastly, covering the whole textbook used in the classes at the end of the year put pressure on teachers. They could not support the topics in the textbook by other activities as they thought they would waste time. Therefore, they struggled adapting the textbook and using different teaching methods.

Lepičnik-Vodopivec (2016) explored primary school teachers' opinions on teacher autonomy in Slovenia. The participants were 104 primary school teachers. When teachers asked to describe teacher autonomy, they used terms such as independence and freedom. Additionally, majority of teachers expressed that they were autonomous. The participants were most autonomous in selecting teaching methods. However, they were least autonomous in selecting textbooks they used. Results also showed that teachers' experience impacts their autonomy in determining methods and techniques to use in classes. Furthermore, teachers emphasized that regulations in education and curriculum was the most significant aspect that impeded with their autonomy.

2.1.2. Teacher autonomy in Turkey

According to PISA's report (OECD, 2016) Turkey is one of the counties that placed emphasis on autonomy the least. In Turkey's Education Vision 2023, it is stated that a framework for curriculum is enough in an education that has good teachers (MoNE, 2019).

Moreover, it is pointed that a good teacher can build their own curriculum in accordance with the demands of their students. However, the truth is that teachers have to maintain the curriculum given by MoNE and cannot alter the subjects needed to be taught to their students' needs. Furthermore, they cannot decide on the course book they use. Therefore, only adjustments they can arrange are contributing their lessons with supplementary activities. Even if it is stated in Turkey's Education Vision 2023 that teachers have the autonomy for curriculum, in practice teachers need to follow the curriculum as instructed.

Üzüm and Karşı (2013) emphasizes that arrangement of rules and practices in a way that extends the teacher's authority and enables them to work freely alone is not enough for teachers to gain their autonomy. They further add that teachers must have sufficient professional knowledge and skills to work autonomously. Therefore, one of the fundamental factors determining autonomy of teachers is their professional development level. Besides, the general understanding in Turkey's education system is to identify and inspect what teachers do (Öztürk, 2011b). Öztürk further adds that when teachers choose course contents and methods, they cannot go beyond the framework drawn by the curriculum and textbooks. Hence, the role of the teacher does not go beyond being a mere implementer of teaching, which is usually determined by curricula and textbooks. On the other hand, most of the teachers consider that developing the curriculum is not their responsibility but the Ministry of National Education (Can, 2009). However, teachers should be able to use their professional experience, which they have gained through their professional training and years of work, in choosing educational material for their students (Özaslan, 2013).

In Turkey, there are studies on teacher autonomy in different areas such as reflective journals and teacher autonomy, curriculum and English language teaching. In her study, Genc (2010) explored teacher autonomy with the context of the using reflective journals and whether their teacher autonomy benefited from reflective journals. The participants were six in-service teachers teaching at several public schools in Bursa, Turkey. She stated that these teachers were limited by the given curriculum by MoNE and the education they obtained before starting their profession. She asked participants to complete journal entries every week for 12 weeks and to analyse and assess their teaching through these journals. In the findings, she stated that journal writing enabled teachers to become more aware of the needs and challenges of their teaching contexts. Moreover, it led them to consider potential solutions and to incorporate different teaching techniques developed by them. Owing to these journals, in their classroom activities, they felt more motivated and independent and they also made more aware and educated decisions about their classrooms.

In another study, Öztürk (2011a) examined the new history curriculum in terms of teacher autonomy in elementary and secondary levels. Öztürk compared old and the current syllabuses in his study. He analysed whether there was a significant change regarding teacher autonomy using content analysis. The content analysis was to determine the position of teacher autonomy in the overall objectives and values of the programs and sphere of independence granted to teachers in the preparation of teaching content (subjects). In his findings, he stated that the program gave little importance to teacher autonomy. Besides, in terms of selection and preparation of the teaching content, methods and materials, it gave the teachers little chance. However, as contrasted to the previous history programs, the current one introduces only minimal improvement on the roles of teachers in curriculum planning.

Moreover, in terms of teacher autonomy, Yıldırım (2017) explored the views of EFL instructors and administrators working at a university and investigated to what degree the instructors had autonomy. She examined the autonomy in six different areas which are curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, classroom management, and institutional operations. Yıldırım also explored the views of the administrators on teacher autonomy. The participants were fifty instructors and five administrators in an English preparatory program in a state university. What she found as a result is that in general, the instructors had low autonomy, but they hoped to have more autonomy. The highest level autonomy was in classroom management, yet instructors felt that they had adequate level of autonomy. The results showed the same for instructional autonomy. It was the second highest, nevertheless instructors also felt adequately autonomous in this area. Moreover, instructors had low level of autonomy for curriculum. Furthermore, in professional development, participants had low level of autonomy. Instructors also had low level of autonomy in assessment as exams were prepared by the responsible unit in the institute. The views of the administrators on the extent of the teacher autonomy varied in each area. They agreed that teachers need to have autonomy on professional development and management of the classroom, and yet they did not embrace the concept of granting autonomy to teachers over evaluation and institutional operations. Both instructors and administrators, however, believed that autonomy of teachers is crucial for teachers and effective teaching.

Additionally, Canbolat (2020) examined professional autonomy of high school teachers in Turkey. He studied the how teachers' perceived autonomy as reasonable and feasible in contexts of instructional, administrative, financial and personal and professional

autonomy. In the results, it was found that teachers perceived administrative autonomy as the most reasonable and instructive autonomy as the least reasonable. Furthermore, teachers thought that MoNE needed to develop curriculum. However, they disapproved a definite curriculum as it restricted their professional autonomy in terms of adaptability. Science teachers thought that instructional autonomy as less reasonable and feasible as their subjects were tested in centralized exams. Lastly, teachers who had more experience thought instructional autonomy less reasonable than less experienced teachers.

Üzüm and Karşlı (2013) studied classroom teachers' awareness about teacher autonomy. Participants were 779 classroom teachers in İzmir, Turkey. In results, it was found that the level of awareness of the classroom teachers about the content of teacher autonomy in technical sense was high. Researchers stated that the fact that teachers knew on which subjects they should have had a say led them to demand autonomy. Furthermore, there was a high degree of awareness among classroom teachers concerning the psychological perception and evaluation of teacher autonomy both inside and outside the classroom. In addition, classroom teachers' awareness of teacher autonomy about the application methods examined in the study was low. Researchers believed that it can be associated with the centralized structure of the education system in Turkey. Moreover, classroom teachers accepted the point that teacher autonomy needed to be limited according to the teacher's experience. Classroom teachers' most common problem was in the sense of lack of authority compared to their professional responsibilities. Thus, the researchers implied that with appropriate responsibility and authority, the application area of teacher autonomy could be expanded.

Similarly, Özaslan (2015) examined teachers' perceptions on their professional autonomy. Participants were 10 teachers in Konya, Turkey. They were English, Turkish, maths and classroom teachers. Participants perceived autonomy as not to interfere with their professional preferences in some aspects of their duties within their field of expertise, and this situation was necessary for the students to gain the objectives determined by the ministry at the level they should be. Participants also stated that there were two consequences of teachers not having sufficient professional autonomy. First is the teachers' being not helpful enough for their students, and the second is the teaching profession losing its dignity. Moreover, classrooms teachers believed that they are more autonomous compared to teachers in other fields, as they had free activity hours, arranged weekly lesson programs and parents meeting as they desire. Participants were not able to go beyond the textbooks

determined centrally by the Ministry of National Education, and this situation made their work difficult during the teaching process. Moreover, participants stated that they needed more autonomy regarding disciplinary action, as they believed a peaceful classroom atmosphere was necessary for an effective education.

Similar to Özaslan, Karabacak (2014) studied the perceptions of high school teachers related to teacher autonomy and teacher self-efficacy. Participants were 3080 high school teachers in Ankara, Turkey. In the results, teachers fully embraced instructional autonomy and administrative autonomy and found it largely applicable. Furthermore, teachers largely adopted autonomy towards personal and professional development and find it feasible, and they adopted instructional autonomy and found it applicable the most. Moreover, as teachers' experience increased, they found autonomy for educational, managerial, financial, and personal and professional development as more feasible. However, the more experienced teachers adopted financial autonomy the less. Finally, as the instructional autonomy increased, the self-efficacy towards teaching strategies also increased.

Uğurlu and Qahramanova (2016) examined opinions of teachers and school administrators on teacher autonomy in Azerbaijan and Turkey. The participants were class teachers and administrators from state schools. In the results, it was stated that both school administrators and teachers from Azerbaijan and Turkey described teacher autonomy as having freedom of choice in teaching. Furthermore, in Turkey, teachers' contribution to curriculum preparation process was low, especially in determining lesson content. School administrators in both countries, on the other hand, believed that teachers had autonomy on the method of education. Moreover, teachers' autonomy was at a high level regarding control and supervision in the classroom. Teachers also stated they had autonomy in choosing evaluation methods. However, teachers in Turkey expressed that they had no autonomy over planning the curriculum and the school's financial plan.

In another study, Çolak and Altinkurt (2017) examined the relationship between teachers' autonomy and school climate. The research was carried in Muğla, Turkey and participants were teachers who work in different levels. Results showed that general autonomy of teachers were above average. Teachers thought that they were the most autonomous in the teaching process among other autonomy dimensions. However, teachers were least autonomous in professional development. Furthermore, according to the school type, the curriculum autonomy and professional communication autonomy differed

significantly. Moreover, teachers who had experience less than 5 years, showed more autonomy in teaching. Teachers working in private schools stated that they had more autonomy over the curriculum than teachers in public schools. Teachers working in public schools, on the other hand, had more professional communication autonomy than teachers in private schools.

Similarly, Gülcan (2011) examined perspectives of teachers and administrators on involvement in school decision-making in Ankara. It was concluded that school administrators usually determine meetings at school and they do not collaborate with teachers on that matter. Moreover, Gülcan stated that decisions made in these meetings were made by school administrators. Therefore, teachers believed that their participation in decision making was not significant. School administrators mostly scheduled the meetings when they desired rather than in accordance with the needs of teachers. Gülcan further commented that principals do not let teachers to make decisions at school, yet they thought that there were enough participation by teachers. However, teachers believed that they could participate more in decision making process in their school.

Khalil (2018) explored teacher autonomy of English teachers in lower secondary schools. Participants for the questionnaire in the study was 88, 3 English teachers were observed and 14 participants were interviewed. Participants generally described teacher autonomy as control, discretion and right to make decisions. In the results, teachers stated that they were autonomous in teaching and assessment except for selecting books. However, most of the participants expressed that they were unable to choose topics and skills from a standardized curriculum to be taught and teach things they liked due to time limit. Participants also felt a great sense of participation and ownership about the events taking place in the school, even though their idea about in context of school management were not positive. Teachers mainly stated that they could identify their professional development objectives and help teachers who had less experience. Nonetheless, participants in the questionnaire stated that they could not inform MoNE about their needs regarding professional development. Hence, they stated they could not impact the selected instructor for in-service training. Moreover, in the interviews they argued that professional development programs organized by MoNE were limited and had low quality. For curriculum, participants stated that they did focus group meetings regarding curriculum, yet no feedback was provided by MoNE on their reports. Therefore, they believed that their reports were not given importance by MoNE.

2.1.3. Teacher autonomy and learner autonomy

Learner autonomy has many different definitions. However, one of the views is that autonomy is an ability to make choices about one's own learning and that it is important to improve this ability through 'learner training' or through a mentor, such as a teacher. (Sinclair, 2008). Holec (1981) defines autonomous learner as someone who can accept the responsibility for his or her entire learning process. Teacher autonomy is believed to be significant as it is the starting point for the process of self-regulated learning (Little, 1995). It is only possible that autonomous behaviours are promoted to students if it is present in teachers (Ramos, 2006). Hence, teacher autonomy became important in the field (Lamb, 2008). Little (2007) notes that the fundamental goal is autonomous language use in language learning, and it suggests the requirement to look further at the theories of second language acquisition and communicative language teaching which are coherent with learner autonomy (as cited in Lamb, 2008). It is possible to suggest definite general rules for teacher education to promote learner autonomy, which link with the development of the autonomy of teachers or student teachers (Smith and Erdogan, 2008). Benson (2007, p. 733) points that the idea of successful learner has changes as they are expected to train and teach themselves rather than being receptive to teaching. Furthermore, Hui (2010) believes that to achieve the classroom autonomy, teachers and learners have to acknowledge the autonomy of teachers and the autonomy of learners.

Smith (2003, p. 6) suggests that it is important for teacher educators to concentrate on developing teacher autonomy for autonomous learners. He believes “pedagogy for teacher(-learner) autonomy” may be required to prepare teachers for self-directed learning. However, he also questions whether teachers have the freedom to adapt teacher autonomy. He states that teachers need to be critical of themselves if they want to promote autonomy to students.

Manzano Vázquez (2018, p. 395) similarly emphasises the importance of teacher education, whether it is in pre-service or in-service education to promote learner autonomy. He further adds that if they are not appropriately trained, teachers will not be able to facilitate learner autonomy. In his paper, 20 different language teacher education programs have been examined. He concluded that “critical reflection and pedagogical inquiry” in pedagogy for autonomy is effective for both teachers and teacher trainees to develop teacher autonomy and learner autonomy. Most of the teacher education programs mentioned in the paper

involve reflection. Reflection is promoted in these programs through “questionnaires, diaries, portfolios, logs, journals, and cases”. Thus, teacher trainees remain conscious of their own process of learning and reassess their professional growth when they become teachers.

2.2. Refugee Education

In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, education is a basic human right and is secured (1948). Schools for children were founded in pre-World War II emergencies by organizations such as Save the Children, but educational provision became more widespread during and after World War II (UNHCR, 2011). Therefore, the origin of refugee education date back to these trying times. At this time, the development of refugee education is linked to international structures, institutional relations and shifting perception of the purposes of education (UNHCR, 2011). UNHCR Education Policy Commitments states that successful refugee education requires ensuring a safe educational environment, free and easy access to education, gender equity, qualified education, coordination of international, national and local agencies and partners to supply incorporated and holistic approach (UNHCR, 2011). When Education for All becomes a reality for young people in the midst of emergencies, then the entire world has a greater chance of prosperity and stability (Sinclair, 2001).

