

Design and Evaluation of a Language Preparatory Program at an English Medium
University in an EFL Setting: A Case Study

Dissertation Submitted to the Institute of Educational Sciences
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
English Language Education

by
Enisa Mede
Yeditepe University

2012



YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

TEZ TESLİM ve ONAY TUTANAĞI

KONU: Design and Evaluation of a Language Preparatory Program at an English Medium University in an EFL Setting

ONAY:

Prof. Dr. Ayşe S. Akyel

(Danışman)

(İmza)

Doç. Dr. Gülecan Erçetin

(Üye)

(İmza)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sumru Akcan

(Üye)

(İmza)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dale Griffice

(Üye)

(İmza)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zeynep B. Koçoğlu

(Üye)

(İmza)

TESLİM EDEN : Enisa Mede
TEZ SAVUNMA TARİHİ : 25.06.2012
TEZ ONAY TARİHİ : 25.06.2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those who have helped me in completing this dissertation.

I would first like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ayşe S. Akyel, for her professional guidance, ongoing support, helpful criticism and sincere attitude throughout the development of this research. She has inspired me to do research on program design and evaluation and has actively engaged me in this process by providing me with the opportunity to be both the researcher and the teacher of the Language Preparatory Program. I am particularly indebted to her for being more than a supervisor and for being such an approachable person, without which writing a dissertation would turn into an endless journey.

My deepest feelings of gratitude also go to my second supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülcan Erçetin for her encouragement and trust in me. She has been by my side for nine years, and I am really grateful to be both her undergraduate and graduate student.

My sincere and special thanks go to Assist. Prof. Dr. Griffee for always being so responsive to my need for help. His invaluable feedback and comments helped me a lot in refining this dissertation and shaping it.

Many wholehearted thanks go to Assist. Prof. Dr. Sumru Akcan for her sincere and overwhelmingly kind attitude, and valuable suggestions in the preparation of this study.

My appreciation is also to Assist. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Koçoğlu for patiently and calmly responding to my never-ending questions.

I extend my special thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Yeşim Keşli Dollar and Josh Dollar for their valuable support, advice and encouragement during this study.

My sincere thanks go to my dear friend and colleague, Görsev İnceçay, for her energy and constant support. Without the hours we spent talking at the office, on the phone, at lunch, and even in the corridors during break times, this study would not be completed yet. I feel very lucky to have her in my life.

My friend, Hatime Çiftçi, also deserves special thanks as she has been always there for me in any difficulty I face in my life and during my studies. I am very proud to have such a friend.

I should also acknowledge the contributions of Volkan İnceçay, Serkan Uygun, Ayşegül Nergis, Aslı Bağışlayıcı and Evrim Eveyik Aydın who unconditionally supported me and always encouraged me during my academic studies.

I would also like to express my appreciation to my students for their willingness to participate in the study. Their constant feedback, comments and support were the basis of designing and evaluating this program.

Last but not least, my thanks from the deepest corner of my heart go to my family.

My mother and father, Ruzica and Abduraman Saban, for their never ending support, sacrifices, trust and unconditional love without which I would have lost hope.

My brother and his wife, Enis and Canan Saban, together with my nephew Kerem and nieces Mine and Merve, for always being there when I needed to cheer up.

My husband, Cem Mede, for creating a peaceful and supporting atmosphere at home, for being a great husband and an ideal father, without whose support, I would not have succeeded in this journey.

And finally, my one year old son, Mert Mede, who has given me the most wonderful feeling in the world.

Thank you all...

VITA

ENİSA MEDE

EDUCATION

- 2007 - 2012 Ph.D., Yeditepe University, Department of English Language Education, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 2006 - 2007 M.A., Yeditepe University, Department of English Language Education, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 1998 - 2003 B.A., Boğaziçi University, Department of Foreign Language Education, Istanbul, Turkey.
-

WORK EXPERIENCE

- 2008 - Present Lecturer, Yeditepe University, English Language Education, Preparatory Program, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 2006 - 2008 Lecturer, Yeditepe University, Language Preparatory School, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 2003 - 2008 English Language Teacher and Coordinator, Doğuş Groups of Schools, Istanbul, Turkey.
-

PUBLICATIONS

Mede, E. (2011). The acquisition of word order (verb placement) in an adult Serbo-Croatian-Turkish bilingual, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 672-675.

Mede, E. & Gürel, A. (2010). Acquisition of English articles in early bilingualism. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 10 (1), 193-219.

Mede, E. (2010). The effects of instruction on graphic organizers in terms of students' attitudes towards reading in English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 322-325.

Mede, E. (2010). The effects of collaborative reflection on EFL teaching: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 3888-3891.

Mede, E. (2009). An analysis of relations among personal variables, perceived self-efficacy and social support on burnout among Turkish EFL teachers. *Inonu University Journal of The Faculty of Education*, 10 (2), 39-52.

Eveyik-Aydin, E., Kurt, G. & Mede, E. (2009). Exploring the relationship between teacher beliefs and styles on classroom management in relation to actual teaching practices: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 612-617.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Mede, E. (2010). The effects of instruction on graphic organizers in terms of students' attitudes towards reading in English. Paper presented at the World Conference on Educational Sciences, Bahçeşehir University, Turkey.

Mede, E. (2010). The effects of collaborative reflection on EFL teaching: A case study. Paper presented at the World Conference on Educational Sciences, Bahçeşehir University, Turkey.

Mede, E. & Gürel, A. (2009). The acquisition of English articles in early bilingualism: A case of a Serbo-Croatian-English bilingual child. Paper presented at the EUROSLA Conference, Cork, Ireland.

Eveyik-Aydin, E., Kurt, G. & Mede, E. (2009). Exploring the relationship between teacher beliefs and styles on classroom management in relation to actual teaching practices: A case study. Paper presented at the World Conference on Educational Sciences, Nicosia, North Cyprus.

Mede, E. (2008). The cross-linguistic influence in article use of bilingual children. Paper presented at the 6th Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics and Language Teaching, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Mede, E. & O'neill, M. (2005). Whole school approaches: The student as an individual. Paper presented at the International Conference, Rome, Italy.

Mede, E. & O'neill, M. (2004). Öğretim desteği ve öğrenm ortamı. Paper presented at Eğitimde İyi Örnekler Konferansı, Sabancı University, Turkey.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Member of Balkans and Education Club, 2009 - Present

Member of Total Quality Management, Boğazici University, 2003-2006

Member of Earthquake and Social Work, Boğazici University, 2003-2004

RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS

Program Design and Evaluation, Bilingualism, Language Transfer, Teacher Education and Professional Development, Material Design and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
VITA.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
ABSTRATCT.....	xvi
KISA ÖZET.....	xvii
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. 1. Background to the Study.....	1
1. 2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1. 3. Purpose of the Study.....	6
1. 4. Overview of Methodology.....	8
1. 4. 1. Participants.....	8
1. 4. 2. Setting.....	8
1. 4. 3. Data Collection Instruments.....	9
1. 4. 4. Data Analysis.....	10
1. 5. Contribution of the Study.....	12
1. 6. Limitations of the Study.....	12
1. 7. Organization of the Study.....	13
1. 8. Definitions of Significant Terms.....	14
CHAPTER 2.....	16
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	16
2. 1. Introduction.....	16
2. 2. Theories of Learning.....	16
2. 3. From Syllabus Design to Curriculum Development.....	19
2. 4. Approaches and Models of Program Design.....	23
2.4.1. Needs Analysis.....	25
2. 4. 1. 1. Types of Needs.....	27
2. 4. 2. Specifying Goals and Objectives of the Program.....	28
2. 4. 3. Development of Tests on the Basis of Program’s Goals and Objectives.....	29
2. 4. 4. Developing Materials.....	29

2. 4. 5. Language Teaching.....	30
2. 4. 6. Program Evaluation.....	31
2. 5. Studies on Program Design.....	35
2. 5. 1. Program Design Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education Programs Abroad.....	35
2. 5. 2. Program Design Studies on Foreign Language Education in Turkey.....	37
2. 6. Historical Background of Program Evaluation.....	42
2. 7. Approaches and Models of Program Evaluation.....	45
2. 8. Dimensions of Program Evaluation.....	53
2. 8. 1. Formative vs. Summative.....	53
2. 8. 2. Process vs. Product.....	54
2. 8. 3. Quantitative vs. Qualitative.....	54
2.9. Studies on Program Evaluation.....	55
2. 9. 1. Program Evaluation Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education Abroad.....	55
2. 9. 2. Program Evaluation Studies on Foreign Language Education in Turkey.....	57
2. 10. Chapter Summary.....	61
CHAPTER 3.....	63
METHODOLOGY.....	63
3. 1. Introduction.....	63
3. 2. Setting.....	64
3. 3. Participants.....	64
3. 4. Case Study as a Research Design.....	65
3. 5. Data Collection Instruments.....	67
3. 5. 1. The Needs Analysis Questionnaire about the Perceptions of the Student Teachers' Language Needs.....	67
3. 5. 2. The Needs Analysis Questionnaire about the Student Teachers' Assumed Learning Needs.....	69
3. 5. 3. Interviews.....	70
3. 5. 4. Proficiency Exam Scores.....	72

3. 7. Data Analysis Procedure.....	75
CHAPTER 4.....	78
RESULTS.....	78
4. 1. Introduction.....	78
4. 2. Findings Related to the Design of the Language Preparatory Program.....	79
4. 2. 1. The Findings of the Pre-Needs Analysis Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers (ST) and Course Instructors (CI) in terms of the Student Teachers’ Perceived Language Needs.....	79
4. 2. 2. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews related to the Student Teachers’ Perceived Language Needs.....	94
4. 2. 2. 1. The General Views of the Course Instructors and Student Teachers related to the Language Preparatory Program.....	94
4. 2. 2. 2. Reading.....	95
4. 2. 2. 3. Writing.....	96
4. 2. 2. 4. Listening.....	98
4. 2. 2. 5. Speaking.....	99
4. 3. Findings Related to the Goals, Objectives, Materials and the Language Teaching Approach of the Language Preparatory Program.....	100
4. 3. 1. The Reading Syllabus.....	101
4. 3. 2. The Writing Syllabus.....	104
4. 3. 3. The Listening Syllabus.....	106
4. 3. 4. The Speaking Syllabus.....	107
4. 3. 5. The Structural Syllabus.....	109
4. 4. Summary of Part 1.....	110
4. 5. Findings Related to the Evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program.....	111
4. 5. 1. The Findings of the Needs Analysis Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers (ST) in terms of their Feelings whether the Program has met their Assumed Learning Needs.....	112

4. 5. 2. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews in terms of the Student Teachers' Assumed Learning Needs.....	114
4. 5. 3. The Findings of the Post-Needs Analysis Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers (ST) and Course Instructors (CI) in terms of their Feelings whether the Program has met the Student Teacher's Perceived Language Needs.....	116
4. 5. 4. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the Student Teachers' Perceived Language Needs.....	129
4. 5. 4. 1. The General Views of the Course Instructors and Student Teachers related to the Language Preparatory Program.....	129
4. 5. 4. 2. Reading.....	131
4. 5. 4. 3. Writing.....	133
4. 5. 4. 4. Listening.....	134
4. 5. 4. 5. Speaking.....	136
4. 6. The Findings related to the Proficiency of the Student Teachers before and after the Implementation of the Language Preparatory Program.....	137
4. 7. The Findings in relation to the Proficiency of the Student Teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the Ones who directly started the Undergraduate Program.....	138
4. 8. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews in terms of the Possible Positive and Negative Side Effects of the Language Preparatory Program.....	140
4.9. Summary of Part 2.....	142
CHAPTER 5.....	145
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	145
5. 1. Introduction.....	145
5. 2. The Design of the Language Preparatory Program.....	146
5. 3. The Evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program.....	150
5. 4. Implications.....	153
5. 5. Limitations.....	154

5. 6. Recommendations for Further Research.....	155
REFERENCES.....	156
APPENDICES.....	164
APPENDIX A: The Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers about their Perceived Language Needs Before the Implementation of the Program.....	165
APPENDIX B: The Questionnaire given to the Course Instructors about the Student Teachers' Perceived Language Needs Before the Implementation of the Program.....	169
APPENDIX C: The Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers about their Perceived Language Needs After the Implementation of the Program.....	173
APPENDIX D: The Questionnaire given to the Course Instructors about the Student Teachers' Perceived Language Needs After the Implementation of the Program.....	177
APPENDIX E: The Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers about their Learning Needs After the Implementation of the Program.....	181
APPENDIX F: The Semi-Structured Interview given to the Student Teachers about their Perceived Language Needs Before the Implementation of the Program.....	183
APPENDIX G: The Semi-Structured Interview given to the Course Instructors about the Student Teachers Perceived Language Needs Before the Implementation of the Program.....	186
APPENDIX H: The Semi-Structured Interview given to the Student Teachers about their Language and Learning Needs After the Implementation of the Program...	189
APPENDIX I: The Semi-Structured Interview given to the Course Instructors about the Student Teachers Language and Learning Needs After the Implementation of the Program.....	192
APPENDIX J: Sample Reading Practice at Three Different Proficiency Levels.....	195
APPENDIX K: Sample Article on Key Concepts in ELT.....	199
APPENDIX L: Sample Book Report Guidelines.....	201

APPENDIX M: Sample Writing Practice at Three Different Proficiency Levels.....	203
APPENDIX N: Sample Reaction Paper Guidelines.....	223
APPENDIX O: Sample Listening Practice at Three Different Proficiency Levels.....	225
APPENDIX P: Sample Speaking Practice at Three Different Proficiency Levels.....	231
APPENDIX Q: Sample Grammar Practice at Three Different Proficiency Levels.....	242

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1.	Comparison of different evaluation approaches (Visser, 2006).....	50
Table 3.1.	Overview of the research questions and the corresponding procedures.....	73
Table 4.1.	Percentages for student teachers' perceptions of their abilities related to the four language skills.....	80
Table 4.2.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their reading abilities in performing the related tasks.....	81
Table 4.3.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their writing abilities in performing the related tasks.....	83
Table 4.4.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their listening abilities in performing the related tasks.....	84
Table 4.5.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their speaking abilities in performing the related tasks.....	85
Table 4.6.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the reading strategies in performing the related tasks.....	87
Table 4.7.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the writing strategies in performing the related tasks.....	89
Table 4.8.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the listening strategies in performing the related tasks.....	91
Table 4.9.	Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the speaking strategies in performing the related tasks.....	93
Table 5.1.	Percentages for the student teachers' feelings of whether the program has met their assumed learning needs.....	112
Table 5.2.	Percentages for student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs related to the four language skills.....	116
Table 5.3.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of reading related tasks.....	117

Table 5.4.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of writing related tasks.....	119
Table 5.5.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of listening related tasks.....	120
Table 5.6.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of speaking related tasks.....	121
Table 5.7.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the reading strategies in related tasks.....	122
Table 5.8.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the writing strategies in related tasks.....	125
Table 5.9.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the listening strategies in related tasks.....	127
Table 6.1.	Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the speaking strategies in related tasks.....	128
Table 6.2.	Paired samples t-test results of pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers enrolled in the language preparatory program on the four language skills	138
Table 6.3.	Independent samples t-test results comparing the proficiency gain scores of PSTs and USTs in terms of the four language skills.....	139

ABSTRACT

Design and Evaluation of a Language Preparatory Program at an English Medium University
in an EFL Setting: A Case Study

by

Enisa Mede

The purpose of this study is to design and evaluate a Language Preparatory Program at an English medium university. A sample of eighty-eight student teachers and ten course instructors from Yeditepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) participated in this study. The study consisted of two parts: a) program design and b) program evaluation. For the first part of the study, the quantitative data were obtained through a pre-needs analysis questionnaire, and the qualitative data were collected from a semi-structured interview related to the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs. As for the second part of the study, the quantitative and qualitative data were gathered from a needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs, a post-needs analysis questionnaire on the student teachers' perceived language needs, semi-structured interviews, the pre- and post-proficiency exam scores of the preparatory student teachers, and the gain scores of the preparatory student teachers and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program. The findings of the study revealed significant implications with respect to the design and evaluation of a Language Preparatory Program.

