

Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 9 Sayı: 44 Volume: 9 Issue: 44

Haziran 2016 June 2016

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

AN EXAMINATION OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS' VIEWS ONIMPLICIT LEARNING IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES

Abstract

Okan SARIGÖZ• Zeki ÖZKARTAL**

Hidden curriculum means latent learning which is not specified in a formal curriculum in schools as well as in an unwritten curriculum that sometimes can be more effective than the formal curriculum, rules that should be obeyed and practices and regulations in schools and classrooms that are the causes of them. The aim of this research is to determine the views of preservice teachers studying at Faculty of Education about implicit learning approach by considering some demographic variables. The sample of the research constitutes 326 preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education in Hakkari University in 2015-2016 school years. General Screening Model, one of the descriptive screening methods, and Mixed Model were used in the research. Validity and reliability studies of 21-item 'Scale of Implicit Learning' used in the research were conducted and Cronbach's Alpha internal reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.87. According to the results obtained from the research, such results have been reached that preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education have knowledge about implicit learning, but their sensitivity to and awareness of implicit learning are unsatisfactory, there is no a significant difference of opinions between the preservice teachers studying in various departments.

Keywords: Implicit Learning, Latent Learning, Hidden Curriculum, Formal Curriculum, Higher Education.

INTRODUCTION

Education in all public schools is given according to a formal curriculum determined by relevant ministries of states. However, all things intended to give students, are not written in these formal curricula, and initiative is given to teachers in terms of some behaviours and core values intended to teach according to the subjects' order in formal curricula or current situation or the event. This curriculum which depends on teachers' initiative and is formally written, is defined as latent curriculum or hidden curriculum.

In brief, the hidden curriculum is composed of knowledge, opinions and values students have acquired outside of the formal curriculum (Yüksel, 2002: 363). According to Garcia & Lissovoy (2013), the hidden curriculum means processes taking a role to transmit norms and values dominant in the structure of society through daily routines in schools. The hidden curriculum includes core values and also many factors creating socio-cultural structure of school (Tezcan, 2003: 2). The hidden curriculum means qualifications students obtain as a consequence of knowledge, opinions and practices which emerge in the teaching-learning process apart from purposes and activities in the formal curriculum (Yeşilyurt & Kurt, 2012). The hidden curriculum is defined as all knowledge, values and beliefs that are parts of learning process in classrooms and schools, and usually not noticed or intentionally not directed (Horn, 2003). The hidden curriculum means learning experiences occurring through especially principals' and teachers' attitudes and behaviours inside the classroom and school (Yeşilyurt & Kurt, 2012). To Kalayci & Güneş (2014), defining, analysing or evaluating the hidden curriculum is difficult because of consciously or unconsciously setting to work and being differently defined and implemented by each partner in relation to many partners of school in private and of education in general.

There are two types of curriculum or two types of learning styles in schools and the researches done, are based on these two types of curriculum. The first of them is defined as the formal curriculum, avert or written curriculum prepared by authorized public institutions or private institutions and directly implemented by schools, and the second type of curriculum is defined as the hidden curriculum, covert or implicit curriculum (Cemiloğlu, 2006; Dönger, 2016a-2016b; Yüksel, 2004: 7). Furthermore, according to Bloom (1995), each student encounters two types of curriculum. The first of them is the manifest curriculum which is a formal curriculum of school previously determined, and the second is the latent curriculum which is invisible and based on the interaction of individuals with each other in school.

The concept of implicit curriculum was first come into use by Philip Jackson in 1968 (Demir & Duruhan, 2015; Kohlberg, 1983; Lynch, 1989; Ozkartal, 2016a-2016b; Yüksel, 2004). According to Jackson

[•] Öğr. Gör. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Çocuk Gelişimi Bölümü.

^{**} Öğr. Gör., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Geleneksel El Sanatları Bölümü.

(1968), the implicit curriculum shapes students' behaviours to get them to be loyal, obey and listen to advice in schools, and makes them individuals conforming to society. Jackson (1968-1983), states that the implicit curriculum is used as a means of regulating relationships in classroom, and thanks to it, students are changed according to society's expectations.