2.2.1. Problems refugee children face in education

Emergencies cause major interruption of education systems (Sinclair, 2001). Furthermore, access to refugee education is inadequate and unequal through regions and displacement environments, and for the most part at the secondary level and for girls (UNHCR, 2011). The needs, perspectives and potential of refugee youth are often ignored by policies and programs, even though more than half the refugee population is under age of 18 (UNHCR, 2019). Enrolment of children in school in emergency circumstances may be limited by social issues such as insecurity and poverty, and inadequate standard of education leads to early dropping out of school, and the failure of educational management systems (Sinclair, 2001). Even if they have the chance to attend school, quality of the education they receive is often poor (Kirk and Winthrop, 2007). Paxton et al., (2011) concentrate on the importance of attendance in education and note that refugee students typically have low attendance at school and that this may lead them to scores below the national minimum standard for basic skills. Most of the refugee children who have been displaced across borders are likely to remain there for almost all of their childhoods and this means that refugee children in exile are very likely to have their school cycle there (UNHCR, 2019b).

Displacement interferes with the education of children due to the challenges and dangers they face in gaining protection, obtaining essential services and new identity papers and supporting their households in precarious circumstances (UNHCR, 2019b). There may not even be a school to attend in poorly supplied areas where millions of refugees are settled (UNHCR, 2019b). In some examples where there is no accessible schools, sometimes the refugees will also initiate basic lessons for young children themselves, with volunteer teachers, improvised blackboards and no books (Sinclair, 2001). Crul et al. (2016) states that until the refugee children undergo asylum procedure, which can take 2 years, they are often placed in elementary schools.

In general, there are three conceptual approaches which more broadly direct the field of refugee education and education in emergencies (Burde, 2005, pp. 10-11).

The first approach is the development approach, which recognizes education as a long term investment and states that crisis may hold back development potential and it may even allow “backward development”. In practical terms, it emphasizes educational content, community engagement, and cooperation with government leaders.

The second is the humanitarian approach. It views education as to provide immediate protection to children and prevent human rights violations. This approach primarily emphasizes safe spaces, educational programs as a stop-gap measure before normal services can resume, and community engagement as a realistic way to provide and maintain services. This doesn't necessarily require government coordination or institution-building.

Third is the human rights approach, which emphasizes the value of education as a human right and makes use of it as a key element in strategies for building peace. It sees crises or underdevelopment in any nation as potential obstacles to children's right to obtain education, and it uses education to promote active citizenship, tolerance, and peacebuilding at for relief or development in industrialized, underdeveloped, or conflict-ridden countries. Cultural factors often affect educational content according to this approach, but education is not characterized by those differences.

In their research Hamilton and Moore (2003, p. 106) emphasizes the importance of a model that has an understanding of different variables that could have an effect on the transition of refugee students to school and evaluation approaches. Their model highlighted the separation migration stages as “pre-, trans- and post-phases” and the implementation of an ecological point of view as “micro-, meso-, exo- and macrosystems”. They believe that

these factors should be taken into consideration as they may have influence the progress and adaptation of refugee children within the schools of the host community. Hamilton and Moore also points out that countries should consider establishing a detailed national refugee education policy. Control, cooperation and financial support for programs for newly arriving refugees need to be included in this policy, and language education should be the key point. Moreover, creating a safe environment for refugee children is quite significant. Including parents and surrounding community is another key point for effective schools. The suggestion that the researchers give is to have social gatherings and activities with the community and the parents to build trust among them. They also highlight the importance of classroom environment and instruction. Creating a collaborative environment is similarly important, in this way the students may learn from each other. Therefore, teachers will need the appropriate education regarding multiculturalism and inclusive approach. As a result, professional development of teachers plays a vital role in refugee education. They believe that teachers need to increase their skills for teaching traumatized children, their awareness of the essence of forced migration and its effect on refugee children, their understanding of the various cultures and societies of refugees, and develop skills to help refugee children learn second languages.

2.2.2. Inclusion of refugees

Schools are a stabilizing aspect of refugee students' unsettled lives (Matthews, 2008). In contrast to migration, refugees seek asylum in other countries because of the crisis they have been in. In this case, education of the children is highly affected as it was mentioned in previous section. Schools play a crucial role for children and for them to feel they are part of the country they settled. Refugee children goes through several challenges in their lives in young ages and hearing their needs and giving the right education plays an essential part in their future lives. Education also plays an essential role for them to feel belonging in the community they are in. If refugee children are overlooked and do not get the right education, it is highly possible that integration process would be hindered.

In the process of integration, education plays a significant role, as it is the central position where the host and the incoming cultures both learn from and about each other (Hannah, 2008). Essentially, schools are accountable for developing literacy, a necessity for achievement in education, social engagement and resettlement. (Matthews, 2008). Oh and Van Der Stouwe (2008) believes that giving attention to possibly disadvantaged children

does not mean having different educational programs for different groups, instead, the aim would be to include refugee students in regular educational programs.

As specified in Article 2 of the Convention on the Right of the Child, children have the right not to be discriminated against (UN, 1989). Therefore, it can be inferred that all children “have the right to receive the kind of education that does not discriminate on grounds of disability, ethnicity, religion, language, gender, capabilities, and so on” (UNESCO, 2003).

Policy makers and scholars in education have ignored the particular needs of refugee students, concentrating mostly on migrant education and multicultural education (Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). Taylor and Sidhu also comments that in policy and research, the invisibility of refugees has impacted their political, social and economic integration negatively. In another study, Taylor and Sidhu (2007) stated that there was almost no specific policy towards refugee students in Australia. They were mostly either not identified or combined with other groups, such as ESL students. They were either mixed or not identified at all with other groups, such as ESL students. Jones and Rutter (1998) reviewed the UK's refugee education policy and said that the policies were inadequate, and they also claimed that there were insufficient resources for refugee education, and that refugee children were perceived more as 'problems' instead of potentials to introduce positive elements into the classrooms. (as cited in Taylor & Sidhu, 2012).

In her research, Rutter (2006), found that many Congolese children had difficulties at school because of the language difference. They showed under-achievement in examinations. The main reason for his problem was Congolese children mainly spoke Lingala in their community rather than English. She stated that this situation affected their linguistic and cognitive development at school. Lingala that they speak was the street language and it was not very stable, and it also affected their ability to learn a second language. If the first language was developed well enough, the second language learning was also supported. As their English was not well developed, they had the risk of falling behind at school and in classroom learning. She said that because of their educational problems, Congolese people did not achieve integration in the UK, and they would likely to have low paid jobs like their parents. She also stated that educational programs need to concentrate on particular communities, rather than refugee children as a whole as they have different linguistic, educational and social experiences.

Matthews (2008) argued that Australia have the general understanding for refugees mainly from Europe and Asia. When they started to have refugees from African countries and the Middle East, the education of them was a concern. The reason for that is Australian people knew little about their cultures and backgrounds, and factors such as interrupted schooling. She stated even refugees from different regions within the same country could have different educational needs. She argued that a socio-political approach was needed for refugee education and it should address post-displacement conditions and racialization, acculturation and resilience issues.

Similarly, Cassity (2007) studied 65 African refugees' transition process in state schools in Australia. The refugee students in the study were placed in Intensive English Centres (IEC) when they came to the country before they were placed in public schools. The participants were 7-11 years old and some of them arrived newly or were in Australia for a year. Because of war and finding asylum, these students have all had long periods of time away from education. In the study, it was revealed that the schooling system is not working as it should and the students were struggling with both the setting and the high expectations. In the study, the students pointed that transitioning from IEC to the schools was the most difficult process after they settled in the country. They stated that they were unable to do well in the academic level they were put. Their challenges also included being a new student again, learning another school structure and learning skills in a different context which is high school. When the students were asked about their future plans, they stated that they knew the importance of education and hoped to complete high school and go to university. The most of the students pointed that their major problem was inadequate money and they need to send money to their relatives in their home country or refugee camps. Therefore, some of them need to look for a job when they finish high school. The students also stated that they still had trauma because of the war and they are afraid of not being successful as a result of this. After the study, Cassity made some recommendations for policy regarding refugee students in Australia. She pointed that it is important to track the post-school progress of the students in a long term. She suggested that the students need mentors to make the transition progress easier as they heavily rely on their teachers as guidance. Overall, she suggested a particular policy for the needs of African students and coordination between schools, government and communities. It is highly clear in the study that the refugee students have both hopes for a bright future and concerns for their loved ones. The right policy to

correctly engage them in the schools and support them would be the key for their goals for a better life be true.

Oh and Van Der Stouwe (2008) conducted a research focused on social inclusion of Burmese students in refugee camps in Thailand. They studied both desirable and undesirable impacts education could have on their circumstances. In these refugee camps, there were different ethnic groups, yet they focused on Karen ethnic group. The refugee students did not receive education outside the refugee camps and the people were not allowed to leave the camps to earn money. Oh and Van Der Stouwe stated that this created a difficulty as they had the control of the development of their own society. In these refugee schools, the teachers were also from the camps and they had a standardized educational system across the camps. Unfortunately, the students were excluded from the outside world and they did not have the opportunities that their Thai peers had. Additionally, there were language issues within refugee camps. Some of the students were not fluent in the language used in the schools, which was Skaw Karen, and this created disadvantage for the many students. It was stated that the curriculum mainly promoted the culture of a particular group despite some efforts to change this situation. The most important aspect of the education in these camps was seen as enrolling and little importance was given to quality, relevance and management. The researchers argued that high enrolment rate in schools was not equal to success and successful learning outcomes. Instead, it should have been checked whether these students stayed in school. However, language differences in the refugee camps created a difficult environment for the students to be successful. Another important point they gave is that having integration of refugee students in classrooms may have discouraged some students if the traditional education system might not recognize these students' particular needs.

Pugh et al. (2012) studied New Arrivals Program (NAP) in a South Australian primary school. They focused on the structural changes in class organization, staff roles and curriculum. This program was the widely used for non-native English speaker students recently resettled in Australia. The main purpose of this program was to prepare these students for mainstream education program and also Australian society. It was stated that the main problem the students have was the transition process to the mainstream schools, as they were too isolated in NAP program. They argued that there was a need for reform in the school structures as giving only support was not enough for the refugee students. They were brought together by different events, such as gardening, sports and games in the school they attended, for the integration of mainstream students and NAP students. This was seen as a

positive opportunity for collaboration between cultures and a greater integration to regular education. The participants also suggested that it improved the view of the community positively towards refugees. In the study, this spatial integration was considered successful by the experiences of NAP students, and the only ongoing problem they had was literacy.

Furthermore, Lems (2020) focused her study on an integration class in Switzerland and she investigated the possibility that education brought in leading the young refugees to the host society. She conducted her research in a house that refugee students reside in a small village near Bern and the participants were mainly from Eritrea, Guinea and Somalia. They were recently moved to integration classes from the school they had in the house they were placed. The integration class were mainly to improve their German and training them for apprenticeship. As much as the students were happy to have the chance to receive education, they hoped to continue their education in a 'normal class'. It is also mentioned in the study that many unaccompanied minors settled in Switzerland were older than sixteen. It became harder for them to attend school because of the policy regarding obligatory education cut-off age of sixteen. Some cities opened bridging schools for these children to make easier transitions into an apprenticeship. In this way, these children got education while they were still waiting for their approval. However, the participants in the study did not seem eager about bridging school and found it discriminatory. Further in the research, it is stated that scholars also thought that the refugee students were leaded into lower qualified educational and vocational tracks. Furthermore, there was also a physical separation between regular classes and integration classes. Regular classes were at the top levels of the building, whereas the integration classes were at the bottom level. This lead to almost no interaction between students and it hindered the integration process of the students. At the end of her study, she found out that even if the refugee youth were considered vulnerable, they face contradictory policies daily. Besides, the existing integration methods do not help the process of transition to the society.

Similar to Lems, Pastoor (2017) also focused on unaccompanied young refugees and she emphasised the importance of education in and outside of school. The research was conducted in schools and residential care facilities for unaccompanied young refugees in Norway. It is pointed out that if the refugee students were over compulsory school age (16 and older), they had to enrol in an introductory programme before they continued their education in upper secondary school. This programme mainly consisted of condensed lower secondary school curriculum and was separate from mainstream schooling. Moreover, the

refugee youth in group homes were encouraged to work part time to adapt to the language and society. As stated before, they continued their education in upper secondary schools, yet the participants stated that their interaction was limited with their Norwegian peers outside the classroom. They mainly interacted with them through sports or activities organized by non-governmental organizations. One participant mentioned that they had difficulties socializing with their peers because of language and cultural differences. However, one of the participants managed to make friends through sport, he joined a football club. Even though it was hard to communicate with his teammates at the beginning because of the language barriers, he formed friendship with his teammates. According to the study, the learning contexts outside the school play a vital role in improving their language abilities as well as integrating them into society. Furthermore, ‘facilitators’, whether adults or peers, are significant factors for supporting young refugees in the process of becoming a part of the host society.

2.2.3. Teachers in refugee education

The majority of the refugee children go through several difficulties until they settle in the host country. These difficulties often cause trauma and most of the time they also have interrupted schooling. The situation they are already in lead to a difficult adaptation process to the host country. Furthermore, they are often placed in schools before they feel comfortable in society and it may cause problems in transitioning process at schools. It is possible that the refugee students need a support at schools as guides or mentors, as they may feel lonely. Similarly, the social, economic, health and education difficulties these children encounter must be acknowledged by educators who work with immigrant children (Bourgonje, 2010). Roxas believes that “Language barriers, a student’s lack of trust in public authorities due to previous experience with discrimination and alienation, and unresolved trauma may feel insurmountable to educators and to the students and families.” In this case, teachers would be the ones to support and guide the refugee students and make the integration process easier. The factors that will affect the child’s adaptation process significantly are the characteristics of schools and teachers (Hamilton, 2003). Hamilton also mentions that preparing the teachers and existing students in the schools need to adapt as well. Moreover, adaptation to the school system and characteristics is another issue that bring the need of support. In this sense, the teachers’ role is highly essential.