Key Words: Program design, program evaluation, language needs, learning needs.

KISA ÖZET

İngilizce'nin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretildiği Eğitim Dili İngilizce Olan Bir Üniversitede Dil Hazırlık Programı Geliştirme ve Değerlendirme: Örnek Olay İncelemesi

Enisa Mede

Bu çalışmanın amacı eğitim dili İngilizce olan bir üniversitede bir Dil Hazırlık Programı geliştirmek ve değerlendirmektir. Çalışmaya Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümünden 88 aday öğretmen ve 10 eğitmen katılmıştır. Çalışma, program geliştirme ve program değerlendirme olmak üzere iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmanın ilk bölümünde, nicel veriler bir ön-ihtiyaç analizi anketi yöntemiyle, nitel veriler ise aday öğretmenlerin dil konusundaki ihtiyaçlarına yönelik algılarıyla ilgili yarı yapılandırılmış bir röportaj yoluyla elde edilmiştir. İkinci bölümde ise, nicel ve nitel veriler aday öğrencilerin varsayılan öğrenme ihtiyaçlarına yönelik bir ihtiyaç analizi anketi, aday öğrencilerin algılanmış dil ihtiyaçlarına yönelik bir son-ihtiyaç analizi anketi, yarı yapılandırılmış röportajlar, hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin dil yeterlilik sınavı ön-test ve son-test sonuçları ve hazırlık sınıfı öğrencileri ile doğrudan bölüme geçen aday öğretmenlerin kazanılmış sonuçlarından elde edilmiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları Dil Hazırlık Programı geliştirme ve değerlendirmeye yönelik önemli sonuçlar ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Program geliştirme, program değerlendirme, dil ihtiyaçları, öğrenme ihtiyaçları.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. 1. Background to the Study

The field of second (or foreign) language teaching has been involved in a search for effective “methods” generalizable to students from different backgrounds in order to teach a foreign language in the classroom effectively. Research aimed to improve the quality of language teaching by referring to general principles and theories focusing on how languages are learned, how knowledge of language is represented and organized in memory or how language itself is structured (Williams and Burden, 1997; Roberts, 1998; Brown and Therivel, 2000; Freeman, 2000; Celce-Murcia, 2001; Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

Language teaching/learning draws from various disciplines including psychology, sociology and educational psychology. Educational psychology theory has passed through a number of changes in its comparatively brief history which has had a particular influence on approaches to language teaching.

To begin, behaviorism explains all learning in terms of some form of conditioning. Skinner (1961) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) constructed principles to account for human behavior in observable terms. He views learning as a result of environmental rather than genetic factors. He emphasizes the importance of operant conditioning (e.g. an individual responds to a stimulus by behaving in a particular way) and reinforcement (e.g. reward or punish).

Contrary to behaviorist approach, cognitive psychology stressed the importance of the mental processes that are involved in learning. According to the Cognitive Approach, the learner is seen as an active participant in the language learning process using various mental strategies. Language is not a matter of habit formation but of a rule-governed cognitive behavior. Reading and writing receive equal importance to listening and speaking. However,

this approach placed little or no emphasis on the ways individuals make sense of their own worlds.

To fill this gap, the Constructivist movement was introduced. Piaget (1970) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) has been the dominant figure in cognitive psychology with his emphasis upon the constructive nature of the learning process during which learners are actively involved in constructing personal meaning. He views cognitive development as a process of maturation. The developing mind is constantly looking for equilibrium based on the two complementary processes of assimilation and accommodation. In this approach, Bruner (1966) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) focused on the discovery approach to learning. The key to transferring what is learned from one situation to another is related to the concept of “learning how to learn” which has given rise to the notion of the spiral curriculum. The teachers first introduced the basic ideas that give life and form to any topic or subject area, and then revisit and build upon these repeatedly. Finally, Kelly’s (1955) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) personal-construct theory suggests that each person’s individual construction of the world will depend upon their previous experiences.

Two more major schools of thought were introduced in the literature: humanism and social constructivism. According to humanistic approaches, the inner world of the learner and the individual’s thoughts, feelings and emotions are crucial for all human development. Erikson (1968) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) for example, argued that human psychological development depends on the way in which individuals pass through predetermined maturational stages and upon the challenges set by the society.

In addition, Maslow (1968) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) suggested a hierarchy of needs representing either deficiency (maintenance) needs or being (or growth) needs. Rogers (1969) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) on the other hand, identified a number of key elements of the humanistic approach to education. Learning is considered to

be experimental when the subject matter is perceived to be of personal relevance to the learner and when it is based on active participation by the learner.

Additionally, Social Constructivism argues that language learning occurs through meaningful interaction with other people. Vygotsky (1978) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) emphasized the importance of interaction with people that aids in the transmission of culture and development of thought. He developed the concept of “zone of proximal development” referring to the layer of skill or knowledge which is just beyond that with which the learner is capable of coping.

Before deciding on the particular approach to language teaching, the properties of the given instruction and the characteristics, needs, and wants of the learners should be identified. As any language program tries to achieve a certain level of proficiency, the weaknesses of the general instructional setting will be observed both in the outcomes (product) and in the implementation (process) of the instruction. The design of most language teaching programs is mostly concerned with the selection, grading, and presentation of the target language forms via various teaching practices or techniques. To fill this gap, recent research has emphasized the perceptions of the students’ language needs to meet the desired level of competence before a program is designed and evaluated.

Program design and evaluation studies have mostly focused on identifying students’ language needs, feelings and attitudes towards preparatory or undergraduate programs (Baştürkmen and Al-Huneidi, 1996; Chia, Johnson, Chian and Olive, 1999; Edwards, 2000; Chan, 2001; Ekici, 2003; Sarı, 2003; Mutlu, 2004; Erozan, 2005; Örs, 2006; Özkanal, 2009; Akyel and Özek, 2010). However, for one reason or another, language pedagogy has not yet made much use of the developments in this field to cope with the curriculum decisions and lacks a systematic curriculum development process. There have been few attempts to apply the principles of curriculum development to the planning, implementation and evaluation of language programs. The focus of the language curriculum has mainly been on only one part

of the total picture such as syllabus design or evaluation (Nunan, 1988). In recent years, there have been calls for a more comprehensive approach to language curriculum design (Nunan, 2004). Therefore, the problem mentioned in this study is one recognized world-wide.

The present study aims to integrate both design and evaluation of a Language Preparatory Program in a Turkish EFL context. For the first part of the study, a program was designed according to the student teachers' perceived language needs. Specifically, a skills-based syllabus and a structural syllabus were developed in terms of the goals and objectives, materials and the language teaching approach dimensions. As for the second part of the study, program evaluation, the student teachers' assumed learning needs, the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs, the general views, the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the preparatory and the gain scores of the preparatory and the undergraduate student teachers were identified. By means of this study, the researcher aims to design and evaluate a Language Preparatory Program, to suggest relevant adaptations and to contribute to the improvement of the program.

1. 2. Statement of the Problem

Yeditepe University is a foundation university in Istanbul, Turkey which is partially funded by the government. English is the medium of instruction, and English courses are offered both at the preparatory and undergraduate levels. Every year, prospective students are required to pass the TOEFL exam (with an average of 79), the proficiency exam (with an average of 60) or IELTS (with an average of 6.5) which aims to measure their competency in general English before they start the undergraduate programs. Students who pass one of these exams continue their education in chosen disciplines at different departments. However, the ones who fail are required to take the placement exam, which determines their level of proficiency. There are three different proficiency levels at the Language Preparatory School

at Yeditepe University: Level A (Advanced), Level B (Intermediate) and Level C (Beginners). Based on their proficiency levels, students receive 30 hours of English instruction per week at one of these levels. The courses are designed to meet the students' language needs in general and they vary in terms of reading, writing, listening and grammar. English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is offered only at the advanced level.

Students from various disciplines such as, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, English Language and Literature are enrolled in the preparatory program. The average number of students in a class is 22.

However, when the preparatory students pass the proficiency exam and start their undergraduate programs, they have difficulties in coping with the requirements of their courses. Particularly, they have problems with the use of the necessary strategies in tasks related to the four language skills. These difficulties might be due to the course content, methodology, differences in students' interests or the properties of given instruction. Specifically, the main reason behind these problems might be the lack of emphasis on strategy training. Unless the course instructors raise the students' awareness of the application on the language strategies in given tasks, they might experience certain difficulties in following the courses in the undergraduate program.

Additionally, the students enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program receive equal number of English instruction. However, English is not required equally in all undergraduate programs therefore the students have different language needs. Particularly, the ELT students have specific language needs because they are going to become teachers in the future.

Considering the discussions above, the instructors who offer courses at the ELT Department complained about the student teachers' proficiency. They stated that the student teachers were not aware of the strategies they could use while performing various assignments related to the four language skills. In other words, they needed a program that

would provide them with strategy training to meet their perceived language needs and help them follow the undergraduate courses more efficiently.

To overcome this problem, the course instructors of the Faculty of Education, Department of English Language (ELT), have decided that a new program should be designed to meet the perceived language needs of the student teachers.

1. 3. Purpose of the Study

The present study has two purposes: (a) to design a Language Preparatory Program, and (b) to evaluate a Language Preparatory Program.

To this end, the first part of the study aims to design a Language Preparatory Program. Brown's (1995) framework including the following dimensions: needs analysis, goals and objectives, materials and language teaching approach were adapted to identify the nature of the program in relation to the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs.

As for the second part of the study, Posavac and Carey's (2003) three types of evaluation: the evaluation of need, the evaluation of process and the evaluation of outcome were integrated to evaluate whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs and their assumed learning needs. Additionally, the student teachers' proficiency level on the four language skills was also evaluated before and after they were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program. Finally, the study compared the performance of the student teachers who studied in the preparatory program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program in terms of their proficiency considering their listening, reading, writing and speaking abilities.

Specifically, the following research questions and the sub questions were addressed for the first part of the study:

1-What is the nature of the Language Preparatory Program in terms of:

- 1a. the language needs
- 1b. goals and objectives
- 1c. materials
- 1d. the language teaching approach

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, the following research questions are addressed:

2-Do the student teachers enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program feel that the program has met their assumed learning needs?

3- Do the student teachers and the course instructors feel that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs?

4-Is there any difference between the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program related to their performance on the four language skills?

5-Are there any differences between the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program in terms of their proficiency in the four language skills?

6-What are the possible positive and negative side effects of the Language Preparatory Program?

1. 4. Overview of Methodology

1. 4. 1. Participants

For the first part of the study, forty-six undergraduate student teachers and five instructors offering courses at the freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior grade levels at the ELT department participated in the study.

As for the second part of the study, the data came from twenty-one student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program, twenty-one student teachers who directly started the undergraduate program and five course instructors who offered courses both in the preparatory and the undergraduate programs.

1. 4. 2. Setting

The present study was conducted at the Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) at Yeditepe University. The program offers a four-year undergraduate program in English Language Teacher Education including courses on English language development, linguistics, language teaching methodology, pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary for teaching English as a foreign language.

Apart from their compulsory courses, the student teachers are also given a chance to learn a second foreign language and to pursue their individual interests in various cultural and professional subjects through elective courses. The overall aim of the program is to offer a comprehensive teacher undergraduate program to future teachers providing them with the most up-to-date knowledge in their respective subject areas.

1. 4. 3. Data Collection Instruments

In an attempt to answer the questions for the first part of the study, the data came from pre-needs analysis questionnaires administered both to the student teachers and course instructors to learn their perceptions in terms of the student teachers' language needs. The information gathered was supported via semi-structured interviews carried out with both groups of participants. Shortly, these two data collection instruments were used to answer the first research question and sub questions to design the Language Preparatory Program.

In relation to the data gathered for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, a needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs and a post-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs were used to find out whether the preparatory program has met these two particular needs effectively. Parallel to the design of the program, the data collected were supported via semi-structured interviews conducted with the student teachers and the course instructors. Additionally, the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program were compared to identify if there was any difference in their proficiency in the four language skills after the implementation of the program. Finally, the gain scores of the preparatory student teachers and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program were compared to find out whether any difference existed in their level of proficiency considering the reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities.

In other words, for the second research question, a needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs and a semi-structured interviews were administered to the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program to evaluate whether the program has met their assumed learning needs.

As for the third research question, a post-needs analysis questionnaire was given to the student teachers and course instructors to evaluate whether the preparatory program has met the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs. The findings were supported by a semi-structured interview.

For the fourth research question, the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program were compared to investigate whether the program has helped them to improve their proficiency related to the four language skills.

To answer the fifth question, the gain scores of the preparatory and undergraduate student teachers were compared in terms of their performances related to the listening, reading, writing and speaking abilities.

Finally, for the last research question, semi-structured interviews were carried out with the two groups of participants to identify the possible positive and negative side effects of the Language Preparatory Program.

1. 4. 4. Data Analysis

For the present study, a combination of qualitative and quantitative strategies was used for data analysis to ensure internal validity. The raw data came from the pre- and post-needs analysis questionnaires on the student teachers' perceived language needs, a needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs, semi structured interviews, the pre- and post- program proficiency scores and the gain scores.

In an attempt to answer the first research question and sub questions related to the design of the Language Preparatory Program, the pre-needs analysis questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed statistically to learn the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs. Additionally, the semi-structured interviews carried out with the student teachers and

course instructors were transcribed and coded according to Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework.

As for the second part of the study, a needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs was tabulated and analyzed statistically to see whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' assumed learning needs after they had finished the program. The results were supported with the information gathered from a semi-structured interview transcribed and coded using Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework.

Furthermore, the post-needs analysis questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed statistically to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs after they had completed their freshmen courses. The data were supported via semi-structured interviews given to the two groups of participants after the implementation of the program. Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework was applied to transcribe and code the gathered data.

The pre- and post- program proficiency scores from the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program were also tabulated and analyzed statistically to compare whether the program has helped them to improve their proficiency in the four language skills.

Additionally, the gain scores were analyzed to identify whether there was a difference between the student teachers who were enrolled in the preparatory program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program considering their performance in the four language skills.

Finally, the information gathered from the semi-structured interviews carried out with the student teachers and course instructors after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program were transcribed and coded to identify the possible positive and negative side effects of the program (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

1. 5. Contribution of the Study

The present study aims to integrate both program design and evaluation in a single study. The findings of the study will provide information regarding the student teachers' perceptions of their language needs, assumed learning needs, goals and objectives, materials and the language teaching approach to be applied for the design of a Language Preparatory Program. The study will also contribute to the program evaluation dimension by providing details in terms of the evaluation of need, the evaluation of process and the evaluation of outcome, which will aid in the redesigning process of the program for the following academic year. By these means, the findings of the study may serve as a model for the design and evaluation of language preparatory programs at other universities.