Yüksel (2002) explains that the implicit curriculum is an inarticulate or unwritten curriculum apart from the formal curriculum, and thanks to this curriculum, students learn emotions, attitudes, values, habits and skills. Giroux (2001) specifies that seeing the implicit curriculum as a basic means of socialising is mistake and that the implicit curriculum is an important mechanism forming social structure. To Kalaycı & Güneş (2014), core values, especially, are some of the most important goals to havein both the formal and implicit curriculum. Gutek (2001), states that dominant groups or official ideologies have influence on education and schools in terms of three dimensions. To him, these dimensions;

- 1. Determine educational policies and their purposes and results.
- 2. Determine behaviours and values in school environment and strengthen them.
- 3. Be effective on determining the knowledge and skills forming schools' formal curricula.

As it is understood from dimensions propounded by Gutek, all curricula considered are formal curricula. On the other hand, implicit curricula are always of secondary importance.

According to Yüksel (2004: 57-71), the purpose of the implicit curriculum is to provide core values necessary in combination with school's regulations of administrative and organisational means, classroom climate and the interaction of school and environment. These learning experiences or purposes are also affected by social, economic and political demands and conditions outside the school. Moreover, to Wren (1999), the implicit curriculum can lead students to learn the value of right competition and acquire the belief, skill and effective attitude towards working.

According to Anderson (2001), the implicit learning consists of unwritten and inarticulate rules that should be obeyed in order to succeed in school. There are some core values, strategies, beliefs and behaviour patterns unwritten and not specified in formal curricula, but necessary for being successful at school. Teachers, who provide students with the awareness of these behaviours, partially increase students' academic success. Academic success also depends on the implicit learning. Students, especially, who know how they communicate with their environment, school principals and teachers, can succeed in class despite their low socio cultural status (Ahola, 2000; Tezcan, 2003; Yüksel, 2004).

When the definitions and researches about the implicit learning are examined, most of the researchers have come to agree on the implicit learning that is unwritten and emerges in the course of activities or practices in the environment, class and school (Çavdarcı, 2002; Demiralay, 2016; Gaufberg, et. al., 2010; Lempp & Seale, 2004; Livesey, 2005; Ozkartal, 2013-2015; White, et al., 2009). In addition, students are given national feelings and sentiments, national and moral values and the importance of these values through the implicit learning (Çavdarcı, 2002). Schools achieve their goals such as training individuals who embrace core human values and have academic success by benefiting from formal curricula and also implicit curricula (Ekşi, 2003: 79; Yeşilyurt & Kurt, 2012).

In order to survive communities' cultural structures without deterioration, get all students to embrace universal moral rules, not to destroy national and moral feelings and forget customs and traditions, all students need the implicit learning in school term and this need can be satisfied by especially teachers. Thus, thesubject of implicit learning should be taught in detail to preservice teachers at the faculty of education and also candidates graduated from other departments and receiving pedagogical formation training in pedagogical formation courses in order that teachers can fulfil their responsibility for the implicit learning. According to Yüksel (2007), in teacher education, implicit messages in the implicit curriculum are conveyed from processes of conducting teacher education programs, institutional and social environments affecting teacher education, textbooks and materials used in class and instructors and administrators' statements and behaviours. In this way, the implicit curriculum can considerably affect preservice teachers' views and attitudes towards teaching profession and also their teaching qualifications.

METHOD

Population and Sample

The population of this research constitutes all preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education in Hakkari University, and the sample of the research constitutes 326 preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, German Language Teaching, English Language Teaching, Primary School Teaching and Turkish Language Teachingat the Faculty of Education in Hakkari University.

Research Model

This research was done with the aim of determining the views and opinions of preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education about the implicit learning by considering the demographic variables of

gender, department, grade level, age, and school graduated. For this purpose, surveys and scales which have been used in researches on the subject, were scanned by the researcher and a new 'Scale of Implicit Learning' that is based on the studies of *Evaluation of Curriculum*, *Hidden Curriculum and Out-Of-School Sources in Terms of Their Efficacy For Gaining Values Based on Student Views* done by Yeşilyurt & Kurt (2012) and of *The Visible Side of the Hidden Curriculum in Schools* done by Çobanoğlu & Engin-Demir (2014), was developed by the researcher and used in the research. At first, a field study was done for the scale used in the research, and then open ended questions about the subject were asked to the preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education, and from the answers given to these questions, a sketch of 34-item scale was created. After necessary analytical studies, 21-item unidimensional scalewas formed by removing 13 items from the scale, and after the opinions of five academic members' experts in the field of educational sciences about the scale were received, and the scale was put into final form by making re quire semantic arrangements.