The refugee students may come from very different backgrounds and cultures. The needs of each student may vary due to this reason. Therefore, the teachers need to be free of stereotypes and do not favour any students based on their achievement level. As a result, informing the teachers about the incoming students' culture is crucial to guide teacher views, knowledge and expectations (Hamilton, 2003). In their educational model, Hamilton and Moore (2003) suggested that "pre-service teacher education needs to focus on inclusive teaching strategies, methods of increasing teacher awareness of different cultures and their experiences, and the plight and experiences of refugees".

Another issue that refugee students may have is literacy problems. Due to possible interrupted school years these students may have low literacy skills in their first language. This adds another burden to the refugee students. If the first language skills of refugee students is not good enough, there is possibility that they have problems learning a second language. Wyatt-Smith and Gunn (2007) believes that every students needs to have 'a full repertoire of literacy skills and competencies'. They further add that thorough understanding of the theoretical models needs to be provided to the teachers regarding literacy acquisition and application. Hence, having knowledge of both second language learning and literacy is necessary for teachers (Naidoo, 2012).

Kronick (2013) studied primary school teachers' attitude towards refugee students. The study was conducted in Kenya and she aimed to detect the difficulties and positive sides of refugee inclusive education. The participants were 20 primary school teachers and 2 school administrators and Kronick conducted her research with open-ended questionnaire and short interviews. She stated that the participants in the study are prepared to accept the refugee students and believe that education is the right of all children. In the study, five challenges that teachers face in general were found. These are language barrier, discipline, over-age students, economic status and religion. Nevertheless, the most common obstacle was language. Teachers stated they had difficulties interacting with students as they did not have a common language. Even if they knew the language to some extent, they could not write or read. Moreover, teachers get help from other students for interpretation from time to time. However, it was not certain that the other students interpreted it in the accurate way and teachers could not truly find out if the refugee students learnt properly until the exams. Language barrier also brought challenges to communication with parents. Teachers stated, as a result, they had no idea about the situation at home or the progress of students. As for the positive aspects, tolerance and acceptance of others is one of them. In the study, it is said

that students embraced the differences between them and showed respect to each other at with time. Another positive side was cultural exchange and mutual learning. Teachers stated that they learnt a lot from their students whether it is about culture or not. Essentially, they learnt how to deal with dissimilar students including the ways on responding to various circumstances, and through that, they improved themselves as educators.

Similarly, Roxas (2011) focused on detecting the challenges teachers had when they tried to create a community with refugee students. The participant was a teacher in a school for newly arrived students in an urban location in The USA. The students were mainly refugees and had almost no education or interrupted education. Moreover, they did not have reading or writing skills in both English and their native language. The teacher had attempts on creating community within the class and integrate the students with the actual society they started living in. She believed in creating a community in her first to adapt students to the community they live in. She stated that if students did not believe they are safe in the classroom, they could not learn. She further added that teachers can achieve that by making them feel welcomed and cared for. The teacher accomplished this goal by encouraging friendship and collaboration between students. She also believed having people from the actual community had great significance, because in this way refugee students could meet people from the community they reside in. This helped students to acknowledge that their community supported them. The teacher also emphasised the significance of bringing the students to the society for learning purposes, with the goal of becoming more familiar with their new environment and possible opportunities. Roxas states that what the teacher achieved in her classroom shows the importance of the role that a teacher has on making refugee students belong to the community they live in.

In another study, Bačáková and Closs (2013) studied the effects of continuing professional development of teachers on decreasing obstacles in inclusive education in Czech Republic. They used the findings from a study focusing on two groups of students from Myanmar in Czech Republic. They aimed to discover the requirements for teacher development in inclusive education. The research had two steps. In the first section they identified the problems and experiences of the first resettled refugee students. They concluded in the first part that education and the teachers in these schools were not inclusive. In the second part of the study, Bačáková gave a seminar for teachers in second group, regarding the concerns and experiences of the students in the first group. Therefore, part two teachers had some further professional development regarding refugee students' education.

When they compared the two parts of the study, they found out that teachers had little to no previous experience teaching children whose native language was not Czech. Furthermore, in their teacher training program, the education of immigrant or refugee students was not addressed. Both part one and part two schools ignored home-school cooperation and refugee parents did not involve in school life, even though it was one of the topics in the seminar. However, schools in part two gave more support to refugee students compared to part one schools. Individual education plans for refugee students were designed, and in one school peer support was presented. The researchers believed that improvements in the second part of the study were the consequences of the seminar. Therefore, it can be inferred that whether teachers have no prior training about refugee education, professional development education can be given for better education of refugee students.

Bourgonje (2010) studied refugee education in four countries, which are the United Kingdom, Sweden, Spain, and Australia. She focused on the teachers' work and their unions' experience in those four countries. The researcher concluded that the general experience of teaching refugees and children seeking asylum was positive in the UK. However, there were still a range of challenges to the active participation of refugee children. These challenges included a lack of staff resources, language barriers, obstacles to their access to school locations, and bullying or discrimination in and outside the school setting. Therefore, teachers in the study emphasized that teacher training for multicultural issues was required. In Sweden, the most of the children in compulsory age group attended school according to the interviews in the study. A mother tongue tuition for refugee children is offered and Swedish as a second language education is given. Nevertheless, teachers stated that they faced challenges as refugee students needed further attention as the majority had traumatic experiences. Hence, they needed more source to give attention to each children and the appropriate teacher training for multicultural context. According to the interviews, in Spain, it was believed that education is a right that applied to recently arrived children, and they were considered as children with special educational need. Teaching were done in Spanish and Catalan. However, the problems were similar to the other countries. The key concerns were segregation, lack of teacher training in multicultural environment and the absence of appropriate curriculum. Lastly, in Australia, the main difficulties in refugee education were insufficiently financed schools to teach English, inadequate training on teaching refugee children and teaching to children who had different educational experiences.

In their study, Kirk and Winthrop (2007) discussed the importance of encouraging teacher development to promote successful education for refugee students in Ethiopia context. The refugees in the study lived in a camp in Kunamas, and education level of the refugees was low and teachers in the community had no or little experience as teachers. Thus, the researchers stress the importance of supporting these teachers for professional development to give appropriate education. In classroom, they had little opportunity to support active learning and the lessons mostly consisted of teacher talk. Furthermore, teachers did not feel confident in their teaching, because they were selected as teachers and they did not intend to become a teacher before. Even after seminar for professional development many of them felt unqualified as teachers. However, it is stated that they are “alternatively qualified”. As they are part of the same community, they support and understand their students better. The International Rescue Committee focused on teacher centred approach for professional development in Ethiopia context in the study. The roles that teachers had were the focal point in this approach. In this way, teachers enhanced their teacher identity and won the respect of their community as teachers.

2.2.4. Education of refugees in Turkey

Rising ethnic and cultural diversity poses both opportunities and obstacles to countries and systems of education (Bourgonje, 2010). Turkey is surely one of the countries that hosts most of the refugees, especially after the crisis in Syria. According to the report of Directorate of Lifelong Learning (2020), population of refugee children between ages of 5-17 increases every year. In the same report, it is stated that there are 1.082.172 refugee children who are at educational age and total of 648.108 refugee students receive education. At secondary school level, 70% of refugee children attend school and the total number is 223.182. As of 2019, 25.278 refugee students receive education in 23 temporary education centres in 4 provinces on the condition that intensive Turkish instruction as basis. In a SWP report, Ahmadoun (2014) states that Turkey treated Syrian refugees more as guests instead of legitimate refugees at the outbreak of the war. Nonetheless, Turkey has granted them "temporary security" status since late October 2011, ensuring no compulsory return and putting no restrictions on the duration of their stay. In April 2014 the newly formed Directorate-General for Migration Management (GDMM), granted them 'conditional refugee status' or temporary asylum by a new migration law. Moreover, after it was realized that the refugees were to stay for long years, long-term policies in education was pursued (Emin, 2016).

In and outside the refugee camps, Turkey has established temporary education centres for the education of Syrian children (Human Rights Watch, 2015). Moreover, a Turkish language programme has been applied for refugee children to be prepared for the transition from temporary schools to Turkish schools (UNHCR, 2019b). This programme also includes “new learning materials, subsidized transport, additional teacher training and other measures” (UNHCR, 2019b, p. 13). In Turkey, the absence of national language skills is the key impediment educational opportunities for Syrian children, in addition to economic hardship forcing many children to work (Crul et al., 2016). Typically, when children start school, they do not yet have any national language control (Crul et al., 2016). This language barrier also impedes integration process, and restrain the chance of bringing refugees and host community together (Chatty et al., 2014). Temporary education centres are the only opportunity they have to get an education in Arabic. There is no additional language education for Turkish in public schools or transitional classes. Furthermore, Turkey's education system is predominantly monolingual, and as a result, the process of adaptation for refugee students is not easy (Aydin & Kaya, 2017). Most refugee children who are at school age do not receive an education and, in spite of the attempts made by authorities and non-governmental organisations, education continues to be Turkey's most significant refugee issue (Aydin & Kaya, 2017).

In HRW report (2015), 51 refugee households were interviewed regarding the education barriers they had. Total participants were 233, and 113 of the total number were school-aged children. It was stated that many of the children could not benefit from free education in Turkey due to economic adversity, language barriers, and social integration problems. One parent stated that as she did not know the process for school registration, and her sons started working as a result. One of the children claimed that he would not comprehend the lessons even though he went to school, because he did not know Turkish very well. According to the report, younger refugee children had a much easier adaptation process compared to older ones, such as fourth or fifth graders. One parent told that her son immediately attended school as a fifth grader thanks to their residency permit. However, he had several difficulties at school as he did not know Turkish, and when the parents wanted their son to learn Turkish, they could not find anything that taught Turkish to children. Regarding grade placement, some of the children were placed below their grades, while some of them were placed according to their age. Being placed below their age level may result in failure in school and hindrance in education according to the interviews with the

children. One parent told that her daughter was placed with the appropriate grade and age group at high school. However, she did not know any Turkish and there was no language support from the school. Therefore, she decided not to continue her education. Lastly, some of the families were concerned that integration process would be difficult and they would be bullied at school. As a result, they did not prefer their children to attend Turkish schools. It can be inferred from the report that due to various difficulties many children could not receive the education they need.

Aydin and Kaya (2017) studied the needs of refugee students and the challenges they encountered. The participants were 7 teachers and one school principal in two elementary schools in Istanbul. All the participants worked with Syrian refugees. Results showed that participants had positive approach and stated that enrolment to schools without prior language training was the key issue for refugee students. One participant pointed out that the students aspired to be successful, but their knowledge of Turkish was a barrier for them. The participants further commented that they would be successful if they managed to learn Turkish. The results were in the same line with the comments of participants. The refugee students who had higher knowledge of Turkish were more successful, while the students with lesser knowledge of Turkish were not. Moreover, the refugee students needed more time in the tests. It took more time for refugee students to grasp the questions and complete the tasks in assessments.

By the same token, Emin (2016) studied the educational status of Syrian refugee children and their access to education within and outside of camps in Turkey. The participants were 4 administrators and 10 teachers in total. The research was conducted in a school in a camp and two temporary education centres in Ankara and Şanlıurfa. The first problem mentioned in the study was access to education. It was stated that temporary education centres outside the camps were not enough and as a result the refugees far away from these centres had difficulties accessing education. Another problem was that girls that were from low socio economic families married at young age. Therefore, their right to education was taken away. Another problem was language. There were significant problems with appropriate teaching materials and the number of teachers to teach Turkish for both refugee students and adults. Thus, this situation hindered the integration process. This also resulted in communication problems between the students, parents and administrators. As they did not know Turkish, they could not express their issues regarding their education easily. Physical conditions of temporary education centres and the schools were another

concern. The number of students exceeded the capacity of both schools and tents. Lastly, refugee students, especially students who are at high school age, worked for daily wages in cheap jobs, they could not continue their education.

In another study, Özel (2018) examined the needs and issues of schools which receive refugee students. The participants were 15 school counsellors in different districts in Turkey. The researcher aimed to examine the needs and issues of both schools and refugee students. The participants in the study stated that language barrier was the cause of majority of problems occurred in the schools. Moreover, the participants had their own idea about refugees, and this caused them to have biased opinion about refugee students. It was also stated that local families, students and teachers had prejudgment regarding refugee students, and for the adaptation process, they need cultural comprehension, ability to solve problems, empathy and orientation. Another important point made in the study is when teachers had positive and protective attitudes toward refugee students, their adaptation process got much easier. Furthermore, school counsellors mentioned they had difficulties understanding the needs of refugee students, they had problems intervening for the needs of refugee students. Consequently, problems for both refugee students and schools counsellors escalated even more. Lastly, in some cases school counsellors were not informed about incoming refugee students or how many students they already had in their schools. Therefore, they could not meet the needs of these students appropriately.

Likewise, Sakız (2016) studied thoughts, beliefs and attitudes of school administrators regarding inclusion of refugee students in schools in south-eastern region in Turkey. The main themes of the interviews with administrators were attitudes towards the education of immigrant children, school culture, structural deficiencies and social acceptance, and thought and implementation suggestions of administrators. Majority of administrators stated that refugee students the difference created by refugee students disrupted the functioning of their schools and disturbed the discipline of current students. Many of the participants opposed to the idea that refugee students needed to be placed in state schools believing that refugee students' needs were different and they could not be met at state schools. They generally defended the idea that refugee students would not be successful at state schools and the homogenous student structure in schools needed to continue. Participants further stated the environmental conditions of the schools and classrooms and the insufficient number of teachers made it difficult for refugee students to receive education. Moreover, one of the participants remarked that teachers' level of

professional competence was not sufficient for the education of refugee students. Lastly, it was stated that current curriculum does not quite fulfil the language and social skills needs of refugee students. In addition, participants suggested that school counselling in the schools was not enough for students from such backgrounds and there was a need for more comprehensive action.