1. 6. Limitations of the Study

One of the main limitations of this study is that it relies only on student teachers' and course instructors' perceptions of the student teachers' language needs. Because of time constraints and the fact that the student teachers' were not aware of their learning needs before they started the program, they were not identified prior to the implementation of the preparatory program.

Following recent developments, the student teachers' assumed learning needs were based on a Social Constructivist approach to teaching and learning, and were reflected in the goals and objectives, the teaching method and the materials used in the program.

As a result, the learning needs were evaluated only after the student teachers had completed the Language Preparatory Program assuming that the program has raised their awareness on the effective use of the related strategies in their course requirements. Because this was a process evaluation, the learning needs were also identified during the implementation of the semi-structured interviews.

A second limitation is the lack of an external evaluator. Since the researcher herself is also the evaluator of the program, the credibility and objectivity of the study might be affected.

Data collector bias might be considered as another limitation of this study. Since the researcher work at the same department, learning the genuine opinions from the participants about the program might be difficult.

Finally, the present study has limited external validity since it was carried out in a specific context, which prevents generalization of the results to different contexts.

1. 7. Organization of the Study

The present study comprises five chapters. In the first chapter, a general introduction of the study in which the background information, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions addressed in the study, the overview of methodology (participants, setting, data collection instruments and data analysis), contribution of the study and limitations of the study are presented. The second chapter provides a detailed literature review organized under four main headings: theories of learning, syllabus design and curriculum development, program design and evaluation. The next chapter, Chapter III, gives information on the methodology focusing on the setting, participants, case study as a research design, data collection instruments and data analysis. As for Chapter IV, the findings in terms of the research questions are reported. Finally, in Chapter V, conclusions and discussions related to the findings followed by the implications, limitations and suggestions for further research are presented. At the end of the dissertation, references and appendices are provided.

1. 8. Definitions of Significant Terms

Evaluation: is a systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions (Lynch, 1996).

Evaluation of Need: tries to identify and measure the level of unmet needs within an organization or community (Gaber, 2000).

Evaluation of Process: involves checking on the assumptions made while the program was being planned (Posavac and Carey, 2003).

Evaluation of Outcome: becomes a focus of evaluation when program managers expect some behavioral changes in people (Posavac and Carey, 2003).

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): refers to the learning of a language, usually in a classroom setting, in a context where the target language is not widely used in the community (Lightbown and Spada, 2006).

English for Academic Purposes (EAP): is concerned with those communication skills in English which are required for study purposes in formal education system (Jordan, 1997).

Goals: are general statements about what must be accomplished in order to attain and specify students' needs (Brown, 1995).

Language Needs: are the target linguistic behaviors that the learners must ultimately acquire (Brown, 1995).

Learning Needs: refer to what the learner needs to do in order to learn. They show how the learner learns the language items. It refers to the skills that he or she uses (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987).

Method: is the presentation of language in learning setting (Ellis, 1990).

Materials: refer to any systematic description of the techniques and exercises to be used in classroom teaching (Brown, 1995).

Need: is defined as the difference between what a learner can presently do in a language and what he or she should be able to do (Ekici, 2003).

Needs Analysis: is defined here as a systematic set of procedures undertaken for the purpose of setting priorities and making decisions about program or organizational improvement and allocation of resources. It is a systematic process for documenting relevant needs (Reviere, Berkowitz, Carter and Ferguson, 1996).

Objectives: are precise statements about what content or skills the students must master in order to achieve a particular goal (Brown, 1995).

Program: is the image of a series of courses linked with some common goal or end product (Lynch, 1996).

Program Design: is a series of tasks that contribute to the growth of consensus among the staff, faculty, administration, and students (Brown, 1995).

Program Evaluation: is the identification, clarification, and application of defensible criteria to determine an evaluation object's value (worth or merit) in relation to those criteria (Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen, 2004).

Social Constructivist Approach: is based on a meaningful interaction between teachers, learners and tasks as a part of dynamic, ongoing learning process (Williams and Burden, 1997).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2. 1. Introduction

The review of literature for the present study is divided into four sections. First, theories of learning are described. Second, brief information on curriculum, syllabus and syllabus types, teaching program, and the relationship among the three is discussed. Third, research on approaches and models of program design including some recent studies is presented. Finally, program evaluation and its dimensions, the historical background of program evaluation and recent studies on program evaluation are explored in detail.

2. 2. Theories of Learning

The field of second (or foreign) language teaching has undergone many changes ranging from minor adjustments to complete paradigm shifts. Behaviorism attempts to explain learning in terms of some form of conditioning. All human behavior could be explained by Stimulus-Response (S-R) or classical conditioning. Skinner (1961) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) constructed a system of principles to account for human behavior in strictly observable terms. Learning is explained in terms of operant conditioning: an individual responds to a stimulus by behaving in a particular way. If the behavior is reinforced (e.g. rewarded or punished), the likelihood of the occurrence of that behavior will be decreased or increased.

According to behaviorism language development could be explained as follows: Teachers should make explicitly clear what is to be taught and break tasks down into small, sequential steps. Students should be encouraged to work at their own pace by means of individualized learning programs. Learning should be ‘programmed’ by incorporation of all these procedures, providing immediate positive reinforcement based on students’ achievement.

Researchers have criticized behaviorist theory on the grounds that behavioral instruction does not enhance meaningful learning and prevents learners from thinking critically, solving problems and/or making inferences. In addition, the dependence on imitation as a learning process has also been criticized. Therefore, the paradigm of teaching and learning has been shifted from a behaviorist to a constructivist theory of learning.

Constructivism places emphasis upon the ways in which individuals bring a sense of personal meaning to their worlds. Piaget (1970) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) has been the dominant figure in cognitive developmental psychology. Learning is a process of continually re-constructing knowledge based on past experiences. During the interaction with the environment, learners' experiences might be inconsistent with their constructed knowledge. If the processed information is consistent with a learner's pre-existent schema, it will be assimilated. Assimilation is the process by which incoming information is changed or modified in our minds so that we can fit it into what we already know. However, when the information is inconsistent with the learner's pre-existing schema it will be accommodated. Accommodation refers to the process by which we modify what we already know to take into account new information.

Bruner (1966) stresses the importance of the discovery approach to "learning how to learn" as the key to transferring what is learned from one situation to another. He also argues that learning in schools must have a purpose which should be included in any curriculum. This gave rise to the notion of spiral curriculum which has been extensively used in language syllabi.

Likewise, Kelly (1955) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) explains that each person's individual construction of the world depends upon his or her previous experiences. This personal-construct theory has profound implications for teachers during which learners are involved in an active process of making sense, of creating their own understanding of the world of language that surrounds them.

In summary, based on this view, teachers should focus both on the learners' existing knowledge and the experiences they come across. Cognitive development is the focus of the teaching environment, which assumes all learners are much the same without focusing on gender, class, race, social or cultural context (Koçoğlu, 2006).

Furthermore, two more major schools of thought have been introduced in literature: humanism and social constructivism. Humanistic approaches emphasize the significance of the inner world of the learner considering the individual's thoughts, feelings and emotions to be crucial for all human development. Erikson (1968) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) for example, claims that human psychological development depends on the way in which individuals pass through predetermined maturational stages set by society at particular times in their lives.

Maslow (1968) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) also argues for two distinct categories of needs, deficiency (or maintenance) needs, and being (or growth) needs. The former needs are related to a person's psychological or biological balance whereas the latter ones are relevant to the fulfillment of individual potential in terms of cognitive and aesthetic development, and the attainment of self-actualization. The process of learning involves both feelings and cognition.

According to Rogers (1969) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997), significant learning will only take place when the subject matter is perceived to be of personal relevance to the learner and when it involves active participation by the learner referred to as experiential learning.

Furthermore, social constructivism emphasizes the dynamic nature of the interplay between teachers, learners and tasks. Learning never takes place in isolation, but is the process of interactions with others. Vygotsky (1978) (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) emphasizes the significance of language in interacting with people. The concept of "zone of

proximal development” refers to the layer of skill or knowledge which is just beyond that with which the learner is capable of coping.

As indicated in the discussion above, the field of second (or foreign) language teaching is continually evolving and changing. For the purposes of the main study, the Social Constructivist Approach has been adopted supporting the view that learning does not occur in isolation, but rather it is a part of a dynamic, ongoing process among teachers, learners, tasks and contexts. Specifically, the learners are actively involved in the learning process whereas the course instructors are scaffolders who guide them during their learning.

Additionally, after graduation, most of the student teachers will work at schools approved by the Ministry of Education where the foreign language instruction is mostly based on Social Constructivism. The lesson plans including goals and objectives, materials, tasks and tests are usually prepared according this approach. Thus, this study was based on this particular approach to learning and teaching.

2. 3. From Syllabus Design to Curriculum Development

Institutional curricula and syllabi have been considered as the major units of second and foreign language programs, which can take various forms, can represent various theories, and can be realized in various ways. Syllabus design is one aspect of curriculum development but it is not identical with it. Although the terms syllabus and curriculum are sometimes used interchangeably, they have major differences in meaning.

Curriculum is the common term used by program designers including all the subject matters to teach, planned activities, related materials, goals, objectives, methods and evaluation procedures. On the other hand, syllabus involves the integration of subject matter (what to talk about) and linguistic matter (how to talk about it) (Küçük, 2008). Richards (2001, p.2) defines syllabus as ‘a specification of the content of a course of instruction, listing what will be taught and tested’ whereas curriculum development as ‘a more comprehensive

process comprising the processes that are used to determine the needs of a group of learners, develop aims or objectives for a program to address those needs, select an appropriate syllabus, course structure, teaching methods, and materials, and carry out an evaluation of the language program from these processes’.

Finally, Knight (2001, p.369) refers to curriculum as a set of purposeful, intended experiences with four parts: content, organization, learning and teaching methods. The curriculum focuses on the essential core of knowledge, understanding and skills learners must be taught and be able to use.

Designing a language syllabus will provide a practical basis both for the teachers and learners with respect to the division of assessment, textbooks, and learning time (Krahnke, 1987; Brown, 1995; Nunan, 2004).

There are different types of syllabi in the field of education which serve various purposes. Nunan (2004), for example, makes a distinction between two syllabus types, product-oriented syllabi and process-oriented syllabi. The former ones are those in which the main focus is to master the knowledge and skills as a result of instruction (e.g. grammatical and/or functional/notional syllabi), whereas the latter are those emphasizing the learning experiences themselves (e.g. task based and/or content based syllabuses).

Product-oriented syllabi can be divided into four; structural syllabus, situational syllabus, functional/ notional syllabus, and lexical syllabus.

A structural syllabus, also known as grammatical syllabus, is the most common syllabus, which involves grammatical forms sequenced from simple to complex (Krahnke, 1987; Brown, 1995; Rabbini, 2002). In other words, structures are graded according to grammatical complexity and internalized by learners before moving to the next item. The learner is expected to master each grammatical structure. The primary focus is on the outcome or the product at the end of the teaching and learning process. To illustrate, a

textbook might begin with the present tense, move on to the future tense, and then introduce past forms or present perfect.

A situational syllabus, on the other hand, is based on the idea that language is organized around different situations or contexts. The sequencing usually moves from situation to situation (e.g. ordering meal, meeting a new friend or seeing a doctor.) which takes these possible situations as a basis for selecting and presenting language content and reflects how the target language is used outside the classroom, in the real world (Far, 2008; Küçük, 2008).

Besides, a functional/notional syllabus focuses on the semantic uses of the language based on the perceived usefulness to the students. Functions can be described as communicative purposes for which we use language, while notions are the conceptual meanings expressed through language (Nunan, 2004). The functions are sequenced on the basis of chronology, frequency, or hierarchy of usefulness of the functions (e.g. greeting people, introducing someone or seeking information) whereas the notions are organized around abstract conceptual categories called general notions, which include concepts (e.g. distance, duration or quality).

Finally, the main focus of the lexical syllabus is vocabulary. High frequency vocabulary and phrases are analyzed in terms of the language in use and meaning. By taking into account vocabulary as a starting point, the most common meanings and patterns of English are identified (Krahnke, 1987; Brown, 1995; Küçük, 2008).

Apart from product-oriented syllabi, process-oriented syllabi focus on what students do during the process of instruction, not what they accomplish at the end of it (Küçük, 2008). Shortly, process-oriented syllabi shifted the concern of teaching from 'content' into 'process' of learning and 'procedures' of teaching (Shuja'a, 2005).

Process-oriented syllabi can be divided into three: procedural syllabus, learner-led syllabus and topic-based syllabus.

A procedural syllabus, also known as task-based syllabus, aims to provide learners with different purposeful tasks to perform in the language (Krahnke, 1987; Brown, 1995; Küçük, 2008; Nunan, 2004). It includes a series of complex and purposeful tasks that the students want or need to perform in the target language such as, writing a resume, reading job ads or making appointments.

A learner-led or learner-centered syllabus primarily emphasizes the learner. The learner is the core point of the syllabus who is expected to learn how to learn, develop his/her language skills and evaluate him/herself (Rabbini, 2002; Küçük, 2008).

Finally, a topic-based syllabus aims to teach some content or information using the language that the students are learning (Krahnke, 1987). A topic-based syllabus is basically practical and its focus is upon flexibility and spiral technique of language sequencing leading to the recycling of language (Far, 2008). An example might be a science class taught in the language the students need or want to learn, possibly with adjustments to make the science more comprehensible.

Parallel to Nunan (2004), Brown (1995) identifies one more syllabus type namely, the skills-based syllabus. A skills-based syllabus is based around the language or academic skills students mostly need in order to use and continue to learn the language. To exemplify, a reading course might include skills such as, skimming, scanning and making inferences.

Based on the discussion above, choosing between and among the various types of syllabi and integrating them in an actual teaching program requires an awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of each. The choice of the syllabus depends on the needs, interests and abilities of the target group. For the purposes of this study, an integrated approach to syllabus design was used. Specifically, a skills based and a structural syllabus were developed to meet the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs to raise their awareness in

terms of the language strategies and to provide them with the opportunity to practice them in meaningful contexts.

2. 4. Approaches and Models of Program Design

Program is an umbrella term that is generally defined as an organized and planned set of related activities directed towards a common purpose or goal (Küçük, 2008, p.17). By taking this point of view into consideration, Lynch (1996, p.2) describes a teaching program as a series of courses linked with a common goal or end product. The core of a good curriculum is a good teaching program. A good language teaching program should be consistent, efficient and effective to reach its aims and objectives. It should meet the needs of the learners and the teaching philosophy resulting in teaching methodologies changing accordingly as well as the changing definition of learning. There is a strict relationship between curriculum, syllabus and teaching program. They are all connected and integrated into each other.

One major source of problems observed in teaching programs is the mismatch between the properties of the given instruction and the characteristics, needs and wants of learners. As any language program tries to achieve a certain level of proficiency, the weaknesses of the general instructional setting will be observed both in the outcomes (product) and in the implementation (process) of the instruction. The design of language teaching programs is concerned with the selection, grading, and presentation of the target language forms via various teaching practices or techniques. To fill in this gap, recent research has emphasized the importance of identifying the student teachers' perceived language needs to design a Language Preparatory Program.

There are different approaches and models of program design by developing different frameworks (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Brown, 1995; Graves, 1996; Dolmans, Snellen-Ballendog, Wolfhagen, and Vleuten, 1997; Orkwis & McLane, 1998; Stein, Carnine and Dixon, 1998).