Validity and reliability studies of Scale of Implicit Learning used in the research were conducted and Cronbach's Alpha internal reliability coefficient of the 21-item scale was determined as 0.87. The answers of preservice teachers participating in the research to the scale depending on the demographic variables were calculated by using Anova test which is an F test, t-test and one-way variance analysis with the help of SPSS 20 statistical software package. Negative items in the scale were calculated by inverting them while making analysis. The scale used in the research consists of five point likert type 21 items including (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. Overall assessment of the scale used in the research was determined as follows (Sarıgöz & Özkara, 2015; Sarıgöz, Dönger & Cengiz, 2015; Sarıgöz & Demiralay, 2015; Cengiz, Sarıgöz & Dönger, 2015):

$RO = \frac{HV - LV}{NO} = \frac{5 - 1}{5} = 0.8$	
RO: Range of Options	1.00 - 1.80: Strongly Disagree
HV: The Highest Value	1.81 – 2.60: Disagree
LV: The Lowest Value	2.61 – 3.40: Undecided
NO: Number of Options	3.41 – 4.20: Agree
	4.21 – 5.00: Strongly Agree

The scale was applied to 326 preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, German Language Teaching, English Language Teaching, Primary School Teaching and Turkish Language Teachingat the Faculty of Education in Hakkari University, and the effort was made to determine the views and opinions of the preservice teachers about the implicit learning depending on some demographic variables. In the research, 'General Screening Model' which is one of the descriptive screening methods and 'Mixed Model' were used. General screening model is the screening arrangements carried out on a group, sample group or a paradigm or the entire universe in order to draw conclusion about the universe composed of numerous elements (Karasar, 2008). General screening model is a research model used to specify the types of information such as people's attitudes, beliefs, values, habits and opinions (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001). Mixed model includes collecting qualitative and quantitative data regarding same basic facts in a study or a series of studies, and analysing and interpreting the collected data (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

FINDINGS

In this part of the research, the demographic data about the preservice teachers participating in the research, and the obtained data about the scale used in the research, and statistical findings and observations regarding these data are presented.

Department		mber of tudent		Gender					
•	Ν	%	N % N		Ν	%	Ν	%	
CIT			3rd Grade=22	45.83	Female=9	40.91	Male=13	59.09	
Teach.	48	14.72	4th Grade=26	54.17	Female=10	38.46	Male=16	61.54	
RCMK			3rd Grade=53	55.21	Female=16	30.19	Male=37	69.81	
Teach.	96	29.45	4th Grade=43	44.79	Female=14	32.56	Male=29	67.44	
Germ. L.			3rd Grade=14	51.85	Female= 7	50.00	Male= 7	50.00	
Teach.	27	8.28	4th Grade=13	48.15	Female= 5	38.46	Male= 8	61.54	
Eng. L.			3 rd Grade=25	52.08	Female=14	56.00	Male=11	44.00	
Teach.	48	14.73	4th Grade=23	47.92	Female=13	56.52	Male=10	43.48	
Prim. Sc.			3 rd Grade=30	54.55	Female=18	60.00	Male=12	40.00	
Teach.	55	16.87	4 th Grade=25	45.45	Female=13	52.00	Male=12	48.00	
Tur. L.			3 rd Grade=28	53.85	Female=11	39.29	Male=17	60.71	
Teach.	52	15.95	4 th Grade=24	46.15	Female=13	54.17	Male=11	45.83	

Table 1: Demographic Data about the Preservice Teachers Participating in the Research