In their study Uzun and Bütün (2016) examined the thoughts of pre-school teachers regarding problems encountered by Syrian refugee children. Participants were 6 pre-school teachers in Samsun, Turkey. The first problem mentioned in the study was language barrier. Participants stated that as refugee students did not know any Turkish, they could not communicate neither with their teachers nor with their peers. Therefore, as refugee students could not tell their problems, they had to overcome obstacles they faced by themselves. In addition, teachers could not communicate with parents either. Therefore, the problem solving process became much more challenging. Furthermore, teachers did not want refugee students as they were unable to communicate with them and they were more intolerant towards refugee students. Participants also pointed that local parents warned their children about not playing or interacting with refugee students. Hence, even though teachers attempted to make refugee students a part of their classes, integration process became significantly difficult. One of the teachers expressed that as another teacher did not want a refugee student in his/her class, school administration placed the students in their classes. Teacher further commented that she/he had difficulties to engage them in activities. Moreover, teachers suggested refugee students needed psychosocial support rather than enrolling in a school. They stated that refugee students could not adapt to school by only attending, instead, they should be supported more planned and continuously.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

This section describes the model of the study, the characteristics of quantitative research methods, sample, participants, data collection instrument and data analysis.

3.1. Model of Study

In this study, quantitative method was used to collect data. Quantitative research is expressed in numbers and graphs and it can be analysed with statistical methods. To analyse the data from quantitative research, software programs like Microsoft Excel or SPSS need to be used. Therefore, the data was gathered structurally. Moreover, qualitative data was gathered through open ended questions, and they were used to support the findings from the questionnaire (Appendix A).

3.2. Sample

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, the study was conducted only in Ankara, Turkey. In addition, the closure of schools during the pandemic caused to have less participants in data collection process. Therefore, convenience sampling was applied in this study. Convenience sampling is a type of non-probability sampling. Boslaugh (2008, p. 235) explains convenience sampling as “a selected group from a particular population that is chosen based on their accessibility to the researcher”. There are three reasons why convenience sampling is used; data collection can be done in a short span of time, it is not financially challenging and participants are readily available. 26 elementary schools in central districts, such as Yenimahalle, Çankaya and Altındağ in Ankara was visited. The total participants were 121 English teachers in these schools. 81 of participants had refugee students in their classes while 40 had no refugee students in their classes before.

3.3. Data Collection Instrument

The data was collected using the quantitative methodology. A survey questionnaire and open ended questions were used to increase the validity and reliability of the research.

Thanks to the survey questionnaire, the same questions was asked to all the participants in a short amount of time. Khalil's (2018) questionnaire which was used in her teacher autonomy study was used. The questionnaire consists of four sections; teaching and assessment, school management, professional development, and curriculum development.

There are total of 28 questions in the questionnaire: teaching and assessment (9), school management (7), professional development (6), curriculum development (6).

For the last part of the study, there were four open ended questions regarding each section in survey. These open ended questions were used to support the results in discussion part of the study.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

To reach more participants in a short time a questionnaire was used to collect data. Khalil's (2018) questionnaire was used. Her questionnaire was suitable for this study as the context of her study was also in state schools in Turkey.

The questionnaire (Appendix A) consisted of four parts. First part of the questionnaire focused on the information of the participants. The questions were about their gender, years of experience, grades they taught, whether they had refugee students in their classes and if yes, the number of refugee students they had. In the second part, the aim was to collect data in teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development. Total of questions were asked in this part were 28. Five-point Likert type scale was used. The options were "not at all", "occasionally", "undecided", "frequently", "always". Lastly, in the final part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked 4 questions about how much discretion they can use in their classes, how much they are involved in school management, how much they have a say over their professional development and how much they are involved in the process of creating/redesigning the English curriculum.

3.4. Participants

121 English teachers working in state secondary schools in the central districts of Ankara, such as Altındağ, Yenimahalle, and Çankaya, participated in this study. 81 of the participants had refugee students in their classes, and 40 of them did not have refugee students. Percentage frequency distributions regarding the demographic characteristics of English teachers are given in Table 2.

Table 2 Demographic Data of Participants

		Frequency	Percent
1. Your Gender:	Male	14	11,6
	Female	107	88,4
	Total	121	100,0
2. Years of experience as an English Teacher:	0-4	2	1,7
	5-9	5	4,1
	10-14	20	16,5
	15-19	44	36,4
	20-24	36	29,8
	25+	14	11,6
	Total	121	100,0
3. Grades taught:	Grade 5	76	62,8
	Grade 6	25	20,7
	Grade 7	12	9,9
	Grade 8	8	6,6
	Total	121	100,0
4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class?	Yes	81	66,9
	No	40	33,1
	Total	121	100,0

As demonstrated in Table 2, the number of male participants in the study was 14 (11,6%) and the number of the female participants was 107 (88,4%). It indicates that the majority of participants were female. Out of total 121 teachers in the study, 2 (1,7%) participants had experience between 0-4 years, 5 (4,1%) participants had 5-9 years. 20 (16,5%) participants had 10-14 years, 44 (36,4%) had 15-19 years, 36 (29,8%) had 20-24 years, and lastly 14 (11,6%) participants had more than 25 years of experience. The data suggests that most of the teachers had experience more than 10 years. Majority of the participants, 76 (62,8%), taught Grade 5. 25 (20,7%) participants taught Grade 6, 12(9,9%) participants taught Grade 7, and 8 (6,6%) participants taught Grade 8. Participants who had refugee students in their classes are 81 (66,9%) and participants who had no refugee students are 40 (33,1%). Furthermore, 29 (35,8%) participants had between 1-4, 21 (25,9%) had 5-9,

10 (12,3%) participant had 10-14, 7 (8,6%) had 15-19, and lastly 14 participants had more than 20 refugee students in their classes.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaire was analysed through different type of analysis for each research question. Likert-type data was obtained from questionnaires and SPSS was used to analyse the data obtained from the questionnaires. The frequency values of each question in the four sections of the questionnaire (teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development) were analysed using descriptive analysis. Each question in the questionnaire was also separately examined. Then, whether the scale scores conformed to the normal distribution was tested with the Shapiro Wilk test to for the second research question regarding if there was difference between teachers who had refugee students in their classes and teachers who had no refugee students. Shapiro Wilk (1965) test is the most sensitive test for a wide variety of alternative distributions (Althouse et al., 1998). Due to its properties of good strength, has become the preferred test of normality (Mendes & Pala, 2003). Furthermore, according to the results of Shapiro Wilk test, t-test and Mann Whitney U test were used when comparing scale scores. The Mann-Whitney U tests for variations between two groups with no unique distribution on a single, ordinal variable (Mann & Whitney, 1945). T-test is also a two-group test and demands that the single variable is measured and usually distributed at the interval or ratio level rather than the ordinal level (McKnight & Najab, 2010). For the third research question regression analysis was used to determine if there is a correlation between number of refugee students in class and teacher autonomy. Regression analysis is used to investigate functional relationships between variables. (Chatterjee & Hadi, 2015). Finally, for the last research question, the scale scores were tested with regression analysis to find whether professional experience affected the autonomy of English teachers who had refugee students.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this section, data gathered through questionnaire will be presented.

4.1. Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes

RQ 1. What is the autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their classes regarding teaching and assessment, school management, professional development, and curriculum development?

The purpose of the first research question was to find out autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their classes regarding teaching and assessment, school management, professional development, and curriculum development. Table 3 shows the average statistics of the opinions of English teachers who have refugee students in their classes on their autonomy regarding teaching and assessment together with percentage frequency distribution.

Table 3 Participants' Autonomy in Teaching and Assessment

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class? = Yes												
Teaching and Assessment	Not at all		Occasionally		Undecided		Frequently		Always		Mean	Std. Deviation
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Q.6	15	18,5%	26	32,1%	14	17,3%	15	18,5%	11	13,6%	2,77	1,33
Q.7	1	1,2%	6	7,4%	8	9,9%	30	37,0%	36	44,4%	4,16	0,97
Q.8	34	42,0%	10	12,3%	12	14,8%	16	19,8%	9	11,1%	2,46	1,48
Q.9	7	8,6%	23	28,4%	12	14,8%	21	25,9%	18	22,2%	3,25	1,32
Q.10	2	2,5%	8	9,9%	7	8,6%	34	42,0%	30	37,0%	4,01	1,04
Q.11	4	4,9%	21	25,9%	14	17,3%	29	35,8%	13	16,0%	3,32	1,17
Q.12	20	24,7%	22	27,2%	18	22,2%	13	16,0%	8	9,9%	2,59	1,29
Q.13	15	18,5%	18	22,2%	16	19,8%	21	25,9%	11	13,6%	2,94	1,34
Q.14	2	2,5%	13	16,0%	14	17,3%	30	37,0%	22	27,2%	3,70	1,11

32,1% of participants answered Question 6, which is “I am free to use my own assessment activities in my class independent from those suggested by the Ministry of National Education.” as “occasionally” and 18,5% answered it as “not at all” and standard deviation is 1,33. Vast majority of participants answered Question 7 which is “I determine the amount of homework to be assigned.” as “frequently” (37%) and “always” (44,4%), whereas only 1 participant answered “not at all”, and the standard deviation is 0,97. Majority of participants (42%) answered Question 8, which was regarding selecting textbook to use in class, as “not at all”, whereas only 11,1% answered as “always” and according to results the standard deviation is 1,48. For Question 9, the standard deviation is 1,32, and 28,4% stated that they determine how classroom space is used “occasionally”. However, the majority stated they could decide on how to use classroom space as 25,9% of participants answered the question as “frequently” and 22,2% as “always”. 42% of participants answered Question 10 “I determine norms and rules for student classroom behaviour.” as “frequently” and 37% answered it as “always”, and only 2 participants answered as “not at all”. Furthermore, the standard deviation is 1,04. Therefore, most of the participants determine norms and rules for their classes. 35,8% of the participants answered Question 11 as “frequently” and 16% answered it as “always” and the standard deviation is 1,17. Hence, the majority of the participants stated that they are free to select their teaching methods and strategies. Most of the participants stated that they do not have the flexibility to select specific topics and skills to be taught from the centralised English teaching curriculum, as 24,7% answered Question 12 as “not at all” and 27,2% as “occasionally”. Moreover, the standard deviation is 1,29 for Question 12. For Question 13, 25,9% of the participants stated they find a way and time to teach things they like teaching in addition to curriculum, and the standard deviation is 1,34. Lastly, majority stated that they reward deserving students without the need to get the head teacher's consent, as 37,0% answered the question as “frequently” and 27,2% as “always” and the standard deviation is 1,11.

Table 4 shows the average statistics of the opinions of English teachers who have refugee students in their classes on their autonomy regarding school management together with the percentage frequency distribution.

Table 4 Participants' Autonomy in School Management

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class? = Yes												
School Management	Not at all		Occasionally		Undecided		Frequently		Always		Mean	Std. Deviation
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Q.15	4	4,9%	16	19,8%	16	19,8%	33	40,7%	12	14,8%	3,41	1,12
Q.16	58	71,6%	7	8,6%	10	12,3%	5	6,2%	1	1,2%	1,57	1,01
Q.17	58	71,6%	15	18,5%	3	3,7%	3	3,7%	2	2,5%	1,47	0,92
Q.18	20	24,7%	18	22,2%	14	17,3%	24	29,6%	5	6,2%	2,70	1,30
Q.19	10	12,3%	19	23,5%	11	13,6%	30	37,0%	11	13,6%	3,16	1,28
Q.20	36	44,4%	16	19,8%	15	18,5%	8	9,9%	6	7,4%	2,16	1,30
Q.21	13	16,0%	24	29,6%	16	19,8%	18	22,2%	10	12,3%	2,85	1,29

Regarding Question 15, most of the participants stated that feel a great sense of involvement and ownership in what is happening in the school. 40,7% of the participants answered the question as “frequently” while only 4 participants answered the question as “not at all”. Moreover, standard deviation is 1,12 for the same question. 71,6% of participants stated that they were not involved in making decisions about the school’s budget planning regarding Question 16, and according to the results standard deviation is 1,01. Only 1 participant answered Question 16 as “always” and stated they were involved in the process. Similarly, 71,6% of participants answered Question 17 which is “I can use money from the school's budget on various activities (e.g. visits to museums, libraries, talks etc.)” as “not at all”. 2 participants answered the same question as “always” and 3 participants as “frequently”. Moreover, the standard deviation for the question is 0,92. It can be inferred that vast majority of participants have no say over budget planning and using money from that budget. For Question 18, the standard deviation is 1,30, and 29,6% of the participants said that they had a say in scheduling the use of time in their classroom. However, 24,7%

answered the same question as “not at all” and 22,2% as “occasionally”. Therefore, the majority did not have say in scheduling. 37,0% of the participants answered Question 19, which is “I work collaboratively with my colleagues to create working conditions that fit in with how we want to work.” as “frequently”, whereas 12,3% answered as “not at all”. Moreover, the standard deviation is 1,28 for Question 19. 44% of participants answered Question 20 “My colleagues and I have a say in grouping students into classes in the school.” as “not at all”, and only 14 participants stated they had a say over grouping their students. Furthermore, the standard deviation for the same question is 1,30. Thus, most of teachers in the study were not involved in grouping students. Furthermore, 29,6% answered Question 21 as “occasionally” and 16,0% as “not at all”, whereas 28 participants stated they were working with parents happily, and the standard deviation is 1,29. Therefore, most of the participants are not comfortable working with parents.

Table 5 shows the average statistics of the opinions of English teachers who have refugee students in their classes on their autonomy regarding professional development together with the percentage frequency distribution.