To begin, Dubin and Olshtain (1986, p.4) introduced a framework emphasizing the ‘fact finding stage’ based on the language setting, patterns of language use in society, group and individual attitudes, and political and national context. The following key questions were considered to be crucial before designing a program:

1. What elements, items, units, or themes of language content should be selected for inclusion in the syllabus?
2. In what order of sequence should the elements be presented in the syllabus?
3. What are the criteria for deciding on the order of elements in the syllabus?
4. How should language be presented to facilitate the acquisition process?
5. What should be the roles of teachers and learners in the learning process?
6. How should the materials contribute to the process of language learning in the classroom?
7. What knowledge is the learner expected to attain by the end of the course?
8. What understandings based on analyses of structures and lexis will learners have as an outcome of the course?
9. What specific language skills do learners need in their immediate future, or in their professional lives? How will these skills be presented in the syllabus?
10. What techniques of evaluation or examination in the target language will be used to assess course outcomes?

Another framework was suggested by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) comprising three main approaches to program design were: the language-centered approach as the simplest type of program design, aims to draw a direct connection between the analysis of target situation and the content of the course. The next program design, skills-centered approach emphasizes the development of language skills and strategies which will help the learner continue to develop after the program itself. Finally, the learning-centered approach to program design focuses on the learner at every stage during the dynamic process which does not move in a linear order. Needs and resources vary across time, and these changes are reflected in the program.

Additionally, Brown (1995) focused on the following steps to be applied during the design of the program:

1. Needs analysis
2. Specifying Goals and Objectives of the Program
3. Development of Tests on the Basis of Program's Goals and Objectives
4. Developing Materials
5. Language Teaching
6. Program Evaluation

2. 4. 1. Needs Analysis

Needs analysis is the door opening to the whole program planning process as it is the first step to be taken in the design and development of any educational program. As the learner has come to be perceived in the core of the language teaching and learning process, the primary focus of any language program ought to be to identify the language needs of the learner.

Altschuld and Witkin (1995, p.20) define needs analysis as “a set of systematic procedures pursued in order to establish priorities based on identified needs, and make decisions attempting improvement of a program and allocation of resources.” Similarly, Brown (1995, p.36) explains needs analysis in language programs as “identification of the language forms that the students will likely need to use in the target language when they are required to actually understand and produce the language.” Similarly, Reviere, Berkowitz, Carter and Ferguson (1996, p.5) refer to needs analysis as “a systematic process of collecting and analyzing data with the goal of identifying the areas where the people concerned are lacking compared to the generally accepted standards”. According to Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004, p.3), needs analysis is “the means by which an evaluator determines whether there is a need for a program, and if so, what program services are most appropriate to that end.” This task involves constructing a precise definition of the problem, assessing its extent, defining and identifying the targets of the interventions, and accurately describing the nature of the service needs of that population. Finally, Sysoyev (2000, p.13) describes needs analysis as, “having the aim of bringing together the required and desired needs, and of determining goals and objectives to conceptualize the content of the course.”

Based on the discussion above, the procedure of needs analysis should be executed systematically and deliberately based on a meaningful purpose of identifying the deficiencies with respect to the needs and preferences of the target learner and providing effective and efficient means for meeting the identified needs.

2. 4. 1. 1. Types of Needs

Among the various types of needs which have been mentioned in the literature, target and learning needs (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997; Nunan, 2004), objective and subjective needs (Brown, 1995; Jordan, 1997), situational and communicative needs (Richards, 2001), and situation and language needs (Brown, 1995) are among the most common terms which have been mentioned in the literature.

The main distinction between the target needs and learning needs is that target needs are what the learners need in order to function successfully in the target situation, whereas the learning needs are what the learners need to do in order to meet the target needs (Çelik, 2003, p.23).

Brown (1995, p.40) differentiates between objective and subjective needs. While objective needs are those determined in terms of clean-cut, observable data gathered about the situation, the learners, the language that students must eventually acquire, their present proficiency and skills level, subjective needs are hard to determine due to the fact that they have to do with “wants”, “desires” and “expectations”. According to Graves (1996, p.179) assessing subjective needs requires information about the following components: students’ attitudes towards the target language and culture, towards learning and towards themselves as learners, their expectations of themselves and the underlying purposes.

A further distinction of needs was also made by Brown (1995) who identified situation and language needs. Situation needs are related to the physical, social and psychological contexts in which learning takes place, whereas language needs are the target linguistic behaviors including details about the circumstances in which the language will be used, the dimensions of language competence involved, the learners’ reasons for studying the language and their present abilities with respect to those reasons.

Communicative and situational needs are among the other classifications considering the types of needs (Richards, 2001). The former types of needs emphasize the general parameters of a language program involving the goals, learning styles, proficiency levels of learners, as well as teachers' expectations, teaching styles and techniques. The latter types of needs are related to the context in which the learners will use the target language, the learners' role in relationships in the target situation, the four language skills, the learners' future interactions and language tasks, and the level of language proficiency that is required in the specific context.

For the purposes of the present study two types of needs have been investigated. For the first part of the study, the student teachers' perceived language needs are identified to design a Language Preparatory Program at the Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching at Yeditepe University. Since the participants in this study are going to become English teachers, their target linguistic behaviors in terms of the four language skills and strategies are investigated. As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, the student teachers' perceived language needs and their assumed learning needs are determined to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the two types of needs effectively after the implementation of the program.

2. 4. 2. Specifying Goals and Objectives of the Program

Determining the needs of a group of language learners is also based on the specification of goals and objectives identified as the next step of curriculum design and development. According to Brown (1995, p.21) goals are general statements about what must be accomplished in order to attain and specify students' needs whereas objectives are precise statements about what content or skills the students must master in order to achieve a particular goal.

The process of identifying the objectives and thinking about what is involved in attaining the program goals will lead to analyzing, synthesizing and clarifying the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the students' language needs. Although the difference between the two terms is not always clear, the distinction will lead to more effective and precise planning and maintaining of a language program.

2. 4. 3. Development of Tests on the Basis of Program's Goals and Objectives

Another step in curriculum design and development is the identification of tests in relation to a program's goals and objectives. This is one of the most difficult steps since the goals and objectives of a program may require extensive test development for different purposes within a program such as, placement of students, language proficiency testing, diagnostic testing and achievement testing (Brown, 1995, p.22). Thus, tests should be thoroughly developed to unify a curriculum and give it a sense of cohesion, purpose and control.

2. 4. 4. Developing Materials

Brown (1995, p.139) defines materials as, "any systematic description of the techniques and exercises to be used in classroom teaching". Adopted, developed, or adapted materials for a program should be well defined in terms of needs analyses, objectives, tests and teaching based on the decisions of the individuals who are on site and know the situation best. Richards and Rogers (2001) argue that the materials specify subject-matter content including the intensity of coverage for syllabus items, the amount of time, attention and particular syllabus items or tasks required. According to Wulf and Schave (1984) (as cited in Brown, 1995), the primary consideration in developing materials is to select the best possible strategy and medium that will most effectively present the lesson. In the case of materials, evaluation should be done carefully primarily because attractive material may be creative and

fun, but if it does not help the students to achieve an objective, it should be replaced. Finally, program evaluation will be all related to each other and to the materials.

2. 4. 5. Language Teaching

The teacher is the only person responsible for making judgments about the particular student in the class, which are related to the cognitive, affective and personal variables (Brown, 1995, p.23). Teaching is the process that includes only those activities (techniques and exercises) rationally selected by the teacher to help students achieve learning. These activities must be related to the objectives set up in the program, and the overall approaches and syllabi that motivate and organize the curriculum (p.179). To accomplish this complexity of demanding tasks including, needs analyses, setting objectives, creating tests, adopting, developing and adapting materials, teachers should be supported in their jobs.

Richards and Rogers (2001) stress the importance of developing a design for an instructional system that focuses on the objectives defined according to the method used, the syllabus including the selection and organization of language content within the particular method, the types of learning tasks and teaching activities parallel to the method, the role of the teachers, students and instructional materials.

The specification of particular learning objectives is related to the method that is going to be used in the program. The objectives of a method are attained through the interaction among the teachers, learners and materials. Learners' contribution to the learning process is related to the types of activities, the degree of control learners have over the content of learning and the view of the learner as processor, performer, initiator or problem solver. As for the teacher's roles, they are closely related to methods applied and their realization. The role of the teacher will reflect the objectives of the method and the learning theory applied in a program.

2. 4. 6. *Program Evaluation*

From various discussions on the effectiveness of different teaching methods to the debates about particular programs, evaluation has typically been recognized as a crucial area of second/foreign language education to measure whether the program is functioning as it was planned. According to Lynch (1996, p.2) program evaluation is “the systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions.” Brown (1995, p. 218) describes program evaluation as “the systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary to promote the improvement of a program and evaluate its effectiveness within the context of the particular institutions involved.” Although this definition seems similar to that given for needs analysis, there is a difference. While a needs analysis is typically conducted in the initial stages of curriculum development relying on interview procedures, questionnaires, linguistic analyses, conjecture and a good deal of professional judgment, evaluation can take advantage of all these to assess the effectiveness of a program, but can also utilize the information gathered during developing objectives, writing and using the tests, adopting, developing and adapting materials, and teaching. Worthen (1990, p.42) defines program evaluation as “the determination of the worth of a thing consisting those activities undertaken to judge the worth or utility of a program (or alternative programs) in improving some specified aspect of an educational system.” In addition, Posavac and Carey (2003, p. 2) view program evaluation as “a collection of methods, skills and sensitivities necessary to determine whether a human service is needed and likely to be used, whether the service is sufficiently intensive to meet the unmet needs identified, whether the service is offered as planned, and whether the service actually does help people in need at a reasonable cost without unacceptable side effects.” Finally, Gaies (1992, p.14) refers to program evaluation as “the systematic collection of information about the effectiveness of the various components of a program based on two goals: an internal goal, with the focus on student learning (outcomes) and as a means for indicating desirable or

needed curricular change, and an external goal, which intends to demonstrate the accountability of an institution and of the program within an institution to the larger public: taxpayers, funding agencies, professional accreditation and all other stakeholders.”

Parallel to Brown’s (1995) framework, Graves (1996, p.13) identified the following components and the related questions to be asked before designing a program:

Needs Assessment: What are my students’ needs? How can I assess them so that I can address them?

Determining goals and objectives: What are the purposes and intended outcomes of the course? What will my students need to do or learn to achieve these goals?

Conceptualizing content: What will be the backbone of what I teach? What will I include in my syllabus?

Selecting and developing materials and activities: How and with what will I teach the course? What is my role? What are my students’ roles?

Organization of content and activities: How will I organize the content and activities? What systems will I develop?

Evaluation: How will I assess what students have learned? How will I assess the effectiveness of the course?

Consideration of resources and constraints: What are the givens of my situation?

Dolmans, Snellen-Ballendog, Wolfhagen and Vleuten (1997, pp.185-189) reported seven fundamental concepts for effective program design:

Prior Knowledge: Learners actively construct explanatory models based on their prior knowledge, which aids in the processing and comprehension of new information.

Elaboration: New information is better understood and recalled if students are stimulated to elaborate on it by discussion, answering questions, asking critical questions and giving explanations.

Relevant Context: If the context in which the information is applied is closely related to the context the information is learned, information is better recalled because it is stored within the same cognitive structures.

Integration of Knowledge: The integration of knowledge results in better diagnostic student performance.

Self-directed Learning: Curricula should prepare students to become independent, self-directed, lifelong learners personally deciding themselves what is relevant for their learning.

Interest in the Subject Matter: Learning should be more intrinsically interesting to have positive influence on student performance.

Faculty Objectives: A case should be designed to match the objectives stated by the faculty to lead to the intended outcomes.

Furthermore, Orkwis and McLane (1998, pp.17-20) summarized the following salient principles to help teachers and other interested individuals consider how the tools employed in the classroom can realistically provide broader access to the program for all students.

Provide Flexible Means of Representation: There is no single method for the presentation that will provide equal access for all learners. Rather there should be alternatives that reduce perceptual (e.g., text, audio and image/graphic) and cognitive (e.g., big ideas which refer to students' background knowledge to solve different problems) barriers.

Provide Flexible Means of Expression: There is no single method of expression that will provide equal opportunity for all students due to the individual differences. Flexible alternatives for expression should be introduced to reduce motor (e.g., writing and drawing/illustration) and cognitive (e.g., explicit strategies and scaffolding) barriers.

Provide Flexible Means of Engagement: There is no single way to ensure that all children are engaged in a learning environment because of the individual differences in emotional constitution, background, culture, developmental experience, or neurological characteristics which can lead to different patterns of motivation and affect for different children. A curriculum should provide flexible alternatives with in accordance with support and challenge, novelty and familiarity, developmental and cultural interest, and flexible curricular materials.

Finally, Stein, Carnine and Dixon (1998, pp.229-231) emphasized the following five components of program design:

Identify “big ideas” to organize content: It refers to students’ ability to use their background knowledge to solve different problems or build foundations for later learning. Organizing instruction using “big ideas” makes it possible for program designers to reduce the memory load for students and to promote more conceptual understanding.

Teach explicit, generalizable strategies: According to this principle not all content can be introduced through the use of strategies that should be generalizable, and applied to a broad range of problem types.

Scaffold instruction: As for this principle, while students are learning new strategies, both teachers and program designers provide support during the process.

Integrate skills and concepts: This principle emphasize the importance of a careful integration of important skills. By integration of knowledge and skills students learn when to apply what they have learned, and also it provides them with a chance to examine the correlation between various concepts.

Provide adequate review: Considering this principle, the value of the review depends on the quality of instruction. The review should be sufficient, cumulative and varied.

2.5. Studies on Program Design

2. 5.1. *Program Design Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education Abroad*

When the literature is reviewed in relation to program design, it can be seen that a number of studies attempted to identify students' needs in order to design or redesign various educational programs (Baştürkmen and Al-Huneidi, 1996; Chia, Johnson, Chian and Olive, 1999; Edwards, 2000; Chan, 2001; Kittidhaworn, 2001; Lepetit and Cichocki, 2002).

Baştürkmen and Al-Huneidi (1996) for example, attempted to design a program based on the communicative language needs of the students in the College of Petroleum Engineering at Kuwait University. Data came from 210 questionnaires received from students registered in different English courses of distinct specialist areas of Engineering, and 65 faculty members and teaching assistants. Observations and examinations of students' materials and samples were used to triangulate the data. The findings of the study revealed that there was a gap between the perceptions of the students and faculty members in terms of the importance of the four language skills. Students considered listening to be the most difficult skill whereas the faculty made no distinctions among the four language skills. As a result, a new program was developed for the prospective students.

A similar study was done by Chia, Johnson, Chian and Olive (1999) where the perceptions of the medical students and the faculty members about English language needs were identified to propose a course design. A questionnaire about the importance of the four language skills and the duration of the program was administered to 349 medical students and 20 faculty members at Chung Shan Medical College in Taichung, Taiwan. According to the findings, the two groups of participants perceived English important for following academic studies and future work. Listening skill was particularly considered to be the most significant skill to improve. As for the duration of the program, more than one year of English language study was desired both by the students and the faculty members.

In another study, Edwards (2000) developed an ESP program based on the needs of the German bankers in terms of the four language skills. An interview was conducted with the director of the bank's language department, and a questionnaire was given to the participants of the course to find out the institutional and personal objectives. According to the results of the study, writing and specialist vocabulary were considered crucial for professional development in banking and thus, should be thoroughly integrated in the program.