From the data in Table 1, it was determined that from among 326 preservice teachers participating in the research, 48 of them (% 14.72) are studying in the department of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching (CIT), from among them studying in this department, 22 of them (% 45.83) are in the 3rd grade, and from among them, 9 of them (% 40.91) are female and 13 of them (% 59.09) are male, and 26 of them (% 54.17) are in the 4th grade, and from among them, 10 of them (% 38.46) are female and 16 of them (% 61.54) are male. It was determined that from among 326 preserves teachers participating in the research, 96 of them (% 29.45) are studying in the department of Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, from among them studying in this department, 53 of them (% 55.21) are in the 3rd grade, and from among them, 16 of them (% 30.19) are female and 37 of them (% 69.81) are male, and 43 of them (% 44.79) are in the 4th grade, and from among them, 14 of them (% 32.56) are female and 29 of them (% 67.44) are male. It was determined that from among 326 preservice teachers participating in the research, 27 of them (% 8.28) are studying in the department of German Language Teaching, from among them studying in this department, 14 of them (% 51.85) are in the 3rd grade, and from among them, 7 of them (% 50.00) are female and 7 of them (% 50.00) are male, and 13 of them (% 48.15) are in the 4th grade, and from among them, 5 of them (% 38.46) are female and 8 of them (% 61.54) are male. It was determined that from among 326 preservice teachers participating in the research, 48 of them (% 14.74) are studying in the department of English Language Teaching, from among them studying in this department, 25 of them (% 52.08) are in the 3rd grade, and from among them, 14 of them (% 56.00) are female and 11 of them (% 44.00) are male, and 23 of them (% 47.92) are in the 4th grade, and from among them, 13 of them (% 56.52) are female and 10 of them (% 43.48) are male. It was determined that from among 326 preservice teachers participating in the research, 55 of them (% 16.87) are studying in the department of Primary School Teaching, from among them studying in this department, 30 of them (% 54.55) are in the 3rd grade, and from among them, 18 of them (% 60.00) are female and 12 of them (% 40.00) are male, and 25 of them (% 45.45) are in the 4th grade, and from among them, 13 of them (% 52.00) are female and 12 of them (% 48.00) are male. It was determined that from among 326 preservice teachers participating in the research, 52 of them (% 15.95) are studying in the department of Turkish Language Teaching, from among them studying in this department, 28 of them (% 53.85) are in the 3rd grade, and from among them, 11 of them (% 39.29) are female and 17 of them (% 60.71) are male, and 24 of them (% 46.15) are in the 4th grade, and from among them, 13 of them (% 54.17) are female and 11 of them (% 45.83) are male. Table 2: t-test analysis results of the preservice teachers' answers to the Scale of Implicit Learning according to the gender

1401	e 2. t-test analysis results of the	preservice teachers	answers to the Sc	ale of implicit Lea	ining according t	o the genaci
Gender	Ν	x	Ss	Sd	t	р
Female	143	72.14	9.79	324	1.361	.175
Male	183	73.55	8.83			

p>0.05

When the data in Table 2 were examined, from the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it can be said that there is no a significant difference of opinions (p>.05) between female and male preservice teachers depending on the gender variable by looking at the t-test results. In the light of the research results, it can be said that female and male preservice teachers have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning.

Table 3: t-test anal	ysis results of the preser	vice teachers' answ	ers to the Scale of	: Implicit Learning	g according to the	grade level
Grade Level	Ν	x	Ss	Sd	Т	р
3 rd Grade	172	73.46	9.37	324	1.091	.276
4 th Grade	154	72.34	9.15			

p>0.05

When the data in Table 3 were examined, from the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it can be said that there is no a significant difference of opinions (p> .05) between preservice teachers in the 3rd grade and in the 4th grade depending on the grade level variable by looking at the t-test results. In the light of the research results, it can be said that the preservice teachers in the 3rd grade and in the 4th grade have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning. Table 4: Tukey test analysis results of the preservice teachers' answers to the Scale of Implicit Learning according to the type of

department										
Department	Ν	x	Ss	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	р	Sign. Diff. (Tukey)
1) CIT T.	48	73.83	6.86	Btw. Gr.	3516.074	5	703.215	9.210	.00	1-5
2) RCMK T.	96	72.77	9.02	Wit. Gr.	24433.303	320	76.354			1-6
3) German. T.	27	70.85	8.70	Total	27949.377	325				2-6
4) English T.	48	71.46	8.98							3-6
5) Pri. Sch. T.	55	68.56	8.02							4-6
6) Turkish T.	52	69.44	10.17							6-5
Total	326	72.93	9.27							

p<0.05

When the data in Table 4 were examined, from the answers of the preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching and of Primary School Teachingin favour of the preservice teachers studying in the department of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching depending on the type of department. It was determined that there is a significant difference between the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, of Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, of English Language Teaching, German Language Teaching and of Turkish Language Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Knowledge Teaching, of Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, of English Language Teaching and of German Language Teaching. Also, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Turkish Language Teaching and of Primary School Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the department of Turkish Language Teaching and of Primary School Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the department of Turkish Language Teaching and of Primary School Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the department of Turkish Language Teaching and of Primary School Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the department of Turkish Language Teaching [$F_{(2.210)}$, $p_{(.00)}$; $p^< .05$].