Table 5 Participants’ Autonomy in Professional Development

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class? = Yes												
Professional development	Not at all		Occasionally		Undecided		Frequently		Always		Mean	Std. Deviation
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Q.22	6	7,4%	14	17,3%	10	12,3%	39	48,1%	12	14,8%	3,46	1,16
Q.23	1	1,2%	21	25,9%	12	14,8%	39	48,1%	8	9,9%	3,40	1,02
Q.24	5	6,2%	15	18,5%	10	12,3%	34	42,0%	17	21,0%	3,53	1,19
Q.25	10	12,3%	16	19,8%	22	27,2%	25	30,9%	8	9,9%	3,06	1,19
Q.26	13	16,0%	29	35,8%	17	21,0%	15	18,5%	7	8,6%	2,68	1,20
Q.27	42	51,9%	12	14,8%	14	17,3%	11	13,6%	2	2,5%	2,00	1,21

48,1% of participants answered Question 22 “I identify my development targets and prepare an individual professional development plan.” as “frequently”, while 7,4% answered as “not at all”, and standard deviation is 1,16. Furthermore, 48,1% of participants stated that engaged in action research and/or exploratory practice to develop their teaching regarding Question 23, whereas only one participants answered as “not at all”. The standard deviation for Question 23 is 1,02. 42% answered Question 24 “I help those who have less teaching experience than I have.” as “frequently” whereas 6,2% answered “not at all”. The standard deviation for the same question is 1,19. What is more, it can be inferred that most of the participants regularly help younger teachers. For Question 25, 30,9% of the participants stated that they “frequently” “take the risk of doing things differently in the classroom”, while 12,3% answered as “not at all”. Moreover, the standard deviation is 1,19. Regarding Question 26, majority stated that cannot make their professional needs heard before the national in-service training. 35,8% of participants answered the question as “occasionally” and 16,0% as “not at all”, and only 8,6% answered as “always”. Furthermore, the standard deviation is 1,20. Significant number of participants (51,9%) answered Question 27 “As a teacher of English, I can make suggestions to the Ministry about who should be appointed as instructors for the national in-service training.” as “not at all”, whereas only 2 participants answered the question as “always”.

Table 6 shows the average statistics of the opinions of English teachers who have refugee students in their classes on their autonomy regarding curriculum development together with the percentage frequency distribution.

Table 6 Participants’ Autonomy in Curriculum Development

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class? = Yes												
Curriculum development	Not at all		Occasionally		Undecided		Frequently		Always		Mean	Std. Deviation
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Q.28	2	2,5%	18	22,2%	15	18,5%	34	42,0%	12	14,8%	3,44	1,07
Q.29	22	27,2%	18	22,2%	25	30,9%	16	19,8%	0	0,0%	2,43	1,09
Q.30	44	54,3%	18	22,2%	12	14,8%	7	8,6%	0	0,0%	1,78	1,00

Q.31	4	4,9%	16	19,8%	26	32,1%	23	28,4%	12	14,8%	3,28	1,10
Q.32	25	30,9%	19	23,5%	13	16,0%	20	24,7%	4	4,9%	2,49	1,30
Q.33	2	2,5%	14	17,3%	22	27,2%	32	39,5%	11	13,6%	3,44	1,01

For Question 28 "I have a good knowledge of national curriculum development processes.", 42% of participants answered as "frequently", and only 2,5% answered as "not at all", and standard deviation is 1,07. No participant answered Question 29 "My work permits me to make contributions to the national curriculum development and redesign processes." as "always", and standard deviation is 1,09. 54,3% of teachers stated that "they were not offered the opportunity to raise issues about the national English curriculum and submit these to the National Curriculum Development Panel" regarding Question 30 and no participant answered the same question as "always". Moreover, standard deviation for the same question is 1,00. 28,4% of the participants answered Question 31 as "frequently" and 14,8% as "always". Therefore, most of the participants believe that their main role is to put the national curriculum into practice. However, 4,9% of the participants answered Question 31 as "not at all" stating their role is not solely putting curriculum into practice. Moreover, standard deviation is 1,10 for the same question. Question 32 "I can initiate and administer new enrichment and cultural activities (e.g. organizing field trips to theatres, English movies, or organizing visits to the schools abroad)." was answered by 30,9% as "not at all" and 23,5% as "occasionally". However, 24,7 of the participants answered the same question as "frequently". Furthermore, standard deviation for Question 32 is 1,30. Regarding the last question in the questionnaire, 39,5% answered it as "frequently" stating they have the flexibility in creating new learning materials for their students, while only 2 participants answered as "not at all". Moreover, for Question 33, standard deviation is 1,01.

4.2. Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes

RQ 2. Is there any difference between the autonomy of English teachers who have refugee students in their classes and those who do not have refugee students in the context of teaching and assessment, school management, professional development, curriculum development?

The aim for the second research question was to find out whether there is a difference between English teachers with and without refugee students in their classes. According to English teachers with and without refugee students in their classes, whether the scale scores of teaching and evaluation, school management, professional development and curriculum development autonomy comply with the normal distribution was tested with the Shapiro Wilk test and the results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class?		Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Teaching and Assessment	Yes	,987	81	,608
	No	,981	40	,730
School Management	Yes	,977	81	,143
	No	,976	40	,543
Professional development	Yes	,959	81	,011
	No	,981	40	,710
Curriculum development	Yes	,977	81	,154
	No	,971	40	,381

According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, according to English teachers with and without refugee students in their classes, the scale scores regarding teaching and assessment, school management and curriculum development autonomy showed normal distribution characteristics ($p > 0.05$). However, it was observed that scale scores related to their autonomy for professional development did not comply with the normal distribution ($p < 0.05$). According to these results, while comparing the scale scores for teaching and assessment, school management and curriculum development autonomy according to English teachers with and without refugee students in their classes, t test was used for independent samples. In addition, Mann Whitney U test was used when comparing scale scores related to their autonomy for professional development.

Table 8 Difference between Autonomy of English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your class?		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t / U	p
Teaching and Assessment	Yes	81	3,24	0,69	t = -,758	0,450
	No	40	3,35	0,73		
School Management	Yes	81	2,47	0,68	t = -1,219	0,225
	No	40	2,65	0,82		
Professional development	Yes	81	3,02	0,67	U = 1372,500	0,171
	No	40	3,18	0,81		
Curriculum development	Yes	81	2,81	0,58	t = -1,300	0,196
	No	40	2,98	0,76		

The scale scores of English teachers who do not have refugee students in their classes were relatively higher than those of English teachers with refugee students in their classroom regarding their autonomy in teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development. However, statistically, no significant difference was found between the scale scores of teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development autonomy compared to English teachers with and without refugee students in their class ($p > 0.05$).

4.3. The Relationship between the Number of Refugee Students and Teacher Autonomy

RQ 3. Is there a relationship between the number of refugee students and the autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their classes?

The aim for the third research question was to find out whether number of refugee students affect English teachers' autonomy. The scale scores of English teachers with refugee students regarding their teaching and evaluation, school management, professional development and curriculum development autonomy were tested by regression analysis whether the number of refugee students in their classes has an effect, and the results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Relationship between the Number of Refugee Students and Teacher Autonomy

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Teaching and Assessment	(Constant)	3,180	,150		21,181	,000
	the number of the refugee students	,026	,052	,056	,502	,617
School Management	(Constant)	2,388	,148		16,163	,000
	the number of the refugee students	,035	,052	,076	,678	,500
Professional development	(Constant)	2,854	,145		19,723	,000
	the number of the refugee students	,068	,051	,149	1,338	,185
Curriculum development	(Constant)	2,751	,126		21,875	,000
	the number of the refugee students	,025	,044	,064	,573	,568

It was observed that the number of refugee students did not have a significant effect on the scale scores of English teachers with refugee students regarding their teaching and evaluation, school management, professional development and curriculum development autonomy ($p > 0.05$). The significance for teaching and assessment is 0,617. For school management, the significance is 0,500. Moreover, the significance of professional development is 0,185. Lastly, for curriculum development, significance is 0,568.

4.4. The Relationship between the Professional Experience of English Teachers and Their Autonomy

RQ 4. Is there a relationship between the professional experience and the autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their classes?

This research question aims to find out whether there is a relationship between professional experiences of English teachers with refugee students and their autonomy. The scale scores of English teachers with refugee students regarding their teaching and

evaluation, school management, professional development and curriculum development autonomy were tested with regression analysis, and the results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Relationship between the Professional Experience of English Teachers and Their Autonomy

			Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)			3,148	,257		12,246	,000
Teaching and Assessment	Years of experience as an English Teacher		,031	,059	,048	,525	,601
(Constant)			2,347	,267		8,777	,000
School Management	Years of experience as an English Teacher		,044	,061	,065	,714	,477
(Constant)			3,133	,264		11,863	,000
Professional development	Years of experience as an English Teacher		-,014	,060	-,022	-,236	,814
(Constant)			3,071	,236		12,984	,000
Curriculum development	Years of experience as an English Teacher		-,048	,054	-,081	-,892	,374

It was observed that the scale scores of English teachers with refugee students regarding their autonomy in teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development, and their professional experience did not have a significant effect ($p > 0.05$). In other words, the teacher's professional experience does not have a significant effect on the scale scores of English teachers regarding their autonomy in

teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development. For teaching and assessment, the significance is 0,601. Furthermore, the significance for school management is 0,477 and for professional development, the significance is 0,814. Finally, for curriculum development, the significance is 0,374.

4.5. Open Ended Questions

The open ended questions aimed to gather more information about the views of English teachers on the dimensions that were asked in the questionnaire.

1. How much discretion are you able to use in the classroom in the area of student teaching and assessment? (e.g. amount of homework, selection of textbook, disciplining students and etc.)

Table 11 Participant's Discretion in the Classroom

Codes and Themes	n
I can decide on the amount of homework	35
I can't select the textbook	17
I can discipline my students	15
I can set my own rules	5
I can use an extra textbook	5
I can't use any discretion	3

For the first open ended question, 35 of the participants stated that they could decide on the amount of homework they gave. 17 participants expressed that they could not select the textbook to use in class. 15 of the participants commented that they could discipline their students. Moreover, 5 participants stated that they could set their own rules. 5 participants remarked that they could use an extra textbook in their classes. Lastly, only 3 participants stated they had no discretion in classroom. The perspectives of teachers on the first question are as follows:

“I'm free to choose my method and my teaching process in the classroom. I don't have any right to choose any textbook except the offered one by MoNE. We can suggest only a source book.”

“As an English language teacher, I’ve never used discretion in selection of textbook. I have the right to appropriately discipline student. The amount of homework is determined at the discretion of the teachers with regard to the age of students.”

“We, as English teachers, aren’t totally free about selecting textbooks. The school principal selects the textbook. I determine the amount of homework and I’m free about disciplining.”

“Most of the time I use my discretion in the classroom freely, and I set my own rules in the class.”

“We don’t have rights to select the textbook. But we can decide how much homework we will give or what to do to discipline the students.”

“I’m able to use my own activities, hand-outs or worksheets.”

“It is up to me how I discipline the classroom or how much homework I give to the students.”

“I decide the amount of homework and disciplining the students. However, MoNE decides and sends the students’ textbook. Unfortunately, textbooks haven’t got enough exercises which will contribute for development of students.”

“Teachers are not totally free in the mean of selection of textbook. This issue is up to the management of school, although it is forbidden”

“I am trying to use additional assessment a lot. I give chance to students about speaking. Also I give homework, or give some challenging duties in order to improve their skills.”

“We use MoNE’ books, but we always choose supplementary book for each graders.”

2. How much are you involved in your school’s management issues? (e.g. budget planning, spending money from schools’ budget for students’ learning purposes, and etc.)

Table 12 Participant’s Involvement in School Management

Codes and Themes	n
I am not involved in school management	42
I sometimes involve in school management	7
I cannot spend money from school’s budget	3
I can use money from school’s budget	2

42 of the participants stated that they were not involved in their school's management in the second open ended question. Furthermore, 7 participants expressed that they sometimes involved in school management. 3 participants stated that they cannot spend money from their school's budget, whereas 2 participants stated they could use money from the budget. The perspectives of teachers on the second question are as follows:

"It depends on the principle that I work with. But, as teachers we can tell our ideas about the school issues."

"I'm generally involved in my school's management, especially for learning purposes."

"Not much. As a teacher, we don't have any involvement in the management issues. However, our manager is open to the suggestions."

"Occasionally. For a trip associated with the topic, we can use the budget."

"I'm not involved in school's management issues on budget. I haven't spent any money from the school's budget so far."

"We're never involved in the budget planning and never spend for learning purposes."

"If we have a kind of project for students, we can use money from school's budget."

"I don't think that we have a budget for spending about English studies."

"I think I am not involved in my school's management."

"We give our opinions in meetings but no one cares most of the time."

"In schools generally school family association, principal and assistant manager is responsible for it."

"I can't spend money from our school's budget because our school doesn't have a regular income."

3. How much say do you have over your own professional development? (e.g. determining the content of in-service professional development programmes).

Table 13 Participant's Autonomy in Professional Development

Codes and Themes	n
I cannot determine the content of in-service programmes	10
School/MoNE decides who will attend in-service programmes	4
I can choose the programme according to my needs	4
I am involved in Continuous Professional Development Programme by MoNE	3
In-service training programmes are not satisfactory	3
I do not have time to attend in-service training programmes	3

For the third open ended question, 10 of the participants stated that they could not determine the content of in-service programmes. 4 participants thought that their school or MoNE decided who will attend in-service training programmes. 4 participants expressed that they could choose the programme according to their professional needs. Moreover, 3 participants stated that they were involved in Continuous Professional Development Programme by MoNE. 3 participants believed that in-service training programmes are not satisfactory. 3 participants stated that they had no time to attend in-service training programmes. The perspectives of teachers on the third question are as follows:

“I would like to have more opportunities to develop my own teaching. Unfortunately, we can’t find any chance to have a say on this subject.”

“I have no say on determining the content of in-service professional development programmes. We only attend the Educational Seminars with the discretion of the school management.”

“We can’t determine it. The school administration may orient us for taking national in-service training.”

“It changes according to the topic, situation etc. but in terms of determining the content of in-service professional development programmes I can clearly say that I have hardly involved.”

“Sometimes, we are asked about the content of in-service professional development programmes via surveys.”

“We apply for some in-service trainings but we cannot have the chance to participate in all of them. The ministry decides who will take part in them.”

“I sometimes have opportunity to join in-service trainings, but they are generally unsatisfying.”

“I try to do my best to develop my profession. I’m writing questions for LGS students and textbooks. I also wrote one for 8th grade students for MoNE.”

“Sometimes I determine, sometimes the Ministry of National Education determines this.”

“Generally MoNE determines it, and you choose the activity you join. Some of them are compulsory.”