Chan (2001) tried to identify the language needs of the students at Hong Kong Polytechnic University with the primary concern to design an English program. A survey was given to 701 tertiary learners and 47 English instructors in order to compare their needs, and ratings of their competence in academic and professional domains. Consequently, there was a match between the responses of the two groups. For academic studies, activities such as, reading magazines and periodicals, and speaking at seminars and meetings were considered to be important. As for the future profession, listening and speaking at conferences, and listening on the telephone were rated to be important. The post-questionnaire interviews confirmed those findings.

On the other hand, several problems including thinking in Cantonese, the lack of opportunity to speak English, their lack of confidence when speaking English, weak vocabulary development (e.g. technical English), and difficulty in getting their meaning across to the listener were identified to constrain students' learning in English.

In a similar fashion, Kittidhaworn (2001) conducted a study with 182 second-year Thai undergraduate engineering students in a public university in Thailand to suggest a program parallel to their language needs. Data were collected from a two-part self-assessment questionnaire constructed in relation to the previous research on the English-language needs of the students learning English as a second or foreign language for academic purposes particularly in the field of Science and Technology. The first part of the questionnaire aimed

to gather demographic information whereas the second part included items of English-language needs in four major areas: Language Structures, Rhetorical Categories, Language Functions, and Language Skills. The results of this study revealed that the students perceived the language needs on the four major areas listed in the questionnaire to be moderately important or very important to learn in their second year English program in engineering.

Finally, Lepetit and Cichocki (2002) examined the students' language needs to design the language courses in the Department of Public Health Sciences at Clemson University. A questionnaire including 30 closed questions and one-open ended question was administered to 165 students who were preparing to work as health professionals. The closed questions contained 17 multiple-choice questions which aimed to gather general information about the population, and 13 Likert-scale type items related to the specific areas of the participants' language needs. According to the findings of the study, oral skills were identified among the most important needs by the students while written communicative skills received the second priority. The lowest score among the all needs variables was related to the literature content in language classes. Based on the results obtained through this study, the language courses were designed in detail.

2. 5. 2. Program Design Studies on Foreign Language Education in Turkey

Parallel to the research carried out abroad, program design studies have been conducted considering the foreign language education programs in Turkey as well (Daylan, 2001; Çelik, 2003; Ekici, 2003; Mutlu, 2004; Örs, 2006; Payam and Sarıçoban, 2006; Tavil, 2006; Yılmaz, 2009; Akyel and Özek, 2010).

To begin, Daylan (2001) aimed to design a program for the Basic English Classes in the preparatory school at Abant İzzet Baysal University. 70 students, 10 teachers of English and 4 subject tutors were asked their opinions to identify the students' language needs. Data were collected via questionnaires from the students and the teachers of English, and a

structured interview from the subject tutors. Based on the needs analysis results, the most important purposes for learning English were “for future success in their career” and “to read materials related to the field of study.” As for the learning strategies, continuity and consistency between the preparatory program and freshmen courses were considered necessary. Learning in the classroom and regular study were regarded as crucial. Finally, the participants stressed the importance of the need for using different teaching methods and giving more emphasis of four language skills as well as academic skills. Based on these findings, the Basic English Classes in the preparatory school were designed.

Çelik (2003) represented an effort to develop the program in the office management and secretarial studies departments of Niğde University’s vocational colleges according to the English language needs of the students. Four different questionnaires were administered to 196 currently enrolled students, 39 former students, 35 content teachers, and 32 employers which aimed to find out the academic and occupational English language needs of office management and secretary students. The results of the study revealed a need for a new curriculum for the vocational English course to meet students’ target needs along with their learning needs. The new course curriculum should particularly focus more on improving students’ reading and speaking skills by using content-related reading materials from the Internet.

In another study, Ekici (2003) attempted to design a program by examining the perceptions of the language needs, learning needs and attitudes of the Tour Guidance students of Faculty of Applied Sciences at Başkent University. An attitude scale and a needs assessment questionnaire were administered to 23 freshman and 22 sophomore students, 3 English instructors, and 2 curriculum coordinators for Tour Guidance. On the basis of the obtained data, it was suggested that speaking, listening and specialist vocabulary should receive more emphasis in order to fulfill the ESP needs of Tour Guidance students. Designing skills based syllabus as primary, and applying situational and content approaches

to syllabus design as subordinate was considered to be effective as well. Lastly, using instructional materials appealing to the sub dimensions of the students' attitudes was another suggestion offered in the study.

Mutlu (2004) aimed to develop the English-Turkish Translation course by identifying the language needs of the third year Management students at the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Başkent University. The data collection instruments were a needs analysis questionnaire administered to 53 students, and structured interviews conducted with 6 course instructors, 16 departmental instructors, 10 graduates and 10 professionals. The study concluded that, translation from English into Turkish was perceived to be crucial to enhance the students' knowledge in the translation skill and raise their competence in the foreign language, mainly in vocabulary knowledge, reading comprehension and writing skills.

Besides, Örs (2006) designed a formal syllabus for the School of Foreign Languages at the University of Gaziantep according to the language needs of the preparatory students. A questionnaire was administered to 146 students from three different proficiency levels to find out whether there were significant differences between the levels of the students and their beliefs. The study also focused on the importance given by the students to learning English, materials used during courses, their beliefs about language skills and strategies, and their views on testing and evaluation procedures applied in the current program. The results reported that there were significant differences between students' beliefs about the program and their proficiency levels. The majority of students believed that the program was not sufficient to meet their future needs in terms of learning and teaching. In addition, materials used at the preparatory program were not considered to be interesting. A strong need for terminology with respect to the students' field of study was considered to be important as well. Finally, students complained that they were not placed at the correct levels, and thus, a new placement system was needed for the program.

In another study, Payam and Sariçoban (2006) made a descriptive analysis of the target communicative and academic needs of the students at the Police College in Ankara which served as main guides to design the preparatory program. The related data were gathered from three different groups: 151 Police College preparatory students, 14 English language teachers and 35 graduates. A questionnaire including 8 sections and a total of 115 items related to both communicative and academic needs was administered. According to the findings of the study, the preparatory program focused on the improvement of the four language skills. Particularly, speaking and vocabulary were perceived as the most needed components to be emphasized in the program. Finally, the program integrated tasks emphasizing the improvement of the general and academic skills.

Tavil (2006) aimed to design a reading syllabus that will meet the students' needs at Hacettepe University English Preparatory School. A questionnaire on the application of the reading strategies in given tasks was administered to 300 students. The findings of the study revealed that the students needed practice related to the application of the reading strategies, summarizing, taking notes, making inferences, scanning or skimming in their assignments. The participants also stated that they experienced comprehension difficulties due to the lack of vocabulary knowledge. Thus, the students should be engaged in tasks that would particularly focus on development of '*guessing meaning from context*' during the reading course.

Yılmaz (2009) conducted a study considering the important steps to be followed in the design of the voluntary preparatory classes at Gaziosmanpaşa (GOP) University. Four groups participated in the study. The first group was made of 40 current students at the preparatory class at the university. The second group consisted of 81 former students who graduated from the program. The third group was composed of 7 EFL teachers teaching at the preparatory classes. Lastly, the director of the program was also included in the study. Questionnaires and structured interviews were used as data collection instruments to identify the language needs

of the prospective students. The results of the study indicated that the students were generally satisfied with the program and felt that it generally met their language needs. As for the important steps to be followed while designing the voluntary preparatory classes, the participating groups stated that the first step should be to set clear-cut objectives for the preparatory students, and plan and organize the courses accordingly. As a second step, students' needs and interests should be taken into consideration in order to develop a learner-centered curriculum. Lastly, before students start the program, they should know what the goals and objectives of the program are in order to make informed decisions about their participation, the method and the materials.

Finally, the primary purpose of the study carried out by Akyel and Özek (2010) was to develop a program for the Language Preparatory School (YADYOK) at Boğazici University parallel to the students' needs associated with the four language skills and strategies. Questionnaires were administered to 2328 students and 125 instructors. Besides, semi-structured interviews were incorporated to collect data. The results indicated a difference between the perceptions of the students and instructors regarding the importance of the performance on the four language skills and difficulty of using the strategies related to the four language skills effectively. Specifically, while the students stated that speaking was the most important skill to be developed, teachers believed that reading should be highly emphasized in the program. There was also a discrepancy between the responses of the participants in relation to the application of language strategies in the given tasks. For instance, while the student teachers stated that they had difficulties while asking relevant questions in class, the course instructors reported that they experienced problems while preparing oral presentations. According to these findings, the preparatory program was designed and started to be implemented.

2. 6. Historical Background of Program Evaluation

The focus of program evaluation in applied linguistics was mostly based on summative, productive evaluations in the 1960s and 1970s. As defined previously, summative evaluation is designed to determine whether the program has been successful or not. Likewise, product-oriented refers to an evaluation that investigates the outcomes of a program such as, end-of-the-year student achievement scores or questionnaire responses. This approach to program evaluation is related to the positivistic (quantitative) paradigm which asserts that reality is objective, facts must be separated from values and the researcher should remain detached and distant from the phenomenon studies (Lynch, 1996).

One of the first evaluations emphasized the effectiveness of the use of the language laboratory in the public schools, which was widely used as a component in language teaching programs. Keating (1963) (as cited in Lynch, 1996) compared students' performance using standardized tests of reading, listening and speaking both in laboratory and nonlaboratory settings. According to the findings, the nonlaboratory students achieved higher end-of-year scores than the laboratory students. However, these results were quite controversial. There was no control of all variables particularly in relation to what was happening in the classroom. Thus, the study cannot be considered as a true experimental study.

Furthermore, Scherer and Wetheimer (1962) (as cited in Lynch, 1996) conducted another evaluation study known as the Colorado Project that compared the two methods, the audio-lingual method and the traditional grammar-translation method. The project was a rigidly controlled large-scale experiment aimed to draw some definite scientific conclusions about the relative merits of the two methods. The participants were students learning German according to these two methods in terms of the four language skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing). Data came from standardized tests constructed by the teaching staff. The speaking and listening measures were constructed by the experimental (audio-lingual method) teachers while the reading and writing measures were designed by the control

(traditional method) teachers. The results indicated that the experimental group was better at speaking and listening whereas the control group was better at translating, reading and writing. Nevertheless, the project received criticisms parallel to Keating's study in terms of the relatively small sample size, the creation of special speaking materials and its investigation of only one language.

Furthermore, the evaluation of language teaching methodologies moved towards tightly controlled experiments with the Pennsylvania Project (Smith, 1970) (as cited in Lynch, 1996). The study was a two-year experiment and a two-year follow-up study with the primary aim to avoid the lack of experimental control of most of the previous studies. Random sampling was used with 3,500 secondary school students from major urban centers in Pennsylvania. The effectiveness of three teaching methods: the traditional method (TLM), the audiolingual method (referred to as the functional skills method or FSM) and a method that combined functional skills with grammar (FSG) was investigated. The study also examined the effect of the language laboratory at three levels: a tape recorder in the classroom, a listen-respond language lab, and a listen-respond-compare language lab. During the study, the TLM group did not receive any of the language lab treatments.

According to the results of this project, the traditional method (TLM) was the same as or superior to the audio-lingual methods (FSM, FSG) on all measures. In addition, the language laboratory system had no effect on achievement (including speaking test scores) and there was no meaningful interaction between the teaching method and the language laboratory system. Shortly, student attitudes were independent of the teaching method, and the initial attitude was not related to later achievement.

At the end of the second year, there was no significant difference between teaching method groups except that the TLM group was only superior on the reading achievement test. The language laboratory system still had no effect on the achievement and the student attitudes towards foreign language learning.

At the end of the third year of the study, the TLM group was equal or superior to the FSM or FSG groups on the listening and reading performances. Finally, at the end of the fourth year, there was no significant difference between the method groups.

Although this was a longitudinal study, the main criticism was related to the inappropriate test instruments used to investigate the differences between the teaching methods (Valette, 1969) (as cited in Lynch, 1996). To put it more simply, the achievement tests were too difficult for the students being tested at the end of the first year. The reading test was extremely biased in favor of the traditional group (TLM). Lastly, the critics asked for more focus on what was happening in the classroom rather than just on student achievement.

Levin (1972) (as cited in Lynch, 1996) conducted a tightly controlled, small-scale program evaluation known as the GUME (Göteborg Undervisnings Method i Engleska; or Göteborg English Teaching Method) to assess the relative merits of different approaches to teaching grammatical structures in English as a foreign language. However, this strict control limited the ability to generalize to other classrooms. The project was also criticized for its only focus on product or outcome excluding the process of how the program carried out.

A decade after the GUME project, Jacobson (1982) (as cited in Lynch, 1996) suggested the use of other approaches to program evaluation such as, needs assessment, implementation evaluation and formative evaluation that would examine the process of language teaching programs as well. Beretta and Davies (1985), for example, reported on an evaluation of the Bangalore/Madras Communicational Teaching Project (CTP), which compared the CTP students to students receiving normal instruction referred to as “structural”. The two groups were compared in terms of three types of achievement tests: one designed to measure structure, one designed as a CTP task-based test and one set of tests designed to measure general proficiency. The study employed a quasi-experimental design which was product-oriented and summative in nature.

The results of the study revealed that, there was no significant difference between the groups. In other words, the structural group did better on the structural test whereas the CTP group did better on the CTP task-based test. Nevertheless, the lack of experimental control and no systematic effort to evaluate what was actually happening in the classroom, and the possible bias of the test instruments designed by the research staff were among the main criticisms of the study.

Finally, the Jet-In, Jet-Out (JIJOE) project conducted by Alderson and Scott (1992) (as cited in Lynch, 1996) included people from all levels of the program in the active planning and execution of evaluation. The study relied primarily on naturalistic evaluation. Data came from questionnaires, interviews, reports on call discussions and statistics on the use of the language center. However, the major focus was only on process ignoring the importance of outcome evaluation which was considered as the weakness of this study.

Based on the discussion above, the history of program evaluation has moved away from a tightly controlled experiment with the primary emphasis on the analysis of product or student achievement, to a concern for describing and analyzing the process of program which has encouraged the use of naturalistic methods. According to Lynch (1996), the combination of methods from the two paradigms should be established to achieve internal and external validity for program evaluation.

2. 7. Approaches and Models of Program Evaluation

There are various program evaluation approaches and models with different functions, purposes or roles for program evaluation (Worthen, 1990; Brown, 1995; Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen, 2004; Priest, 2001; Posavac and Carey, 2003; Owen, 2007; Visser, 2006).

Worthen (1990) introduced the following five approaches to program evaluation:

1. *Performance-Objectives Congruence Approaches*: This approach, originally formulated by Tyler (1949) views evaluation as the process of determining the extent to which the educational objectives of a school program or curriculum are actually being attained. Broad goals or objectives should be established or identified and relevant student behaviors should be measured using either standardized or evaluator-constructed instruments. The outcome data should be used to determine whether the performance was congruent with expectations. Discrepancies between performance and objectives would result in modifications, and the evaluation cycle would be repeated.

The approach was adapted by many program evaluators and had great influence on subsequent evaluation theorists. Hammond's (1973) EPIC evaluation model and Provus' (1971) discrepancy model of program evaluation were considered to be Tylerian.

2. *Decision-Management Approaches*: In this approach, the decision to be made by program managers is fundamental. The evaluator works closely with the program manager and the evaluation becomes an explicitly shared function on good teamwork between evaluators and decision makers. The objectives are clearly defined and the decision is made by the program managers. Stufflebeam's (2002) Context, Input, Process and Product evaluation model and Alkin's (1969) Center for the Study of Evaluation model have made the most important contributions to a decision-oriented approach to program evaluation. In both of these models, evaluation depends on a good teamwork between evaluators and decision makers.