Age	Ν	x	Ss	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	Sđ	Mean Square	F	р	Significant Difference (Anova)
1) 19-22	51	74.49	7.34	Btw. Gr.	265.503	4	66.376	.770	.546	
2) 23-26	181	72.31	9.80	Wit. Gr.	27683.875	321	86.243			
3) 27-30	63	73.37	8.69	Total	27949.377	325				
4) 31-34	21	74.05	11.50							
5) 35-over	10	71.10	6.52							
Total	326	72.93	9.27							
10 OF										

Table 5: Anova test analysis results of the preservice teachers' answers to the Scale of Implicit Learning according to the age variable

p>0.05

According to the data in Table 5, from the answers of the preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was determined that there is no a statistically significant difference between the preservice teachers who are 19-22 years old, 23-26 years old, 27-30 years old, 31-34 years old, 35 years old and over in terms of their views about the implicit learning depending on the age variable [$F_{(.770)}$, $p_{(.546)}$; p > .05]. In the light of the research results, it can be said that the preservice teachers of different age groups have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning.

Table 6: Tukey test analysis results of the preservice teachers' answers to the Scale of Implicit Learning according to the school

					graduated					
School Graduated	N	x	Ss	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	р	Significant Difference (Anova)
1) SciAna. H.S.	80	74.55	8.18	Btw. Gr.	338.638	3	112.88	1.316	.269	
2) Voc. H.S.	149	72.20	9.56	Wit. Gr.	27610.739	322	85.75			
3) SupReg.H.S.	69	73.15	9.47	Total	27949.377	325				
4) Other	28	71.64	10.00							
Total	326	72.93	9.27							
p>0.05										

According to the data in Table 6, from the answers of the preservice teachers studying at the Faculty of Education to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was determined that there is no a statistically significant difference between the preservice teachers who have been graduated from Science-Anatolian High School, Vocational High School, Super-Regular High School and Other High Schools in terms of their views about the implicit learning depending on the variable of school graduated [$F_{(1.316)}$, $p_{(.269)}$; p > .05]. In the light of the research results, it can be said that the preservice teachers who have been graduated from different high schools, have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning.

Table 7: Arithmetic averages of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning

IMPLICIT LEARNING SCALE ITEMS	x	Skill Level
1. The implicit learning is not specified in formal curricula.	4.32	S. Agree
20. It is not clearly stated in formal curricula.	4.23	S. Agree
10. What is taught is not planned previously.	4.15	Agree
12. It depends on teacher knowledge and skill.	4.00	Agree
13. It should be offered in theory.	3.95	Agree
3. It is related to student behaviours.	3.84	Agree
4. It strengthens communication among the teacher and the student.	3.73	Agree
5. It does not create the awareness for students.	3.71	Agree
2. Learning only happens in the course of the lesson.	2.63	Agree
8. It means universal moral rules.	3.63	Agree
18. It does not give message to the student.	3.62	Agree
6. It is related to religious culture and moral principles.	3.60	Agree
14. It gains meaning according to the teacher's opinion.	3.41	Agree

3.41	Agree
3.24	Undecided
3.05	Undecided
2.94	Undecided
2.84	Undecided
2.60	Undecided
2.57	Undecided
2.56	Undecided
	3.24 3.05 2.94 2.84 2.60 2.57

General ArithmeticMean: 3.47 (Agree)

According to the data in Table 7, from the arithmetic averages of the answers of the preservice teachers to the implicit learning scale items, it is seen that article 1 stating 'The implicit learning is not specified in formal curricula.' ($\overline{X} = 4.32$), article 20 stating 'It is not clearly stated in formal curricula.' ($\overline{X} = 4.23$), article 10 stating 'What is taught is not planned previously.' ($\overline{X} = 4.15$) and article 12 stating 'It depends on teacher knowledge and skill.' ($\overline{X} = 4.00$) are the items with the highest arithmetic averages in the scale. In the light of the answers given to the scale items and general average of the scale, it can be said that

scale. In the light of the answers given to the scale items and general average of the scale, it can be said that the preservice teachers have knowledge about the implicit learning and think that it depends on a teacher's sensitiveness, awareness, knowledge and skill.