“I cannot determine the content of in-service professional development programmes but I can make a choice according to my needs.”

“I identify professional development programmes to attend. I usually join the online seminars and courses.”

“Sometimes I decide according to my will, sometimes it is only an obligation.”

“I have a say over my own professional development as it should be. Annually what we should do as a teacher is determined by MoNE, but we can re-organize it according to the level of our students or school.”

“We can just apply to some courses, seminars on MEBBIS. Also, I’m involved a training course which is called Continuous Professional Development.”

“I have the chance to make suggestions on in-service professional development programmes according to my needs, but not clear that they will organize it.”

“As I’m so busy with my school and family life, I’m not so interested in in-service professional development programmes.”

“We can determine in-service education but the content is generally unsatisfactory. We prefer ELT teaching programmes/courses of the private schools.”

“I don’t think we get enough support for our professional development.”

4. How much are you involved in the process of creating/redesigning the English teaching curriculum?

Table 14 Participant's Involvement in Creating Curriculum

Codes and Themes	n
I am not involved in curriculum creating process	39
I make changes according to the needs of my students	8
I make suggestions to MoNE about curriculum	4
I design my own teaching materials	2

39 of the participants stated that they were not involved in curriculum creating process. 8 participants commented that they made changes according to the needs of their students. 4 participants stated that they made suggestions to MoNE regarding curriculum. Lastly, 2 participants stated that they designed their own teaching materials to use in classroom. The perspectives of teachers on the fourth question are as follows:

“Individually, I can redesign the curriculum in a limited way in my classroom.”

“We are sometimes asked to express our thoughts about these issues but no matter what we say, they pretend as they listen to us, but actually they don't.”

“I present suggestions about teaching English, but I can't get a respond.”

“Unfortunately not. I'd like to involve in the process of redesigning it.”

“We must follow the official curriculum. When I have time, I use extra-curricular activities and sometimes I use different techniques.”

“If necessary, I can change the order of subjects.”

“We have no right to create/design the curriculum.”

“I am not involved in the process of creating the curriculum, I am just the one to apply it in class.”

“I can make my own teaching materials. I have no right to create the curriculum, but I can make small changes on it.”

“At the end of all semesters, we determine the problems of teaching that we have come across during the year. As teachers we submit curriculum suggestions to the MoNE, but I don’t think they pay regard, because we experience the same problems every year.”

“At the beginning of the year, we have annual curriculum meeting. I can change some parts of it as I wish but I have to be obedient to MoNE in general.”

“The only thing I’m involved is designing my own teaching materials for my own classes.”

“As a teacher, it’s hard to create English teaching curriculum but I can change the activities to be practised in the class.”

“We can do extracurricular activities and supplementary book units because we have extra lessons.”



CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to examine the autonomy of English teachers who had refugee students in their classes, and in this section the results of this study will be discussed.

5.1. Autonomy of English Teachers with Refugee Students in Their Classes

The aim for the first research question was to find out autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their classes regarding teaching and assessment, school management, professional development, and curriculum development. The first part of the questionnaire targeted teaching and assessment. It can be inferred from the results that teachers were autonomous in determining the amount of homework, rules and norms for student classroom behaviour and rewarding their students. Most of the participants in the open ended questions stated that they can use discretion on the amount of homework. Hence, it can be said that homework is one of the most common theme in practicing their autonomy. One of the participants explained that she tried to implement additional assessment, activities to improve her students' speaking skill, and give some challenging duties to improve their language skills. Thus, she implements different activities to further support her students and uses her autonomy in her teaching. According to the results, the participants in this study are not autonomous in selecting textbook. Furthermore, in open ended questions, majority also mentioned that they could not select the textbook, whereas some participants expressed that they could use supplementary books. This indicates that some teachers and school managements believe that textbook given by MoNE would not be sufficient, and they need another book to support learning.

Uğurlu and Qahramanova (2016) stated that the participants in their study also were autonomous in determining rules and norms in their classes. However, they were not autonomous regarding textbook selection, using their own assessment activities and selecting specific topics and skills to be taught. Similarly, in Özaslan's study (2015), teachers expressed that they could not choose the textbook to use in their classes. Furthermore, majority of teachers stated that they were not autonomous in using their own assessment activities. Likewise, Yıldırım's (2017) study showed that instructors in the study also had low level of autonomy as they did not contribute in developing exams in their institution. Furthermore, teachers in Canbolat's (2020) study expressed that definite curriculum given

by MoNE restricted their autonomy. Benson (2010) also stated that strict English curriculum hindered autonomy of teachers in Hong Kong.

For school management, teachers stated that they had sense of involvement and ownership in their schools, worked collaboratively with their colleagues create fitting working conditions. This finding is parallel with Khalil's (2018) findings as teachers in her study also stated they had they had sense of involvement and ownership in their schools. Nonetheless, they expressed that they were not involved in making decisions about the school's budget planning, could not use money from the school's budget on various activities, such as visiting museums, libraries etc. This finding is in line with Ugurlu and Qahramanova (2016) as in their study, the teachers also stated that they had no part in planning schools' budget. Gülcan's (2011) study also showed that teachers were not active participants in decision making process in their schools. Furthermore, they did not have a say over grouping students into classes in the school. Pearson and Moomaw's (2005) study showed that teachers desired autonomy in decision making process in their school. Moreover, majority of participants were not comfortable working with parents. It may indicate that they have issues hindering teacher-parent relations. Therefore, the causes of this problem need to be examined to resolve it. As it may influence teachers negatively, it may also affect refugee students' learning. It was discussed in literature that parents' involvement in education is important, particularly in refugee education. Since refugee students and their parents may not speak a common language with teachers, it may result in drawbacks on their education. Therefore, the reason why teachers do not feel comfortable must be further investigated for a better relation between teachers and parents, as well as better education for refugee students.

In open ended questions, vast majority of the teachers stated they are not involved in their schools' management issues. Most of the participants stated that they cannot spend money from school's budget. Thus, teachers cannot plan any activities outside the school for learning purposes. However, some participants commented that they can use money from school's budget for such activities. It can be inferred that spending money from the budget varies between schools and school administration. Therefore, creating equality in spending money from the budget for learning purposes would be beneficial for teachers' autonomy regarding school management. Furthermore, some participants commented that they shared their opinions in the meetings as teachers, yet they believed that school management did not value their ideas generally. In this case, school managements need to involve teachers more

on management or give importance to their suggestion, as teachers' experiences are significantly essential to resolve issues in their schools.

Breen (2007) believes that teachers are responsible for their professional development. In professional development part of the questionnaire, majority of teachers stated that they identified their development targets and prepare an individual professional development plan and engage in action research and/or exploratory practice to develop their teaching. Unlike the findings in this study, Çolak and Altinkurt's (2017) study showed that teachers in their study was the least autonomous in professional development. Teachers in this study also stated they helped teachers who had less teaching experience than they had. Yet, it can be inferred from the results that teachers did not have the opportunity make their professional needs heard before the national in-service training and they could not make suggestions about who should be appointed as instructors for the national in-service training.

In open ended questions, some participants stated that sometimes MoNE or school administration decides who will attend in-service training programs. However, leaving the decision about the teachers that will attend the in service training to MoNE may have setbacks on teachers. Teachers need to identify their own needs and attend the appropriate in service training program for teachers to successfully improve themselves. If MoNE decides who will attend the training, it may not have the desired results regarding the teachers' professional development, as it will not target their identified professional development plan most likely. Furthermore, some of the participants stated that generally in service training are not satisfactory. This may be due to prior situation mentioned. If teachers cannot identify their needs and have access to the suitable training for them, the chance of trainings to be beneficial would be lower. Another teacher commented that they do not get enough support for their professional development. This may cause teachers' to feel their needs on professional development are unvalued. However, if MoNE regularly requests teachers' needs and suggestions, in service teacher training may be more beneficial.

Some of the participants in the study stated that they sometimes consider in service training programs as obligations. Some participants also stated that their school management decided who would attend in-service training programs. In this case, needs analysis would be beneficial to identify the professional needs of teachers. In their study, T. Bümen et. al (2012) stated that professional development needs of teachers cannot be determined exactly and most of the teachers think that the professional development activities they participate

are not effective. Furthermore, they also argue that traditional seminars and workshops are ineffective since they do not take into account teachers' current beliefs and needs. Moreover, it can be inferred that teachers do not attend these programs according to their professional needs in some schools. Moreover, they also stated that they did not have the chance to have a say over the content of in-service training programmes. Improving the amount and content of these in service training according to the needs of English teachers would be helpful for them to consider in service training as voluntary rather than obligatory. In this way, teachers would find a subject to attend and they would also benefit from these trainings.

Nevertheless, three participants stated that they were members of continuous professional development program by MoNE and commented that they learnt various new teaching techniques and activities. Therefore, their opinion about the program and in-service training were significantly positive when compared to other participants.

Curriculum development needs to include teachers and teachers have to possess proper knowledge and ability to make contributions (Carl, 2009). In the last part of the questionnaire, teachers answered questions regarding curriculum development. As it was discussed in literature review, teachers in Turkey are restricted regarding determining the textbook and they cannot contribute curriculum development process. Similarly, Webb (2002) criticizes the policy in the USA as it does not give freedom to teachers to adjust curriculum.

Teachers in this study stated that they had a good knowledge of national curriculum development processes and they had flexibility in devising new learning materials for their students. However, majority of teachers could not make contributions to the national curriculum development and redesign processes. They were also not offered the opportunity to raise issues about the national English curriculum and submit these to the National Curriculum Development Panel. Lastly, they stated that they could not can initiate and administer new enrichment and cultural activities.

Similarly, some participants stated that they were asked their opinions on curriculum from time to time via surveys, yet they did not get feedback from MoNE. It can be concluded that commonly teachers are not involved in creating or designing the curriculum. This may cause teachers to feel their ideas on curriculum are not valued. However, the teachers are the ones that put the curriculum into practice and see the possible problems. Therefore, their opinions and suggestions would be valuable to further develop the national curriculum. One

of the participants commented that at the beginning of each year they had annual curriculum meeting and could change some parts of it or the timing of some subjects. However, she also stated that she had to follow MoNE in general even if she could adapt some parts. It can be inferred that making minor changes to the curriculum shows difference between schools and it depends on the school administration. Another participant commented that she could change the activities on the textbook according to the needs of her students. Therefore, with the experience and autonomy of the teachers, they can adapt the activities even if they do not have the chance to make changes on curriculum. Teachers are the ones who know and identify the needs of their students, as a result, their ideas regarding curriculum is highly crucial.

In conclusion, teachers were already autonomous in teaching and assessment. However, for professional development, it would be beneficial for teachers to focus on their own professional development after identifying their own needs. For instance, teachers may achieve this by reading articles related to their needs, attending post-graduate courses by universities. Nevertheless, it is needed to make changes in educational system in Turkey for teachers to have higher autonomy in school management and curriculum development. Unfortunately, teachers have the autonomy as much as the system allows them. For example, they do not have a say in budget planning and using money from this budget for educational activities outside school. Moreover, they are not involved in curriculum development process, yet teachers need to be the part of the process as they can easily identify the issues in the English curriculum.

5.2. Difference between English Teachers with and without Refugee Students in Their Classes

Another aim of this study was to compare the autonomy of English teachers with and without refugee students in their classes. Therefore, the purpose of the second research question was to find out whether there was difference between the autonomy of English teachers who have refugee students in their classes and those who do not have refugee students. T-test for teaching and assessment, school management and curriculum development and Mann Whitney U for professional development were applied. According to these analysis, English teachers without refugee students in their classes had relatively higher autonomy in teaching and assessment, school management, professional development

and curriculum development. It was anticipated for English teachers without refugee students to have a higher autonomy, and the results were in line with the expectations.

This finding was in line with Yıldırım's (2017) study. In her study, she also found out that EFL instructors had low level of autonomy in professional development, as they cannot determine whether to attend professional development courses. According to Üzüm and Karşlı (2013), professional development is a significant factor in determining autonomy of teachers. Çolak and Altinkurt (2017) also showed that teachers were not autonomous in professional development. In contrast, Karabacak's (2014) study showed that teachers had a high level of autonomy in professional development.

In MoNE' Turkey's Education Vision 2023 report, it is stated that the professional development of teachers and school administrators will be reorganised. The report further states that to improve the overall and field-oriented skills of teachers and school administrators, postgraduate level professional development programs will be planned. It is also expressed in the report that there will be cooperation with universities to initiate minor degree programs targeting 21. Century skills and face-to-face, formal, and/or distance training programs to support the professional development of teachers and school administrators. However, when current professional development programs available for teachers, it can be inferred that these programs are limited in content. For instance, there is no available course for teachers to attend in inclusive education. When the refugee students' number is considered, an inclusive education for in-service training programs is highly necessary. In this way, teachers will have the required essential professional development course and it will affect their autonomy positively as well.

In open ended questions, most of the teacher who had refugee students had negative opinion about in-service teacher training and commented that they could not decide on the content of these programs. Furthermore, they stated that these professional development programs generally did not target their needs. However, one participant who had no refugee students stated that she read articles for her professional development and some of the participants stated that they attended in-service training programmes. Moreover, another participant commented that she could identify her needs and apply for an in-service training programme. Another participant also stated that she sometimes attended courses and shared her experiences with her colleagues. Therefore, it can be inferred that some of the

participants, who had no refugee students, use their autonomy to further develop themselves professionally.

Some of the English teachers who had no refugee students commented on the same issues similar to English teachers who had refugee students. Most of them stated that they had to use the textbook given by MoNE and they do not have a say over the content of in-service professional development programs. However, when the regulation on using the textbook given by MoNE is considered, both groups stated they could not use other textbooks and this situation was expected. Some English teachers without refugee students stated that they could apply different teaching techniques and use different activities in their classes. One of the participants also stated that she could change the teaching time of subjects. Moreover, the most common theme on discretion in teaching and assessment was the amount of homework they gave similar to English teachers with refugee students.

On the contrary, on school management, some participants stated that they could use money from schools budget for learning purposes. Moreover, one participant commented that she was quite involved in her schools' management issues. However, in general, participants stated that they were not involved in school management issues. Similarly, Uğurlu and Qahramanova (2016) stated they the participants in their study were also not autonomous on the school's financial plan.