3. *Judgment-Oriented Approaches*: The major concern of this approach to evaluation is to yield judgments about a program being observed. The experts would observe the program in action, examine its products and gain sufficient information to make judgments about the program. Stake's (1967) Countenance Model emphasized the judgment phase standards and procedures for making judgmental statements should be explicated to ensure

the publicness of evaluative statements. Site visits done by funding agencies to evaluate programs and visits by accrediting agencies to secondary schools or universities can be other examples to judgment-oriented approach.

4. *Adversarial Approaches*: The rubric of this approach includes a collection of divergent evaluation practices which might be referred as being adversarial in nature. The term refers to all evaluations in which there is planned opposition in the points of view of different evaluation teams. While one evaluator would serve as the program advocate, presenting the most positive points, the other one would play an adversarial role, indicating the deficiencies in the program. These kind of adversarial proceedings were mostly invoked as models for anniversary evaluations in education, comprising judicial, congressional hearings and debate models.

5. *Pluralist-Intuitionist Approaches*: In this approach to evaluation, the evaluator focuses on the values and needs of all individuals and groups served by the program. Weighing and balancing judgments and criteria in a largely intuitive fashion is considered to be crucial. Stake's (1975b), Parlett and Hamilton's (1976), Rippey (1973), and MacDonald's (1976) democratic evaluation might be shown as examples of pluralist-intuitionist evaluation.

Likewise, Brown (1995) reported the following four approaches in the educational literature for performing program evaluation:

1. *Product-Oriented Approaches*: The primary focus is on the goals and instructional objectives aiming to determine whether they have been achieved. Tyler (1949) and Hammond (1973) were the primary advocates of this approach.

2. *Static-Characteristic Approaches*: This type of evaluation is performed to determine the effectiveness of a particular program. It is conducted by outside experts who inspect a program by analyzing different accounting and academic records, and static characteristics such as the number of library books, types of degrees held by the faculty, the student to teacher ratio the number and seating capacities of classrooms etc.

3. *Process-Oriented Approaches*: The main emphasis is on the ongoing process of a program. Scriven (1967) and Stake (1967) were the two important figures of this approach claiming that evaluators engage both in descriptive and judgmental activities. To accomplish this, a transaction component to evaluation that is dynamic rather than static is suggested.

4. *Decision-Facilitation Approaches*: According to this approach, the most important function of evaluation is to help in making decisions. Making judgments is often avoided. Instead, gathering information that will help the administrators and the faculty members make their own decisions in the programs. Examples are the Context (rationale for objective), Input (utilization of resources for achieving objectives), Process (periodic feedback to decision makers), and Product (measurement and interpretation of attainment during and at the end of a program) (CIPP), Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA (CSE) and Discrepancy models of evaluation.

Worthen, Sanders and Fitzpatrick (1997) identified the following six approaches to program evaluation:

1. *Objectives-Oriented Evaluation Approach*: This evaluation approach focuses on specifying goals and objectives, and to the extent to which they have been attained. Tyler's (1949) behavioral objectives model can be shown as an example under this approach.

2. *Management-Oriented Evaluation Approach*: The key point of this approach is to meet the informational needs of managerial decision-makers in education such as, administrators, policymakers and teacher by providing them evaluative information. Stufflebeam's (2002) CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model is an example of this approach used internal evaluations conducted by organizations, self-evaluations carried with by individual service providers, and contracted external evaluations.

3. *Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approach*: Developing evaluative information on educational "products" to assist decisions about educational purchases and adoptions is the primary concern of this approach. The emphasis is on the cost of the program and the data

gathered and evaluated accordingly. This model is commonly used by government agencies and consumer advocates who compile information to evaluate a product's effectiveness. Scriven's (1967) was a pioneer in applying this model, distinguishing between the formative and summative roles of evaluation.

4. *Expertise-Oriented Evaluation Approach*: This approach is the oldest and most-widely used evaluation approach based on professional expertise to judge a teaching program, product or activity and their quality. Doctoral exams and board reviews are usually evaluated in this model. The review process can be formal or informal. According to Worthen, Sanders and Fitzpatrick (1997, p.121), a formal review system comprises the following components: (a) a structure or organization established to conduct periodic reviews, (b) published standards, (c) a pre-specified review schedule, (d) a combination of several experts to judge overall value and (e) an impact depending on the outcome of the evaluation". Any other evaluation lacking one of these five components is considered as an informal review system.

5. *Adversary-Oriented Evaluation Approach*: The evaluation in this approach utilizes a judicial process in examining a program. The primary focus is to obtain results through the examination of opposing views. The pros and cons of an issue are examined by two separate teams who take part in a debate to defend their positions and reach a consensus. This model includes a hearing, defense, jury, charges and rebuttals (Hogan, 2007).

6. *Participant-Oriented Evaluation Approach*: This approach stresses the importance of firsthand experience and the participant involvement in the data collection and evaluation process. The required criteria, values, needs and data for evaluation are specified by the naturalistic inquiry and the involvement of stakeholders. This approach allows the evaluator to engage with the stakeholder as a partner in the problem solving process. As an example, Stake's (1967) countenance and responsive models can be given.

Furthermore, Visser (2006) introduced four different approaches of evaluation namely, Traditional Evaluation (TE), Stakeholder Based Evaluation (SBE), Empowerment Evaluation (EE), and Self Assessment (SA). Table 2.1. illustrates the comparison of the four evaluation approaches.

Table 2.1.

Comparison of different evaluation approaches (Visser, 2006)

	Traditional Evaluation (TE)	Stakeholder Based Evaluation (SBE)	Empowerment Evaluation (EE)	Self Assessment (SA)
Stakeholders' influence	None	In design and reporting only	Throughout	Throughout
Extent of evaluators' control	Complete	Majority	Shared with stakeholders	None
Image(s) of evaluators	Doctor, scientist, professor	Chief executive, policy maker	Mentor, facilitator, teacher, coach	n/a
Purpose	Summative only	Mostly summative	Mostly formative	Formative only
Utilization rate	Very low	Low	High	Very high
Basis for credibility	Evaluator expertise, methodological rigor	Evaluator expertise, stakeholder involvement	Utilization of findings and evaluator endorsement	Usefulness of findings

Owen (2007) classified program evaluation into five categories:

1. *Proactive Evaluation*: This form takes place before a program is designed. The primary purpose is to provide input decisions about how best to develop a program in advance of the planning stage. Approaches that are consistent with this type of evaluation comprise, needs assessment or needs analysis, research synthesis (evidence-based practice), and review of best practice (creation of benchmarks).

2. *Clarificative Evaluation*: The major concern of this form is to make the internal structure and functioning of intervention explicit, which is sometimes described as the theory or logic of a program. The logic of a program attempts to provide links between program assumptions, program intentions and objectives, and the implementation activities designed to achieve these objectives. The collection and analysis of data is considered to be crucial. Approaches that are included in clarificative evaluation are: evaluability assessment (EA), program logic development and ex-ante evaluation.

3. *Interactive Evaluation*: This form assists with ongoing service provision and structural arrangements, usually with a strong emphasis on process. The findings of the interactive form are usually directed to middle level managers and program implementers. Approaches applicable in this evaluation are: responsive evaluation, action research, developmental evaluation, empowerment evaluation and quality review.

4. *Monitoring Evaluation*: Monitoring is appropriate when a program is well-established and ongoing. The goals or intentions are specified, the program targets are identified and implementation is taking place. Component analysis, devolved performance assessment and systems analysis can be given as examples for this type of evaluation.

5. *Impact Evaluation*: The main concern of this form is to assess the effects of a settled program at a given point. The emphasis is mostly on outcomes, but it may also include a review of the implementation characteristics of the program known as process-outcome evaluation. Objectives-based evaluation, needs-based evaluation, goal-free evaluation,

process-outcome studies, realistic evaluation and performance audit can be classified under this type of evaluation.

Priest (2001) described the following five models of program evaluation including the primary questions they addressed:

1. *Needs assessments* measure the gap between “what is” (the present state of affairs) and “what should be” (the target state that is aimed at).

2. *Feasibility studies* measure if the program is likely to succeed or not, by searching for alternative approaches that might help the program delivery.

3. *Process evaluations* measure the gap between the aims of the program and its actual implementation. The program is examined in order to determine if the existing program delivery matches its design. This information is used to make the required adjustments to the program during its delivery.

4. *Outcome evaluations* measure if the learning objectives were achieved and if the stakeholders are satisfied with the products.

5. *Cost analysis* measures the worth of a program in comparison with other approaches. The decisions are being made whether this program should continue or not.

Finally, Posavac and Carey (2003) proposed four common types of program evaluation which were also applied for the purpose of this study.

1. *The Evaluation of Need*: It aims to identify and measure the unmet needs of an organization or community. The consideration and assessment of unmet needs is the first step before any effective planning can begin. Once a program has been developed and implemented, evaluators check on the degree the program operates as expected and the assumptions made while the program was being planned.

2. *The Evaluation of Process*: This type of evaluation may well benefit both from quantitative and qualitative information which provide details on the implementation of the program.

3. *The Evaluation of Product:* After the program has been implemented, there should be a focus on the evaluation of the outcome. Although an evaluation of outcome might lead to positive changes in people, the behavioral changes are difficult to identify. Besides, there might be conflicts between the evaluators gathering information and program staff providing services. Assessing the maintenance of improvement might be another problem when evaluating outcomes. Therefore, the evaluation of outcome is a complicated process that should be carried out thoroughly.

4. *The Evaluation of Efficiency:* This type of evaluation deals with the questions of costs and resources, and the comparison of two or more programs designed to affect similar outcomes, before deciding on the requirement of the program.

2. 8. Dimensions of Program Evaluation

Depending on the purposes for information gathering and on the types of decisions that will evolve from each purpose, there are three common dimensions of program evaluation namely, the purpose of the information: formative vs. summative, types of information: process vs. product, and types of data and analyses: quantitative vs. qualitative (Brown, 1995).

2. 8. 1. *Formative vs. Summative*

Formative and summative evaluations focus on information gathering and on the types of decisions that will ultimately evolve from each purpose (Muşlu, 2007). While formative evaluation takes place during the development of a program with the purpose of collecting information to be used for the improvement of the program, summative evaluation is done at the end of a program to gather information to determine whether the program was successful and effective, resulting in important changes like continuation or cancellation of the program.

Apart from formative and summative evaluation, Richards (2001) added illuminative evaluation that seeks to find out how different aspects of program work have been implemented. In other words, it tries to provide an in-depth understanding of the processes of teaching and learning that occur in the program, without necessarily trying to change the course in any way as a result.

2. 8. 2. Process vs. Product

The distinction between product and process is based on the type of information gathered (Muşlu, 2007). Parallel to summative evaluation, the primary aim of product evaluation is to make decisions whether the goals (product) of the program have been achieved or not. On the contrary, process evaluation focuses on what is going on during the implementation of the program (process) to determine if the goals (product) have been met and to improve the processes involved.

2. 8. 3. Quantitative vs. Qualitative

Quantitative and qualitative evaluations differ in terms of data gathered. While quantitative data are gathered using measures that produce results in the form of numbers such as, exam scores and the number of students in each class. Qualitative data, on the other hand, consist of more holistic information based on observations that may not generally be converted into quantities or numbers such as, classroom observations or interviews (Brown, 1995).

2. 9. Studies on Program Evaluation

2. 9. 1. Program Evaluation Studies on Second and Foreign Language Education Abroad

Since evaluation has gained attention in education, a great deal of evaluation studies that differ in terms of their purposes, emphasis and methodologies have been conducted abroad. The studies generally investigated whether the institutions met their goals and objectives at the end of the program by identifying the perceptions of the course instructors, students and principals about the program followed (Henry and Roseberry, 1999; Tarnopolsky, 2000; Yıldız, 2004; Marcinkoniene, 2005; Nam, 2005).

Henry and Roseberry (1999) for example, evaluated the teaching method and materials used in the writing course based on the process-genre approach at the University of Brunei Darussalam. The aim of the study was to investigate whether the participants would improve their ability to texture their writing, and whether they would produce texts closer to the allowable structure after genre-based language instruction. Findings from the essay written before and after instruction revealed that students showed progress in their ability to structure their essay introductions and their ability to texture their writing effectively.

In a parallel study, Tarnopolsky (2000) evaluated the process-genre approach in the writing course at the language program in Ukraine. The past and present situations in teaching writing and the reasons for avoiding teaching communicative writing skills in English courses in that country were considered. The findings of the needs analysis indicated a necessity of introducing writing using the process-genre approach. The first version of the course was evaluated and it was concluded that there were certain problems with the activities used after the process-genre approach was integrated in the program. Although the course was communicative, the activities that are more fun needed to be added. After adapting the course in terms of students' needs, the second version of the course was found to be more successful.

In another study, Sawatpanit, Suthers and Fleming (2003) described and evaluated the design of a courseware authority tool, BRIX which was particularly built for the second language acquisition domain. The tool was developed to fulfill language educators' requirements focusing on reading, writing, and listening activities. Interviews were conducted through expert usability reviews. Students' testing performances were evaluated as well. Based on the obtained data, it was found that BRIX supports reading, writing and some listening activities. However, future development was needed to support speaking activities and to fully integrate audio and video functions.

Yıldız (2004) aimed to investigate the Turkish Language Teaching Program for Foreigners at Minsk State Language University (MSLU) in Belarus. The purpose of the study was to identify the discrepancies between the current status and the desired outcomes of the Turkish program at MSLU. The study also tried to find out the aspects of the Turkish program that should be maintained, strengthened, added or deleted. Data were collected from the prospective students and their parents, instructors teaching in the program, the graduates of the program, the former instructors, the authorities at the institution and the employers of the graduates of this program. Questionnaires and interviews were administered to the target groups and written documents were analyzed. The results of the study indicated that the language program at MSLU partially met the needs and demands of the learners since the Turkish language proficiency among the current students, graduates and the university authorities was higher than expected.

Another study conducted by Marcinkoniene (2005) aimed to reveal the role of evaluation in the English language teaching and make value judgments for the sustainability of the offered courses at Kaunas University of Technology (KTU). A questionnaire was administered to 234 first and second-year students to identify their expectations, achievements and attitudes towards the program and the role of course materials. The

findings of the study revealed that, the participants became more critical, took the evaluation more seriously and raised their awareness on language skills development.

Finally, Nam (2005) investigated the development of communication-based English language instruction in a Korean university context by (a) evaluating/critiquing a specific college English program at Pusan National University (PNU), (b) describing and exploring perceptions regarding English instruction at the collegiate level in Korea among Korean college students and their teachers in the EFL program, and (c) identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the college EFL curriculum of the university in terms of how close it was to the perceptions of the students' and teachers' needs about English. The findings gathered from the surveys and interviews revealed that while students generally seemed to have somewhat negative opinions, teachers were more positive about the effectiveness/quality of the new curriculum. Additionally, the possibility of the current communication-based EFL curriculum might not be closely related to the students' desires, due to several weaknesses of the curriculum itself and the institutional system.

2. 9. 2. Program Evaluation Studies on Foreign Language Education in Turkey

Many program evaluation studies in terms of English language teaching and learning have been conducted in Turkey. While some of these studies made a thorough program evaluation, some others tried to evaluate only one particular aspect of a program (Toker, 1999; Sarı, 2003; Erozan, 2005; Gerede, 2005; Şahin, 2006; Karataş, 2007; Muşlu, 2007; Özkanal, 2009).