According to the data in Table 7, from the arithmetic averages of the answers of the preservice teachers to the implicit learning scale items, it is seen that article 15 stating 'It should be offered in practice.' (\overline{X} =2.56), article 19 stating 'It provides cohesiveness among students.' (\overline{X} =2.57), article 17 stating 'It is determined according to students' needs.' (\overline{X} =2.60) and article 21 stating 'Encouragement is in the forefront.' (\overline{X} =2.84) are the items with the lowest arithmetic averages in the scale. In the light of the answers given to the implicit learning scale items, it can be said that the preservice teachers think the implicit learning is not effective enough in terms of being offered in practice, increasing communication and

cohesiveness among students, being determined according to students' needs and encouraging them.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

This research was done with the aim of determining the views and opinions of the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, German Language Teaching, English Language Teaching, Primary School Teaching and Turkish Language Teaching at the Faculty of Education in Hakkari University about the implicit learning. Also, in the research, the effort was made to determine whether the opinions of the preservice teachers about the implicit learning differ according to the variables of gender, grade level, age, school graduated and the type of department or not. From the t-test analysis results of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was concluded that there is no a significant difference between female and male preservice teachers depending on gender. Therefore, the result has been reached that female and male preservice teachers have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning.

From the t-test analysis results of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was concluded that there is no a significant difference between the preservice teachers in the 3rd grade and in the 4th grade depending on grade level. Therefore, the result has been reached that the preservice teachers in the 3rd grade and in the 4th grade and in the 4th grade have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning.

From the analysis results of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning depending on the variable of the type of department, it was concluded that there is a significant difference between the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching and of Primary School Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the department of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, and between the preservice teachers studying in the department of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, of Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge Teaching, of English Language Teaching, of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, and between the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, German Language Teaching and of Turkish Language Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Computer and Instructional Technology Teaching, and also between the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Turkish Language Teaching and of German Language Teaching, and also between the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Turkish Language Teaching and of Primary School Teaching and of Primary School Teaching in favour of the preservice teachers studying in the departments of Turkish Language Teaching.

From the t-test analysis results of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was concluded that there is no a significant difference between the preservice teachers who are 19-22 years old, 23-26 years old, 27-30 years old, 31-34 years old, 35 years old and over depending on the age variable. Therefore, the result has been reached that the preservice teachers have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning depending on the age variable.

From the analysis results of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was concluded that there is no a significant difference between the preservice teachers who have been graduated from Science-Anatolian High School, Vocational High School, Super-Regular High School and Other High Schools in terms of their views about the implicit learning depending on the variable of school graduated. Therefore, the result has been reached that the preservice teachers have similar opinions regarding the implicit learning depending on the variable of school graduated.

From the analysis results of the answers of the preservice teachers participating in the research to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it was determined that the items with the highest arithmetic averages are related to that the preservice teachers have knowledge about the implicit learning and that the implicit learning depends on a teacher's sensitiveness, awareness, knowledge and skill, and also, the items with the lowest arithmetic averages are related to that the implicit learning is not effective enough in terms of being offered in practice, increasing communication and cohesiveness among students, being determined according to students' needs and encouraging them.

In the light of the preservice teachers' answers to the Scale of Implicit Learning, it is seen that the scale's general arithmetic average coincides with Agree almost above the middle-level. It reveals that the preservice teachers' attitudes, opinions, perceptions and sensitiveness towards the implicit learning are not intended (Strongly Agree).

Recommendation

The implicit learning is an important necessity for education because it is an essential part of education and all things related to education cannot be given in formal curricula. There are various kinds of knowledge that teachers are responsible for teaching in case of need. For this reason, teachers should always closely follow everything in course of teaching, intervene if necessary, and inform students about every necessary subject even if not in formal curricula.

Students are affected from implicit curricula like formal curricula. Especially, they are affected from formal curricula about the knowledge, and also, from implicit curricula about behaviour, social, moral and ethical subjects. Thus, teachers should be trained about the importance of the implicit curriculum and when and how they intervene with students by academicians or experts through in-service trainings, seminars, conversations or necessary interventions.