In the questionnaire, English teachers who had no refugee students had higher autonomy in curriculum development. Similarly, in Çolak and Altinkurt' (2017) study, teachers working in private schools stated that they had more autonomy over the curriculum than teachers in public schools. Therefore, it can be concluded that the autonomy of teachers can vary depending on the school they work at. In open ended questions, participants were also asked whether they were involved in creating the curriculum. Most of the participants commented that they were not involved in the process. However, some of them expressed that they could make some alterations on it. Regarding curriculum, one of the teachers stated similar things to another participant who had refugee students. She commented that her role is to put curriculum into practice. The answers of the participants were similar to the findings of Uğurlu and Qahramanova (2016). The participants in their study also commented that they had no autonomy on creating the curriculum.

Furthermore, none of the participants, who had refugee students, stated that they had an in-service training for refugee education. The review of the content of in-service training

programs of MoNE and the answers of teachers indicate that professional development programs are inadequate in the context of refugee education and their inclusion. Therefore, it is highly possible that this will also affect their autonomy, especially in teaching, as they do not get the appropriate training.

5.3. The Relationship between the Number of Refugee Students and Teacher Autonomy

Number of refugee students in classes varies due to different reasons. In some areas of Ankara, such as Yenimahalle and Altındağ, they are highly populated. Hence, some teachers had more than 20 refugee students in their classes while some of them only had between 1 and 4. Therefore, it raises the question if the number of refugee students affects their autonomy in teaching and assessment, school management, curriculum development and professional development. As the result of the study indicated, the number of refugee students did not have a significant effect on the autonomy of teachers. Number of the refugee students was expected to affect English teachers' autonomy, yet the findings showed otherwise. In contrast to these findings, Mustafa and Cullingford (2008) stated that teachers who had crowded classes had difficulties in terms of autonomy. What's more, it was stated that a teacher in Uzun and Bütün's (2016) had an extra refugee student in his/her class and had difficulties engaging these students in activities. Moreover, one of the teachers stated that he/she ignored the refugee student completely.

In this study, some of the participants complained that their classes were overcrowded and one of the teachers, who had more than 20 refugee students in her class, could not even check homework they gave. Furthermore, some of them stated that it was hard to discipline the students as the classes were crowded. However, the results showed that the number of refugee students did not affect their level of autonomy. Additionally, none of the teachers mentioned issues regarding refugee students in open ended questions even if they had more than 20 refugee students in their classes. Moreover, none of the participants, especially who had more than 20 refugee students, stated that they attempt to improve themselves in the education of refugee students. This could be the result of teachers' ignoring the refugee students in their classes. Even if teachers practice autonomy successfully, when they ignore refugee students, it will have a negative impact on them.

5.4. The Relationship between the Professional Experience of English Teachers and Their Autonomy

Özaslan, (2013) believes that education system should allow teachers to use their professional experience in choosing appropriate educational material for their students. The last research question intended to find out whether professional experience of teachers affects the level of autonomy. The results showed that professional experience did not have a noteworthy impact on English teachers' autonomy in teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development. It was expected in the results that teachers with more experience would be more autonomous, as teacher with more experience were expected to be more conscious on practicing autonomy. Specifically, it was expected that more experienced English teachers would be more autonomous in teaching and assessment, and professional development, since they were two dimensions that may be influenced by experience. As it was mentioned in literature, teachers with experience are expected to adapt to the needs of their students and be more responsible for their professional development. Particularly, this situation was expected to be the result of this study, as the participants had refugee students in their class and they needed to adapt to the change in their classes. Moreover, they had to develop themselves professionally as having refugee students require further training and research for inclusive education. However, the results showed no significant difference.

When literature review is considered, generally teachers become more autonomous as they gain more experience. In the context of refugee students, it was expected that teachers would practice autonomy more as they had more experience and more training in professional development. However, their autonomy was no different than teachers who had less experience. For instance, this may indicate that as none of the participants mentioned they had in-service training regarding refugee students, there was no significant difference in their autonomy as well. Another reason for no difference regarding experience may be the context of the study. As the study was conducted in Ankara, number of participants were limited to the state schools in central districts. Therefore, having no difference between their autonomy may be the consequence of this situation.

However, in Canbolat's (2020) study, more experienced teachers thought instructional autonomy was less reasonable than less experienced teachers. Similarly, teachers in Karabacak's (2014) study found autonomy for educational, managerial, financial,

and personal and professional development as more feasible as their experience increased. Furthermore, teachers with experience less than 5 years had more autonomy compared to more experienced teachers in Çolak and Altinkurt's (2017) study. Although there was no significant correlation between experience and general autonomy of teachers in Slovenia, more experienced teachers were more autonomous in determining appropriate methods and techniques to use in their classes (Lepičnik-Vodopivec, 2016).



CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, results of the study for each research question are summarized and recommendation for further research based on the results are included.

6.1. Summary of the Results

The aim of this study was to explore the autonomy of English teachers with refugee students in their classes and working in state schools. Their autonomy was examined in four different contexts, which are teaching and assessment, school management, professional development and curriculum development using questionnaire. Moreover, their further views were also explored in open ended questions in the same contexts of the questionnaire.

The purpose of the first research question was to identify autonomy of English teachers who had refugee students in their classes over four dimensions mentioned before. The results indicated that for teaching and assessment, they were autonomous in determining the amount of homework, how classroom space is used, norms and rules for classroom behaviour, selecting teaching methods and techniques, rewarding students. However, they were not autonomous in determining their own assessment activities, selecting textbooks, choosing topics and skills to be taught. In open ended questions, participants similarly mentioned that they were autonomous in the amount of homework and disciplining their students. Besides, they mentioned that they could not select or use textbooks except for the one given by MoNE. For school management, participants' overall level of autonomy was low. The participants felt involvement and ownership about the events in their schools and they cooperated with their colleagues on their working conditions. However, majority of them were not involved in budget planning, they could not use money from the schools' budget. Moreover, their opinions about their schedule in school were ignored, they did not have a say on grouping students and majority were not comfortable working with parents. For professional development, teachers stated that they identified their own targets for professional development, involved in action research or investigative practice, supported other teachers with less experience, and tried to do things in a different manner in class. On the contrary, participants did not have the opportunity to state their needs about in-service training by MoNE, and they could not make suggestions about the instructors of these in-service trainings. Furthermore, majority of the answers in open ended questions indicated that they believed in-service training were limited in content. Moreover, they could not

always determine to attend in-service trainings as school administration mostly decided who would attend. Some of the participants also stated they had no time for in-service training or other professional development programs. The results of curriculum development showed that teachers had the knowledge about the process of national curriculum development, and they could develop new learning materials for their students. In contrast, they could not make contributions to the process of curriculum development, they did not have the chance to inform the MoNE on the problems about the English curriculum. They also believed that their main role is to put curriculum into practice, and they could not plan cultural activities for their students. Answers for open ended questions were also similar. Participants stated that they were not involved in curriculum development, yet they wished they could make contributions to the national English curriculum.

The second research question was aimed at determining if there was difference between the autonomy of English teachers who had refugee students and those who did not. T-test and Mann-Whitney U test results showed that autonomy of English teachers who had no refugee students were relatively higher compared to English teachers who had refugee students. However, most of the English teacher who had no refugee students answered open ended questions similarly. They stated that they could not select the textbook, and some participants commented that in-service training did not meet their needs. Even though some of the participants stated that they could use money from school's budget, most of them were not involved in school management issues as well. Moreover, they also stated they were not involved in curriculum designing process.

The purpose of the third question was to find out if the number of refugee students had an impact on autonomy of English teachers. The results indicated that the number of refugee students did not have a noteworthy effect on the autonomy of teachers. Even though the teachers mentioned some problems about crowded classes in open ended questions, they did not remark any problems regarding the number of their refugee students.

The aim of the last research question was to discover if professional experience of English teachers affected their level of autonomy. The findings revealed that professional experience did not have a notable effect on the autonomy of English teachers in teaching and evaluation, school management, professional development and curriculum development.

6.2. Recommendations

The main focus of this study was the autonomy of English teachers who had refugee students in state schools. The results may give insight on autonomy levels of English teachers in four different dimension, and their strengths and weaknesses regarding autonomy. However, this study was conducted in central districts of Ankara, Turkey. Furthermore, during the data collection process, schools were closed due to COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the participants were limited. Moreover, the schools in the study were only in Ankara, and it may show the autonomy of English teachers in Ankara and the difficulties they have in practicing their autonomy. Different teachers from different cities may have particular issues as a result of their environment. Hence, a research with more participants from different cities of Turkey would be beneficial to determine a general understanding of their autonomy. Moreover, the study is applied only on English teachers, and it can be generalized to other fields for a more comprehensive insight about autonomy of teachers who have refugee students.

Open ended questions were asked to participants for their further opinions about the dimensions in the questionnaire. However, if follow-up interviews are conducted, there might be more detailed results about their obstacles regarding autonomy and refugee students. Moreover, the lessons of teachers can be observed to see the classroom environment. It may give more indication on teachers' autonomy in teaching in particular and their relationship with refugee students. The views of teachers may be revealed from interviews and questionnaires, nonetheless, if observations are conducted the true nature of classroom can be examined.

Furthermore, as it was discussed in literature, teacher autonomy and learner autonomy is related. Moreover, refugee children's education is significantly important for their inclusion in society. Therefore, autonomy of English teachers and autonomy of their refugee students can be studied in order to discover if there is a correlation.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadoun, S. (2014). Turkey's policy toward Syrian refugees domestic repercussions and the need for international support. *SWP Comment*, 47, 1-4.
- Althouse, L. A., Ware, W. B., & Ferron, J. M. (1998). Detecting Departures from Normality: A Monte Carlo Simulation of a New Omnibus Test Based on Moments.
- Aras, B., & Yasun, S. (2016). The educational opportunities and challenges of Syrian refugee students in Turkey: Temporary education centers and beyond.
- Aydin, H., & Kaya, Y. (2017). The educational needs of and barriers faced by Syrian refugee students in Turkey: a qualitative case study. *Intercultural Education*, 28(5), 456-473.
- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy and its role in learning. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 733-745). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Benson, P. (2010). Teacher education and teacher autonomy: Creating spaces for experimentation in secondary school English language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(3), 259-275.
- Benson, P., & Huang, J. (2008). Autonomy in the transition from foreign language learning to foreign language teaching. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 24(SPE), 421-439.
- Bircan, T., & Sunata, U. (2015). Educational assessment of Syrian refugees in Turkey. *Migration Letters*, 12(3), 226-237.
- Boslaugh, S. (2008). *Encyclopedia of epidemiology* (Vols. 1-2). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412953948
- Bourgonje, P. (2010). Education for refugee and asylum seeking children in OECD countries. *Education international*, 50, 1-12.
- Bozkurt, N. (2017). An Investigation into The Syrian Refugee Efl Learners' Perceptions Of Learner Autonomy And Their Readiness For Autonomy In Language Learning
- Breen, M. P. (2007). Appropriating Uncertainty. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 1067-1084). Springer, Boston, MA.

- Canbolat, Y. (2020). Professional Autonomy of High School Teachers in Turkey: A Retrospective and Prospective Policy Analysis. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 45(202).
- Carl, A. E. (2009). Teacher empowerment through curriculum development: Theory into practice. Juta and Company Ltd.
- Cassity, E. (2007). Voices shaping education: Young African refugees in Western Sydney high schools. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 2007, 8(3), 91-104.
- Chatterjee, S., & Hadi, A. S. (2015). Regression analysis by example. John Wiley & Sons. p. 1
- Chatty et al., Ensuring quality education for young refugees from Syria (12-25 years): a mapping exercise (RSC Research Report, 2014) <http://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/files/publications/other/rr-syria-youth-education-2014.pdf>, p. 70
- Culbertson, S., & Constant, L. (2015). Education of Syrian refugee children: Managing the crisis in Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan. Rand Corporation.
- Crul, M., Keskiner, E., Schneider, J., Lelie, F., & Ghaeminia, S. (2016). No lost generation: Education for refugee children a comparison between Sweden, Germany, The Netherlands and Turkey.
- Çolak, İ., & Altinkurt, Y. (2017). Okul iklimi ile öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 23(1), 33-71.
- Dorman, S. (2014). Educational Needs Assessment for Urban Syrian Refugees in Turkey. YUVA Association Report. Istanbul: UNHCR. <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/download.php?id=7898>
- Emin, N. M. (2016). Türkiye'deki Suriyeli çocukların eğitimi: temel eğitim politikaları (Educating Syrian Refugees in Turkey and Basic Education Policies). Ankara: SETA Publications.
- Ercakır-Kozan, B. (2019). A Case Study: Exploring The Experiences of Educational Stakeholders In Relation To Refugee Education at A Public School In Mamak
- Forghani-Arani, N., L. Cerna & M. Bannon (2019). "The lives of teachers in diverse

- classrooms", OECD Education Working Papers, No. 198, OECD Publishing, Paris
- Friedman, I. A. (1999). Teacher-perceived work autonomy: The concept and its measurement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59, 58-76.
- Genc, Z. S. (2010). Teacher autonomy through reflective journals among teachers of English as a foreign language in Turkey. *Teacher Development*, 14(3), 397-409.
- Hamilton, R. (2003). Schools, teachers and the education of refugee children. In *Educational interventions for refugee children* (pp. 97-110). Routledge.
- Hamilton, R., & Moore, D. (2003). Education of refugee children: Documenting and implementing change. In *Educational interventions for refugee children* (pp. 120-130). Routledge.
- Hannah, J. (2008). The role of education and training in the empowerment and inclusion of migrants and refugees. In *Comparative and Global Pedagogies* (pp. 33-48). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford/New York: Pergamon Press. (First Published 1979, Council of Europe).
- Hong, W. P., & Youngs, P. (2016). Why are teachers afraid of curricular autonomy? Contradictory effects of the new national curriculum in South Korea. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 36(sup1), 20-33.
- Hui, Y. A. N. (2010). Teacher-learner autonomy in second language acquisition. *Canadian social science*, 6(1), 66-69.
- Human Rights Watch (2015) "When I Picture My Future, I See Nothing" Barriers to Education for Syrian Refugee Children in Turkey
- Isik, A. (2008). Yabancı dil eğitimimizdeki yanlışlar nereden kaynaklanıyor? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2
- Khalil, B. (2018). Teacher autonomy in Turkish state lower secondary schools with reference to English language teaching: A mixed methods study (Doctoral dissertation, Open University (United Kingdom)).
- Kirk, J., & Winthrop, R. (2007). Promoting quality education in refugee contexts: Supporting teacher development in Northern Ethiopia. *International Review of*

Education/Internationale Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft/Revue
Internationale De l'Education, 53(5/6), 715-723.