Toker (1999), for example, evaluated the Preparatory School Program at Gaziantep University in terms of the students' attitudes. The participants included 120 freshmen students and 35 instructors selected randomly from the program. Two questionnaires were including 25 items were used to collect data. The questions were either in yes-no format or open-ended. According to the results of the study, the program was reevaluated in terms of

the needs of the students, the objectives, the duration, language skills, materials, teaching methods, laboratory hours and the ESP course.

In another study, Sari (2003) investigated the English teaching program at Gülhane Military Medical Faculty and suggested a new program based on the Monitor Model. The participants of the study were 230 students, 25 doctors and 7 teachers. The instruments used for data collection were two questionnaires for the students, a structured interview for the doctors, two questionnaires (in the form of structured interview) for the teachers and random written student reports. The findings reported that speaking and reading were considered to be the priority skills. Additionally, to understand and translate medical material, to get an overseas assignment, to talk to foreigners, and to follow lectures were identified as the common language-related goals in the study.

Erozan (2005) examined the language improvement courses, Oral Communication Skills I /II, Reading Skills I/II, Writing Skills I/II, Advanced Reading Skills, Advanced Writing Skills, and English Grammar I/II in the undergraduate curriculum of the Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) at Eastern Mediterranean University. The participants of the study were 43 first and 52 second year students and 6 instructors teaching the language improvement courses at the department. Course evaluation questionnaires for students, interviews with students and teachers, classroom observations and examination of relevant written documents such as, course policy sheets, course materials, and assessment tools used in the courses were administered as data collection instruments. According to the results, as perceived by the students and instructors, the language improvement courses were generally effective in terms of five aspects specified in the evaluation model employed in the study. Consequently, some recommendations were offered in terms of overcoming the weaknesses in the current program such as, enhancing the practice component in the language improvement courses, using a wider variety of authentic materials, utilizing various methods

and activities in teaching-learning process, and strengthening intra-subject and inter-subject relationships (e.g. continuity and coherence) between or among the courses.

Moreover, Gerede (2005) aimed to evaluate the effects of a curriculum renewal project started at Anadolu University, Intensive English Program. The participants were 135 first year students of five English medium departments in 2004, and 129 first year students of the same departments in 2005. Data were collected by means of questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The perceived language needs of the students to follow English-medium content courses at five English-medium departments were first determined and then, the them were compared to determine whether there was a difference between the two curricula in meeting students' language needs. The findings revealed that there were some significant discrepancies in meeting the students' language needs. Several suggestions were proposed in terms of the goals and objectives, testing, material development and the teaching method of the program.

Moreover, Muşlu (2007) aimed to find out the teachers' view on the writing curriculum in terms of the materials, the process-genre approach, journal writing, portfolios, project work and the writing competition at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages (AUSFL). 48 writing course instructors working at different proficiency levels at AUSFL participated in the study. A questionnaire was designed to identify the teachers' views on the writing curriculum. In addition, a semi-structured interview was conducted with 40% of the teachers to get their further thoughts. According to the results of the study, there were problems with the course packs and supplementary materials used during the terms. They were inappropriate for the students and needed to be revised. As for the process-genre approach, most of the teachers stated that the genre and the approach taught in the program were parallel to the students' needs. Additionally, the grammar syllabus was considered to be crucial while preparing the writing syllabus particularly in the lower levels. As for journal writing, portfolios and project work the teachers believed that it was a good communication

opportunity between the teacher and the students. Finally, the teachers suggested that the award and the topics should be changed in terms of the writing competition.

In a different study, Karataş (2007) evaluated the syllabus of the English II instruction program applied in the Modern Languages Department, Yıldız Teknik University (YTU) School of Foreign Languages by using Stufflebeam's (2002) context, input, process and product (CIPP) model. 35 teachers implementing the English II program and 415 students were chosen randomly to participate in the study. Data came from two questionnaires given to the teachers and the students. The findings revealed some significant differences between the teachers' and students' opinions in terms of context, input, process and product. Considering the context, some significant differences were found in relation to the suitability of the program's objectives for the students' improvement, the proficiency level and the comprehensibility of the textbook. For the input, the teachers expressed negative opinions only about the contribution of the audio-visual materials used in the program for the improvement of the students. Regarding the process element, the teachers believed the students were doing sufficient exercises and revision, providing the students' participation, availability of the activities languages skills can be used and spending time on solving students' problems about the lesson. As for the product, the participants stressed that the program had no positive effect on the students' improvement in listening, speaking and grammar, and the syllabus was not enough to provide the student with the necessary English knowledge for various job areas.

Finally, Özkanal (2009) investigated the English Preparatory Program of Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Foreign Languages Department to find out whether the program was successful and suggest a new Preparatory Program model. Two questionnaires and an interview were carried out with 354 students who were either enrolled in the program, finished the program or studied at the faculties and 27 instructors of the program. The results of the study showed certain problematic elements particularly in technical English, and

suggested the necessity for an English Preparatory model and increase the qualities of the program.

2. 10. Chapter Summary

The literature review in this chapter has examined how the concept of language teaching/learning has been re-conceptualized. The paradigm shift from behaviorism to constructivism has emphasized the significance of learners as constructors of knowledge. Based on this view, teachers should focus both on the learners' existing knowledge and their experiences. In addition, learning never takes place in isolation, but it is an ongoing process among teachers, learners, tasks and contexts.

Considering the changes in language teaching, recent research has focused on the process of designing or evaluating a program based on students' needs. However, most studies have investigated program design and evaluation separately. Additionally, process evaluation has not been thoroughly emphasized in the current literature. To fill this gap, the present study combines the components of program design and evaluation, and also provides evidence for the modifications to be done in the Language Preparatory Program by integrating process evaluation based on the student teachers' perceived language needs and their assumed learning needs.

Specifically, this study comprises two parts: a) program design and b) program evaluation. For the first part of the study, Brown's (1995) framework, including needs analysis, goals and objectives, materials and the language teaching approach was adapted to design the Language Preparatory Program based on the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs.

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, Posavac and Carey's (2003) three types of evaluation: the evaluation of need, the evaluation of product and the evaluation of process were used to evaluate the program according to the student teachers' perceived language needs, assumed learning needs and performances related to their overall language abilities.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3. 1. Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology of the study. The remainder of the chapter will include a description of the research setting, selection of the participants, case study as a research methodology, data collection instruments, research questions, and data analysis.

The present study comprises two parts. The first part attempts to answer the following research question and sub questions in relation to the design of the program:

1-What is the nature of the Language Preparatory Program in terms of:

- 1a. the language needs
- 1b. goals and objectives
- 1c. materials
- 1d. the language teaching approach

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, the following research questions are addressed:

2-Do the student teachers enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program feel that the program has met their assumed learning needs?

3- Do the student teachers and the course instructors feel that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs?

4-Is there any difference between the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program related to their performance on the four language skills?

5-Are there any differences between the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program in terms of their proficiency in the four language skills?

6-What are the possible positive and negative side effects of the Language Preparatory Program?

3. 2. Setting

The present study was conducted at the Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) at Yeditepe University. This department offers a four-year undergraduate program in English Language Teacher Education. The program consists of courses on English language development, linguistics, language teaching methodology, pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary for teaching English as a foreign language. It also provides student teachers with the opportunities to learn a second foreign language, and to pursue individual interests in various cultural and professional subjects through the elective courses. Thus, the overall aim of the program is to offer a comprehensive teacher undergraduate program to the future teachers that would equip them with the most up-to-date knowledge in their respective subject areas.

3. 3. Participants

For the design of the Language Preparatory Program, forty-six undergraduate student teachers and five instructors offering courses at the freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior grade levels at the ELT department participated in the study.

As for the evaluation of the program, the data were gathered from twenty-one student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and twenty-one student teachers who directly started the undergraduate program. Five course instructors who offered courses both in the preparatory and the undergraduate programs also participated in the present study.

The participating student teachers' age range was between 18-22 and they were graduates of language departments of their high schools. Ten male and seventy-eight female student teachers at intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced proficiency levels participated in the study.

As for the course instructors, they were all females with an age range of 28-39. Every instructor had at least six years of English teaching experience.

3. 4. Case Study as a Research Design

The study employs a case study as research design, which has been supported by many researchers as an effective research strategy to investigate a specific educational phenomenon such as a program, event, person, process or social group (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Mertens, 1998; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000; Brown and Rodgers, 2002; Ritchie and Lewis, 2003; Yin, 2003; Duff, 2008).

Bogdan and Biklen (1998, p.54) describe the case study as “a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository of documents, or one particular event.” Brown and Rodgers (2002, p. 21) reports that the case study design comprises an intensive study of the background, current status, and environmental interactions of a given social unit: an individual, a group, an institution, or a community. Yin (2003, p.4) argues that the case study design is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident”. He suggests that case studies can be identified based on a 2x3 matrix. A case study research can be based on single- or multiple- case studies. A single case study focuses on a single case only whereas multiple-case studies include two or more cases within the same study (p.5).

There are three types of case studies, categorized with respect to their main purposes: exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory. An exploratory case study (whether based on single or multiple cases) aims to define the questions and hypotheses of a subsequent study (not necessarily a case study) or to determine the feasibility of the desired research procedures. As for descriptive case study, the focus is on complete description of a phenomenon within its context. Finally, an explanatory case study presents data based on cause-effect relationship explaining how events happened. According to Ritchie and Lewis (2003, p. 52) the case study design can build up very detailed in-depth understanding, providing a full account or perspective of the research issue with a holistic, comprehensive and contextualized understanding. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000, p. 185) identify the purpose of CSD observation as following: “to probe deeply and to analyze intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle of the unit with a view to establishing generalizations about the wider population to which that unit belongs”. Duff (2008, p. 31) points out that the purpose of the case study design varies, depending on how much is already known about a topic, the amount of previous empirical research conducted on it, the nature of the case itself, and the philosophy of the researcher. Therefore, stemming from previous research, the case study was chosen for this study for the following reasons:

1. It provides detailed description of an educational phenomenon (e.g. a language preparatory program).
2. It allows the researcher to gather in-depth data about a particular setting, or a single subject, a single depository of documents, or one particular event (e.g. design and evaluation of a language preparatory program).
3. It permits the study of process in terms of design and evaluation of a specific program (e.g. a language preparatory program).
4. It provides detailed information about a specific population in a particular context (e.g. a language preparatory program).

Since the present study's main aim is to gather in-depth information to design and evaluate a language preparatory program within a particular setting, a descriptive case study was chosen as an appropriate research design.

3. 5. Data Collection Instruments

For the first part of the study namely, program design, the data came from a pre-needs analysis questionnaire and a semi-structured interview administered to the student teachers and course instructors considering the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs.

As for the second part of the study, a post-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs, a needs analysis questionnaire on the student teachers' assumed learning needs, semi-structured interviews, and the pre- and post- program proficiency scores were used as the data collection instruments to evaluate the Language Preparatory Program.

The study was conducted during three consecutive semesters: Spring 2008, Fall 2008 and Spring 2009.

3. 5. 1. The Needs Analysis Questionnaire about the Perceptions of the Student Teachers'

Language Needs

The needs analysis questionnaire about the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs was administered to the two groups of participants before and after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program.

For the first part of the study, a pre-needs analysis questionnaire was given to the student teachers and the course instructors at the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department in the Spring semester of 2008 to investigate their perceptions of the student teachers' language needs (See Appendices A and B). The questionnaire was adapted from a

study conducted by Akyel and Ozek (2010) which aimed to determine the language needs of the students at a Language Preparatory Program in one of the most prestigious universities in Istanbul, Turkey.

The questionnaire contained two main parts. The first part (Part 1) was designed to gather demographic information about the student teachers to identify their gender, proficiency level, age and the type of high school they graduated from. As for the second part (Part 2), the aim was to gather information on the following concepts related to the student teachers' perceived language needs: the importance of the improvement of the language abilities namely, reading, writing, speaking and listening (2a), the performance in the tasks related to the four language skills (2b), and the difficulties the student teachers experienced with the application of the strategies in tasks considering the four language skills (2c). Each item in the scale was accompanied by a 5-point Likert scale ranging from '*very important*' (a) through '*unimportant*' (d) in *Part 2 and 2a* and '*always*' (a) through '*never*' (d) in *2b and 2c*.

Based on the obtained results, a Language Preparatory Program was designed and started to be implemented in the Fall semester of 2008. The preparatory student teachers were given the opportunity to take a proficiency exam after studying in the program for one semester. Twenty-one student teachers passed the exam and started the undergraduate program (the freshmen academic year) in the Spring semester of 2009. In other words, the participating student teachers studied in the preparatory program only for one academic term.

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, a post-needs analysis questionnaire was carried out with the student teachers and the course instructors who were enrolled in the preparatory program to find out whether the program has met their perceptions of the student teachers' language needs after they had completed one semester of their freshmen courses. The same items as in the design of the program were included in a 5-point

Likert scale ranging from '*strongly agree*' (a) through '*strongly disagree*' (d) (See Appendices C and D).

Before the questionnaire was administered to the participants, it was piloted with fourteen undergraduate student teachers. Reliability estimates for subscales were $\alpha=0.781$ for Part 1, $\alpha=0.858$ for 2a, $\alpha=0.796$ for 2b and $\alpha=0.976$ for 2c and $\alpha=0.961$ for the whole needs analysis questionnaire which indicates a high internal consistency of the items in the scale (Gliem and Gliem, 2003).

3. 5. 2. The Needs Analysis Questionnaire about the Student Teachers' Assumed Learning Needs

The learning needs were not investigated before the student teachers were enrolled in the preparatory program since they did not explicitly know what they were, and also due to time constraints. Social Constructivist Approach was taken as a theoretical underpinning of the learning needs which was also reflected in the identification of the goals and objectives, and the materials of the program. Specifically, the learning needs were evaluated after the student teachers had completed the Language Preparatory Program in the Fall semester of 2008 (See Appendix E).

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher. The aim was to evaluate whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' assumed learning needs after they had completed the program. The questionnaire was a 5-point Likert scale consisting of 15 items ranging from '*strongly agree*' (a) through '*strongly disagree*' (d). The items were prepared in relation to practices done during the courses offered in the preparatory program. Before the questionnaire was administered to the participants, it was piloted with eight preparatory student teachers. A high internal consistency of the items was found since the reliability estimate for the whole needs analysis questionnaire was $\alpha=0.883$ (Gliem and Gliem, 2003).

3. 5. 3. Interviews

Another primary source of data for this study were interviews given to the student teachers and course instructors before and after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program. Patton (2002, p. 4) defines interviews as “open-ended questions and probes yield in-depth responses about people’s experiences, perceptions, opinions, feelings, and knowledge.”

Interviews can be classified according to the purpose, the structure, and the administration (Özek, 2000). Four different interview types are commonly used in literature: structured, semi-structured, informal and retrospective (Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh, 1996, p. 456). Structured and semi-structured interviews consist of questions designed to elicit specific answers on the part of respondents. The difference between these two types is that in a structured interview the researcher designs the whole agenda in advance without making any modifications, whereas in a semi-structured interview the questions are prepared before the interview, but can be modified according to the responses. As for informal interviews, specific types of questions are not involved. Instead, the aim of this interview is to try to find out what people think and how the views of one individual compare with those of another. Finally, in retrospective interviews, a respondent tries to recall and then reconstruct from memory something that happened in the past.