The importance of the implicit learning should be clearly explained to all preservice teachers in both educational sciences courses at the faculty of education and pedagogical formation courses, and their knowledge about this subject should be strongly reinforced.

When it comes to the implicit curriculum, only teachers and students should not come to mind. Administrators, especially, are so important for students in terms of the implicit curriculum because administrators step in when there is a problem related to a student or some behaviour of students at school is not adopted. As a result, all administrators should be subjected to some training about the implicit learning.

When it comes to the implicit learning, only teachers who give lessons in the verbal field should not come to mind, but also teachers giving lessons in the quantitative field, should warn students when required and effectively fulfil their own duties about the implicit curriculum. Necessary training should be given to teachers who feel inadequate about this topic by relevant institutions and organizations.

REFERENCES

AHOLA, Say (2000). "Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education: Something to Fear for or Comply to", *Paper Presented at the Innovations in Higher Education 2000 Conference*, August 30- September 2, Helsinki, Finland.

ANDERSON, Terry (2001). "The Hidden Curriculum in Distance Education: An Updated View", Change the Magazine of Higher Learning, C/S. 33(6), s. 28-35.

BLOOM, S. Benjamin (1995). İnsan Nitelikleri ve Okulda Öğrenme, (Çev: D. A. Özçelik), İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

CENGIZ, M. Şirin, SARIGÖZ, Okan and DÖNGER, Ahmet (2015). "Evulation of Pre-Service Teachers' Ideas About Brainstorming Method in Terms of some Veriables", *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, C/S. 3(12), s. 251-263.

ÇAVDARCI, Mustafa (2002). Türkiye'de Sosyal Değerlerin Aşınması ve Kültür Sömürgeciliği, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İsparta: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

ÇOBANOĞLU, Rahime ve ENGİN-DEMİR, Cennet (2014). "Okullardaki Örtük Programın Görünen Kısmı", İlköğretim Online, C/S. 13(3), s. 776-786.

DEMİR, Okay ve DURUHAN, Kemal (2015). "Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Programı'nda Örtük Program Algısı (İnönü Üniversitesi Örneği): Bir Durum Çalışması", Bilgisayar ve Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, C/S. 3(6), s. 32-70.

DEMİRALAY, Raziye (2016). "Yaşamboyu Öğrenme Bağlamında Yenilikçi Bir Öğrenme Modeli: Evde Ders Okulda Ödev Modeli", XV. Uluslararası Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu, 1-14 Mayıs, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.

DONGER, Ahmet, (2016a). "Ortaöğretimde Okuyan Öğrencilerin Yabancı Dil Kaygısı", VIII. Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi, 5-8 Mayıs, Çanakkale 18 Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.

DONGER, Ahmet, (2016b). "Eğitim Fakültesinde Okuyan Öğrencilerin Yabancı Dilin Gerekliliğine İlişkin Görüşleri", VIII. Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi, 5-8 Mayıs, Çanakkale 18 Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.

EKŞİ, Halil (2003). "Temel İnsani Değerlerin Kazandırılmasında Bir Yaklaşım: Karakter Eğitimi Programları", Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, C/S. (1)1, s. 79-96.

GARCIA, Jose and LISSOVOY, Noah (2013). "Doing School Time: The Hidden Curriculum goes to Prison", Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, C/S. 11(4), s. 49-68.

GAUFBERG, H. Elizabeth, BATALDEN, Maren, SANDS, Rebecca, and BELL, K. Sigall (2010). "The Hidden Curriculum: What can we Learn From Third-Year Medical Student Narrative Reflections", *Medical School Education*, C/S. 11(85), s. 1709-1716.

GIROUX, A. Henry (2001). Theory and Resistance in Education, London: Bergin & Garvey Publishing.

GUTEK, L. Gerald (2001). Eğitime Felsefi ve İdeolojik Yaklaşımlar, (Çev.: N. Güzel), Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları.

HORN, A. Raymond (2003). "Developing a Critical Awareness of the Hidden Curriculum Through Media Literacy", *The Clearing House*, C/S. 76(6), s. 298-300.

JACKSON, W. Pihilip (1968). Life in Classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.