Kronick, R. (2013). Exploring primary school teachers' attitudes towards urban refugee education in Nairobi, Kenya. *Special Contributions*, 2(1), 49.

Lamb, T. (2008). Learner Autonomy and Teacher Autonomy. *Learner and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses*. 279-284.

Lems, A. (2020). Being inside out: the slippery slope between inclusion and exclusion in a Swiss educational project for unaccompanied refugee youth, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46:2, 405-422

Lepičnik-Vodopivec, J. (2016). Primary school teachers' views on their autonomy. *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences*, 9(2), 71-84

Little, D. (1995). Learning As Dialogue: The Dependence Of Learner Autonomy On Teacher Autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175-181.

Mann, H. B., & Whitney, D. R. (1947). On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 50-60.

Manzano Vázquez, B. (2018). Teacher development for autonomy: An exploratory review of language teacher education for learner and teacher autonomy. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 387-398.

Matthews, J. (2008). Schooling and settlement: refugee education in Australia, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 18:1, 31-45

Mendes, M., & Pala, A. (2003). Type I error rate and power of three normality tests. *Pakistan Journal of Information and Technology*, 2(2), 135-139.

McKnight, P. E., & Najab, J. (2010). Mann-Whitney U Test. *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology*, 1-1.

Ministry of National Education. (2019). Turkey's Education Vision 2023. Ankara: Ministry of National Education.

Ministry of National Education, Directorate of Lifelong Learning (2020) – Retrieved from

https://hbogm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2020_01/27110237_OCAK_2020inter_net_BulteniSunu.pdf

- Mustafa, M., & Cullingford, C. (2008). Teacher autonomy and centralised control: The case of textbooks. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(1), 81-88.
- Naidoo, L. (2012). Refugee action support: Crossing borders in preparing pre-service teachers for literacy teaching in secondary schools in Greater Western Sydney. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 7(3), 266-274.
- OECD (2016), PISA 2015 Results (Volume II): Policies and Practices for Successful Schools, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264267510-en>.
- Özaslan, G. (2015). Öğretmenlerin sahip oldukları mesleki özerklik düzeyine ilişkin algıları. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(2), 25-39.
- Üzüm, P., & Karslı, M. D. (2013). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretmen özerkliğine ilişkin farkındalık düzeyleri (İzmir ili örneği).
- Pastoor, L. D. W. (2017). Reconceptualising refugee education: exploring the diverse learning contexts of unaccompanied young refugees upon resettlement. *Intercultural Education*, 28(2), 143-164.
- Paxton, G., Smith, N., Win, A. K., Mulholland, N., & Hood, S. (2011). *Refugee Status Report: A Report on How Refugee Children and Young People in Victoria Are Faring*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.
- Pearson, L. C., & Hall, B. W. (1993). Initial construct validation of the teaching autonomy scale. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 86(3), 172-178.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism.
- Pugh, K., Every, D., & Hattam, R. (2012). Inclusive education for students with refugee experience: Whole school reform in a South Australian primary school. *The Australian educational researcher*, 39(2), 125-141.

- Prichard, C., & Moore, J. E. (2016). Variables influencing teacher autonomy, administrative coordination, and collaboration. *Journal of Educational Administration*.
- Oh, S. A., & Van Der Stouwe, M. (2008). Education, diversity, and inclusion in Burmese refugee camps in Thailand. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(4), 589-617.
- Özel, D. (2018). Examining needs and issues of refugee-receiving schools in Turkey from the perspectives of school counselors. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara, Middle East Technical University.
- Erden, O. (2017). Schooling experience of syrian child refugees in Turkey (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University).
- Öztürk, İ. H. (2011a). Curriculum reform and teacher autonomy in Turkey: The case of the history teaching. *International Journal of Instruction*, 4(2).
- Öztürk, İ. H. (2011b). Öğretmen özerkliği üzerine kuramsal bir inceleme. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(35), 82-99.
- Ramos, R. C. (2006). Considerations on the role of teacher autonomy. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 183-202.
- Rutter, J. (2006). Refugee children in the UK. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Roxas, K. C. (2011). Creating communities: Working with refugee students in classrooms. *Democracy and Education*, 19(2), 5.
- Sakız, H. (2016). Göçmen çocuklar ve okul kültürleri: Bir bütünleştirme önerisi. *Göç Dergisi (GD)*, 3(1), 65-81.
- Sidhu, R., and S. Taylor. 2007. Educational provision for refugee youth in Australia: left to chance? *Journal of Sociology* 43, no. 3: 283–300.
- Sinclair, B. (2008). Multiple voices: Negotiating pathways towards teacher and learner autonomy. *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts realities and responses*, 236-266.
- Sinclair, M. (2001). Education in emergencies. *Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries*, 1-84.
- Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment. *Education*, 114(4), 488-493.
- Smith, R. C. (2000). Starting with ourselves: Teacher-learner autonomy in language

learning. *Learner autonomy: Teacher autonomy: Future directions*, 89-99.

Smith, R. C. (2003). Teacher education for teacher-learner autonomy. In Symposium for Language Teacher Educators: Papers from Three IALS Symposia (CD-ROM). Edinburgh: IALS, University of Edinburgh. Retrieved from: http://www.warwick.ac.uk/~elsdr/Teacher_autonomy.pdf.

Smith, R., & Erdoğan, S. (2008). Teacher-learner autonomy: Programme goals and student-teacher constructs. *Learner and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses*. 83-102.

Taylor, S., & Sidhu, R. K. (2012). Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education?. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(1), 39-56.

T. Bümen, N , Ateş, A , Çakar, E , Ural, G , Acar, V . (2012). TÜRKİYE BAĞLAMINDA ÖĞRETMENLERİN MESLEKİ GELİŞİMİ: SORUNLAR VE ÖNERİLER . Milli Eğitim Dergisi , 42 (194) , 31-50 .

Webb, P. T. (2002). Teacher power: The exercise of professional autonomy in an era of strict accountability. *Teacher Development*, 6(1), 47-62.

Uğurlu, Z., & Qahramanova, K. (2016). Opinions of school administrators and teachers on the teacher autonomy in Azerbaijan and Turkey educations system. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(2), 637-658.

UNESCO. (2003). Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education: A Challenge and a Vision. Conceptual paper. Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF. (2018). UNICEF Turkey 2018 Humanitarian Results Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/report/turkey/unicef-turkey-2018-humanitarian-results>

UNHCR, (2019). Global Framework for Refugee Education Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5dd509dc7/grf-pledging-guidance-global-framework-refugee-education.html?query=refugee%20education>

UNHCR, (2019b). Refugee Education in Crisis Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/publications/education/5d651cbd4/stepping-refugee-education-crisis.html?query=refugee%20education>

United Nations. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. New York: United Nations.

Uzun, E. M., & Bütün, E. (2016). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarındaki Suriyeli sığınmacı çocukların karşılaştıkları sorunlar hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. Uluslararası Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Çalışmaları Dergisi, 1(1).

Wyatt-Smith, C & Gunn, S. (2007). Evidence-Based Research For Expert Literacy Teaching. Melbourne: Office for Education Policy and Innovation (DEECD).

Yıldırım, T. (2017). *The Perceptions Of Efl Instructors And Administrators On Teacher Autonomy: A Case Study* (Doctoral dissertation, MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY).



Appendix 1: Teacher Autonomy Survey

Dear Participant,

I am a Master's student at Baskent University, in English Language Teaching department. The aim of this study is to investigate the concept of teacher autonomy of teachers who work in state secondary schools. There are five sections in the survey, and it would approximately take 15 minutes to complete.

Completing this survey indicates that you are willing to participate in the study and your answers will be used anonymously. It is very important that you give accurate and sincere answers for the questions.

Thank you for your participation and contribution to the study.

Ceren Tek
cerentek@outlook.com

A. Information about you

1. Your gender:

☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Years of experience as an English teacher

☐ 0-4 ☐ 5-9 ☐ 10-14 ☐ 15-19 ☐ 20-24 ☐ 25+

3. Grades taught:

☐ Grade 5 ☐ Grade 6 ☐ Grade 7 ☐ Grade 8

4. Have you ever had refugee students in your classes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. If yes, please select the number of the students.

☐ 1-4 ☐ 5-9 ☐ 10-14 ☐ 15-19 ☐ 20+

B. Teaching and assessment

Choose the option to the statement that best describes your experience as an English teacher.

	not at all	occasionally	undecided	frequently	always
6. I am free to use my own assessment activities in my class independent from those suggested by the Ministry of National Education.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I determine the amount of homework to be assigned.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have a say over selecting English textbooks together with my colleagues at school.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I determine how classroom space is used (e.g. putting desks in small groups).	1	2	3	4	5
10. I determine norms and rules for student classroom behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am free to select the teaching methods and strategies independent from those suggested by the Ministry of National Education.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I have the flexibility to select specific topics and skills to be taught from the centralised English teaching curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I find a way and time to teach things I like teaching in addition to those in the English teaching curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I reward deserving students without the need to get the head teacher's consent.	1	2	3	4	5

C. School Management

Choose the option to the statement that best describes your experience as a teacher.

	not at all	occasionally	undecided	frequently	always
15. I feel a great sense of involvement and ownership in what is happening in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I am involved in making decisions about the school's budget planning.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I can use money from the school's budget on various activities (e.g. visits to museums, libraries, talks etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
18. I have a say in scheduling the use of time in my classroom (e.g. having the opportunity to give your opinion about the days of the week you want to teach etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
19. I work collaboratively with my colleagues to create working conditions that fit in with how we want to work.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My colleagues and I have a say in grouping students into classes in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I am comfortable working with parents.	1	2	3	4	5

D. Professional development

Choose the option to the statement that best describes your experience as a teacher.

	not at all	occasionally	undecided	frequently	always
22. I identify my development targets and prepare an individual professional development plan.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I engage in action research and/or exploratory practice to develop my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I help those who have less teaching experience than I have.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I take the risk of doing things differently in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
26. As a teacher of English, I have the opportunity to make my professional needs heard before the content of national in-service training (hizmetiçi eğitim) is determined by the Ministry of National Education.	1	2	3	4	5
27. As a teacher of English, I can make suggestions to the Ministry about who should be appointed as instructors for the national in-service training.	1	2	3	4	5

E. Curriculum development

Choose the option to the statement that best describes your experience as a teacher.

	not at all	occasionally	undecided	frequently	always
28. I have a good knowledge of national curriculum development processes.	1	2	3	4	5
29. My work permits me to make contributions to the national curriculum development and redesign processes.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I am offered the opportunity to raise issues about the national English curriculum and submit these to the National Curriculum Development Panel (via local authorities).	1	2	3	4	5
31. My main role with regard to curriculum consists of putting the prescribed national curriculum into practice in my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I can initiate and administer new enrichment and cultural activities (e.g. organizing field trips to theatres, English movies, or organizing visits to the schools abroad).	1	2	3	4	5
33. I have flexibility in devising new learning materials for my students.	1	2	3	4	5

F. Teachers' Perception

1. How much discretion are you able to use in the classroom in the area of student teaching and assessment? (e.g. amount of homework, selection of textbook, disciplining students and etc.)

2. How much are you involved in your school's management issues? (e.g. budget planning, spending money from schools' budget for students' learning purposes, and etc.)

3. How much say do you have over your own professional development? (e.g. determining the content of in-service professional development programmes).

4. How much are you involved in the process of creating/redesigning the English teaching curriculum?

Thank you for your participation!



T.C.
ANKARA VALİLİĞİ
Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 14588481-605.99-E.408073

07.01.2020

Konu : Araştırma İzni

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİNE
(Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü)

İlgi : a) MEB Yenilik ve Eğitim Teknolojileri Genel Müdürlüğü'nün 2017/25 nolu Genelgesi.
b) 25.12.2019 tarihli ve 21727 sayılı yazınız.

Enstitünüz İngiliz Dili Öğretimi tezli yüksek lisans programı öğrencisi Ceren TEK'in "**Mülteci öğrencilerin Bulunduğu Sınıflarda İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Özerkliği**" konulu çalışma kapsamında İlimize bağlı, ekli listede bulunan okullarda uygulama talebi ilgi (b) Genelge çerçevesinde incelenmiştir.

Yapılan inceleme sonucunda, söz konusu araştırmanın Müdürlüğümüzde muhafaza edilen ölçme araçlarının; Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasası, Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu ile Türk Milli Eğitiminin genel amaçlarına uygun olarak, ilgili yasal düzenlemelerde belirtilen ilke, esas ve amaçlara aykırılık teşkil etmeyecek, eğitim-öğretim faaliyetlerini aksatmayacak şekilde okul ve kurum yöneticilerinin sorumluluğunda gönüllülük esasına göre uygulanması Müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi ve gereğini rica ederim.

Turan AKPINAR
Vali a.
Milli Eğitim Müdürü

Dağıtım:
Gereği:
Başkent Üniversitesi

Bilgi:
Çankaya, Mamak, Altındağ, Sincan, Pursaklar,
Keçiören, Yenimahalle İlçe MEM

Adres: Emniyet Mah. Alparslan Türkeş Cad. 4/A
Yenimahalle/ANKARA
Elektronik Adres: www.meb.gov.tr
e-posta: istatistik06@meb.gov.tr

Bilgi için: D. KARAGÜZEL
Tel: 0 (312) 306 89 07
Faks: 0 () _____