KALAYCI, Nurdan ve GÜNEŞ, Emel (2014). "Resmi Programdaki Örtük Mesajların Öğrencilerin Özgürlük Değerine İlişkin Algıları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Belirlenmesi", *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, C/S. 12(1), s. 17-34.

KARASAR, Niyazi (2008). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

KOHLBERG, Lawrence (1983). The Moral Atmosphere of the School, (Ed.: Henry Giroux & David Purpel, The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education), Berkeley, California: McCurthan Publishing Corporation.

LEECH, L. Nancy and ONWUEGBUZIE, J. Anthony (2009). "A Typology of Mixed Methods Research Designs", *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, S. 43, s. 265-275.

LEMP, Heidi and SEALE, Clive (2004). "The Hidden Curriculum in Undergraduate Medical Education: Qualitative Study of Medical Students' Perceptions of Teaching", *British Medical Journal*, C/S. 329, s. 770-77.

LIVESEY, Chris (2005). "The Hidden Curriculum", http://www.sociology.org.uk/ceducate.htm Erisim Tarihi: 15.04.2016

LYNCH, Kathleen (1989). The Hidden Curriculum: Reproduction in Education, A Reappraisal, London: The Falmer Press.

MCMILLAN, H. James and SCHUMACHER, Sally (2001). Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction, New York: Longman.

OZKARTAL, Mehmet (2013). "Variability of Students' Achievements and Attitudes Towards Turkish Legends and Epics In Visual Arts Course at Primary Schools", *Ulakbilge International Journal of Social Sciences*, S. 1, s. 1-14.

OZKARTAL, Mehmet (2015). "Turkish Mythology and Its Place in Education of Art", International Journal of Turkish Education Sciences, S. 5, s. 83-98.

OZKARTAL, Zeki (2016a). "Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin İlköğretimde Sanat Eğitiminin Gerekliliğine İlişkin Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi", XV. Uluslararası Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu, 1-14 Mayıs, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.

OZKARTAL, Zeki (2016b). "Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin İlköğretimde Verilen Sanat Eğitimine Yönelik Analitik bir Çalışma", XV. Uluslararası Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu, 1-14 Mayıs, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.

SARIGÖZ, Okan and DEMİRALAY, Raziye (2015). "Evaluation of Attitudes of the Students Towards Lifelong Learning", *The Journal of International Social Research*, C/S. 8(41), s. 994-999.

SARIGÖZ, Okan, DÖNGER, Ahmet and CENGİZ, M. Şirin (2015). "The Evaluation of the Teachers' Views About Environmental Education and Issues", *International Peer-Reviewed Journal of Humanities and Academic Science*, C/S. 4(14), s. 54-76.

SARIGÖZ, Okan and ÖZKARA, Yasin (2015). "Öğretmen Adaylarının Eleştirel Pedagoji ve İlkeleri Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi", Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, C/S. 8 (39), s. 710-716.

TEZCAN, Mahmut (2003). "Gizli Müfredat Eğitim Sosyolojisi Açısından Bir Kavram Çözümlemesi", Gazi Üniversitesi Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, C/S. 1(1), s. 1-8.

WHITE, B. Casey, KUMAGAI, K. Arno, ROSS, T. Paula and FANTONE, C. Joseph (2009). "Students' Values a Qualitative Exploration of How the Conflict Between the Formal and Informal Curriculum Influences Student Values and Behaviors", *Academic Medicine*, C/S. 5(85), s. 597-603.

WREN, J. David (1999). "School Culture: Exploring the Hidden Curriculum", Adolescence, C/S. 34(135), s. 593-596.

YEŞİLYURT, Etem ve KURT, İbrahim (2012). "Değerleri Kazandırmasındaki Etkililik Açısından Resmi ve Örtük Program ile Okul Dışı Etmenlerin Öğrenci Görüşleri Doğrultusunda Değerlendirilmesi", *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume*, C/S. 7(4), s. 3253-3272.

YÜKSEL, Sedat (2002). "Yükseköğretimde Eğitim-Öğretim Faaliyetleri ve Örtük Program", Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, C/S. 15(1), s. 361-370.

YÜKSEL, Sedat (2004). Örtük Program: Eğitimde Saklı Uygulamalar, Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

YÜKSEL, Sedat (2007). "Örtük Programın Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğretmelik Meslek Derslerine Yönelik Düşüncelerindeki Etkisi", Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, S. 50, s. 321-345.