For the purposes of this study, a semi-structured interview was chosen since it allowed the researcher to gain detailed information from each participant which can be modified according to the responses to the given questions. Semi-structured interviews were conducted before and after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program both with the student teachers and the course instructors. The student teachers were chosen according to their proficiency exam scores received before the implementation of the program. To put it simply, two high achievers who received scores higher than 65 out of 120, two average students with ranging scores from 50 to 64, and two low achievers with scores lower than 50

out of 120 were chosen as the representatives of the population. The same interview was carried out with the course instructors who offered courses both in the preparatory and undergraduate programs. The primary purpose was to gather in-depth data to design and evaluate the Language Preparatory Program.

Specifically, in an attempt to design the Language Preparatory Program, a semi-structured interview was carried out with six student teachers and five course instructors offering courses at the Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department. The questions were prepared parallel to the items in the pre-needs analysis questionnaires (see Appendices F and G). The interview included four different parts. Part 1 aimed to gather general information in terms of the primary aim of the program, the importance of the improvement of the four language skills, and the effective tasks to be included in the program. As for Part 2, questions in terms of improving the student teachers' reading skills were included. For example, the two groups of participants were asked questions about the effective tasks that the student teachers could be engaged in the program to improve their reading ability, the common problems observed and the possible solutions, the strategies that could be used for effective reading (e.g. reading for general information or synthesizing information) and the significance of extensive reading. In Part 3, questions related to the development of the writing skills by integrating effective tasks, focusing on the content, organization and presentation in the student teachers' written assignments, the requirement of doing research, the importance of synthesizing information and writing reaction papers, the frequent problems the student teachers faced with and the possible reasons behind them were included. In addition, in Part 4 parallel questions were asked considering the effective tasks to be used for the progress of the listening skill, the important problems and the possible solutions. Finally, Part 5 comprised similar questions which aimed to find out the effective ways to improve the student teachers' speaking ability stressing the importance of oral participation, class presentations and discussion/debates. Questions were also asked in terms

of the effective speaking tasks, the general problems the student teachers experienced while speaking and the reasons of their occurrence.

As for the evaluation of the program, a semi-structured interview was carried out with six preparatory student teachers and five course instructors who offered courses in the program (See Appendices H and I). The aim was to find out the participants' feelings as to whether the program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs after they had completed one semester of their freshmen courses. The questions were parallel to the ones in the design of the program by primarily focusing on the aim of the program, the importance given to the four language skills, the effective tasks used to improve the student teachers' performance in the four language skills, the frequent problems observed in the and the possible reasons behind them. Besides, via semi-structured interviews the researcher tried to investigate whether the program has met the student teachers' assumed learning needs as well. Finally, the data gathered from the semi-structured interview were used to identify the possible positive and negative side effects of the program to find out the strengths and weaknesses which would serve as main guides while redesigning the program for the following academic year.

3. 5. 4. Proficiency Exam Scores

Proficiency scores help planners to determine exit and entrance standards for a curriculum, to adjust the levels and goals and objectives to the true abilities of the students, or to compare the effectiveness of different program (Brown, 1995, p. 109).

For the second part of the study, namely program evaluation, the pre- and post-program proficiency scores were used to compare whether there was any difference in the student teachers' proficiency level before and after the implementation of the preparatory program considering their performance on the four language skills.

Furthermore, the gain scores of the pre- and post- proficiency exams were analyzed to compare the performance of the student teachers who were enrolled in the preparatory program and the ones who directly started their undergraduate program on their improvement in the reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities. Table 3.1. summarizes the research questions and the corresponding procedures.

Table 3. 1.

Overview of the research questions and the corresponding procedures

Research question	Data collection instrument(s)	Data analysis
Part1. Program Design		
1. What is the nature of the Language Preparatory Program in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. the language needs 1b. goals and objectives 1c. language teaching approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pre-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs (Adapted from Akyel and Ozek, 2010) • A semi-structured interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive statistics; (means and standard deviations) and percentages • Pattern coding (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998)

Part 2. Program Evaluation

2-Do the student teachers enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program feel that the program has met their assumed learning needs?

- A needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs (developed by the researcher)
- Descriptive statistics; (means and standard deviations) and percentages
- A semi-structured interview
- Pattern coding (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998)

3-Do the student teachers and the course instructors feel that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs?

- A post-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs (Adapted from Akyel and Ozek, 2010)
- Descriptive statistics; (means and standard deviations) and percentages
- A semi-structured interview
- Pattern coding (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998)

<p>4-Is there any difference between the pre and post program proficiency exam scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program related to their performance on the four language skills?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre- and post-program proficiency scores of the preparatory student teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paired samples <i>t</i>-test
<p>5-Are there any differences between the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program in terms of their proficiency in the four language skills?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gain scores of the preparatory and the undergraduate student teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent samples <i>t</i>-test
<p>6-What are the possible positive and negative side effects of the program?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pattern coding (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998)

3. 7. Data Analysis Procedure

The following section describes the data analysis procedures applied for the design and evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program.

For the first part of the study, a pre-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs and a semi-structured interview were administered both to the student teachers and the course instructors to design the Language Preparatory Program.

Specifically, in order to answer the first main research question and the sub questions, the data gathered from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs were tabulated and analyzed statistically. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) and percentages were estimated to identify the nature of the

Language Preparatory Program with respect to the following components: goals and objectives, materials and the language teaching approach. The data gathered were supported via semi-structured interviews carried out with the two groups of participants. According to Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework, the interviews were first transcribed, and then by reading each participant's transcripts, the conceptual themes were identified by the researcher according to the recurring words and ideas. These conceptual categories were used to create a matrix of major themes which were sorted under specific headings. Finally, the supporting quotes from each participant were listed and discussed under each heading.

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, a post-needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' perceived language needs and a needs-analysis questionnaire on their assumed learning needs were tabulated and analyzed statistically to answer the second and third research questions. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) and percentages were calculated to find out whether these two types of needs have been met after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program. Parallel to the design of the program, semi-structured interviews were used to support the findings, and were transcribed and coded using Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework.

Furthermore, in an attempt to answer the fourth research question, a paired samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the student teachers' pre- and post- program proficiency scores to find out whether there was any improvement in their proficiency related to the four language skills after they were completed the preparatory program. Before a *t*-test was conducted, the associated statistical assumptions were checked through the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality in order to decide whether a parametric or nonparametric comparison would be applied for the given data. The analysis revealed that the assumption of normality was sustained for all distributions ($p > .05$).

Next, for the fifth research question, an independent samples *t*-test was used to compare the gain scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started their undergraduate program with respect to their proficiency in the four language skills. Before the test was conducted, Levene's Tests for Equality of Variances and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality were obtained to assess the homogeneity of variances and the normality assumptions of the scores related to the four language skills.

According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the two variances were approximately equal between the two groups which shows that the homogeneity of variances assumption was met considering the student teachers' performance on four language skills ($p > .05$). Likewise, according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality, there was no violation of the normality assumption for all distributions ($p > .05$).

Finally, in an attempt to answer the seventh research question, data gathered from the semi-structured interviews were transcribed and coded according to Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) framework to find out the possible positive and negative side effects of the Language Preparatory Program.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4. 1. Introduction

This chapter includes the results of the study related to the design and evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program. Data were gathered from pre- and post- needs analysis questionnaires about the student teachers' perceived language needs, a needs analysis questionnaire considering the student teachers' assumed learning needs, semi-structured interviews, and pre- and post- proficiency exam scores of the preparatory and undergraduate student teachers.

The present study comprises two parts. The first part attempts to design a program according to the following research question and sub questions:

1-What is the nature of the Language Preparatory Program in terms of:

- 1a. the language needs
- 1b. goals and objectives
- 1c. materials
- 1d. the language teaching approach

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, the following research questions are addressed:

2-Do the student teachers enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program feel that the program has met their assumed learning needs?

3- Do the student teachers and the course instructors feel that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs?

4-Is there any difference between the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program related to their performance on the four language skills?

5-Are there any differences between the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program in terms of their proficiency in the four language skills?

6-What are the possible positive and negative side effects of the Language Preparatory Program?

4. 2. Findings Related to the Design of the Language Preparatory Program

As it will be discussed in the following pages, for the first part of the study, the findings related to the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview administered to the student teachers and course instructors are used to provide evidence for the design of the Language Preparatory Program. First, the results on the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs are identified. Then, the five syllabi developed for the program are thoroughly described.

4. 2. 1. The Findings of the Pre-Needs Analysis Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers (STs) and Course Instructors (CIs) in terms of the Student Teachers' Perceived Language Needs

Based on the results gathered from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire, the perceptions of the participants related to the student teachers' needs on the four language skills are reported. Their percentages are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1.

Percentages for student teachers' perceptions of their abilities related to the four language skills

	Very Important/Important		Slightly Important		Not Very Important/Unimportant	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
Reading	88.8	100	6.9	-	4.3	-
Writing	87	100	4.3	-	8.7	-
Listening	87	100	6.3	-	6.7	-
Speaking	84.8	100	6.5	-	8.7	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CI=Course instructors.

1

As Table 4.1. shows, both the student teachers and the course instructors perceived the student teachers' abilities on the four language skills namely, reading (ST: M=1.76, SD=0.84 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.44), writing (ST: M=1.73, SD=0.97 / CI: M: 1.40, SD=0.54), speaking (SD: M=1.54, SD=0.95 / CI: M=1.00, SD=0.00) and listening (ST: M=1.91, SD=1.17 / CI: M=1.40, SD: 0.54) to be equally important.

In other words, it can be stated that the student teachers need training to improve their reading, writing, listening and speaking skills. Since they are going to be English teachers in the future, they need to be proficient in all four language skills. Thus, as indicated in the results above, special attention should be given to the development of the four language skills while designing the Language Preparatory Program.

¹ The means are based on a 5-point Likert scale where a represents very important, b important, c not sure, d not very important and e unimportant. (Low mean indicates high agreement; high mean indicates low agreement.)

Furthermore, the student teachers' and the course instructors' perceptions in terms of the student teachers' performance in tasks related to the four language skills are presented. Table 4.2. below shows the percentages obtained from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire for the student teachers' performance in reading tasks.

Table 4.2.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their reading abilities in performing the related tasks

	Very Important/Important		Slightly Important		Not Very Important/Unimportant	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
textbooks	56.6	100	34.8	-	8.6	-
articles in journals	74	80	17.3	20	8.7	-
reference tools (e.g. dictionaries)	60.9	80	21.7	20	17.4	-
course handouts	74	100	17.3	-	8.7	-
texts on the Internet	54.4	100	26	-	19.6	-
computer-presented texts	58.7	100	19.6	-	21.7	-
instructions for projects	71.8	60	17.4	20	10.8	20
newspapers/magazines	58.7	80	19.6	-	21.7	20
lecture notes	71.7	100	10.9	-	17.4	-
works of literature	69.3	60	28.6	40	2.1	-
graphs/ charts/ diagrams/ tables	-	-	37.3	20	62.7	80

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

Looking at the table above, both groups of participants perceived the student teachers' performance in tasks related to the reading abilities to be highly important. Specifically, they agreed that reading textbooks (ST: M=2.06, SD=1.04 / CI: M= 1.60, SD=0.54), articles in journals (ST: M=1.97, SD=0.95 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), course handouts (ST: M=1.97, SD=0.95 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), lecture notes (ST: M=2.04, SD= 1.11 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), instructions for projects (ST: M=2.29, SD=1.00 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), reference tools (e.g. dictionaries) (ST: M=2.23, SD=1.15 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), computer-presented texts (ST: M=2.26, SD=1.18 / CI: M=2.20, SD=1.09), texts on the Internet (ST: M=2.39, SD=1.08 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), works of literature (ST: M=2.06, SD=0.80 / CI: M=2.20, SD=0.83) and newspapers/magazines (ST: M=2.26, SD=1.18 / CI: M=2.20, SD=1.09) were highly important for the development in reading.

The only item rated lower by the participants was *'reading charts/diagrams/tables'* (ST: M=3.81, SD=0.72 / CI: M=4.00, SD=0.70). One possible explanation behind this finding might be the fact that the undergraduate program focuses on the student teachers' involvement in more academic tasks such as, reading works of literature or course handouts. Therefore, this task can be just simply introduced at the beginning of the preparatory program.

Additionally, Table 4.3. presents the percentages of the perceptions of the student teachers and the course instructors regarding the student teachers' performance related to their writing abilities.

Table 4.3.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their writing abilities in performing the related tasks

	Very Important/Important		Not Sure		Not Very Important/Unimportant	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
a resume (CV)	84.7	-	15.3	20	-	80
essays in reactions to readings	69.6	100	26.1	-	4.3	-
references for a report or project	68,2	80	19,8	20	12	-
book reports	69.6	100	23.9	-	6.5	-
workbook exercises	69.6	100	15.2	-	15.2	-
essay-type questions	62.4	100	28.9	-	8.7	-
term papers	63	100	26	-	11	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As shown in Table 4.3., the student teachers and the course instructors perceived the performance in writing to be closely relevant to almost all the tasks listed above. The following tasks were considered significant in terms of improving the student teachers' writing ability: essays in reaction to readings (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.89 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44), references for a report or project (ST: M=2.07, SD=1.05 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.89), book reports (ST: M=2.10, SD=0.94 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44), workbook exercises (ST: M=2.19, SD=0.88 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44), essay-type questions (ST: M=2.19, SD=1.06 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44) and term papers (ST: M=2.15, SD=1.07 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44).

The only task that was perceived differently by the participants was ‘*writing a resume (CV)*’. While the student teachers perceived it to be important (M=1.79, SD=0.69) the course instructors gave it much less importance (M=4.00, SD=0.70). One possible explanation behind this finding might be the fact that the major goal of the preparatory program is to engage the student teachers in more academic tasks such as, writing essays in reaction to readings or writing term papers that would help them improve their productive skills. Therefore, writing a resume (CV) is more appropriate to be introduced in the undergraduate program.

As for the student teachers’ perceptions regarding their performance in the tasks related to their listening abilities, both groups perceived the tasks listed below to be important (See Table 4.4.).

Table 4.4.

Percentages for the student teachers’ perceptions in terms of their listening abilities in performing the related tasks

	Very Important/Important		Not Sure		Not Very Important/Unimportant	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
lectures	76.1	100	15.2	-	8.7	-
question/answer sessions	71.7	100	19.6	-	8.7	-
class presentations	82.6	100	13	-	4.4	-
dialogues	23.9	100	18.3	-	57.8	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CI=Course instructors.

Looking at the table above, the two groups perceived the performance on these tasks to be fundamental for the development of their listening ability: listening to lectures (ST: M=1.89, SD=0.97 CI: M=1.00, SD=0.00), question/answer sessions (ST: M=1.97, SD=0.97 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44) and class presentations (ST: M=1.65, SD=0.94 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44).

The only task that was perceived less important by the student teachers but important by the course instructors was *'listening to dialogues'* (ST: M=3.26, SD=1.23 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.89). In the undergraduate program, the student teachers are generally asked to listen to a lecture followed by question/answer sessions. Besides, they are asked to prepare a presentation in most of their courses. They are rarely engaged in tasks based on listening to dialogues. Thus, the student teachers ranked this item lower than the others. On the other hand, the course instructors perceived this task to be as important as the others, and indicated that it should be included in the program so that the student teachers can be engaged in authentic listening where they can have the opportunity to hear the authentic use of language in meaningful contexts.

Finally, Table 4.5. shows the perceptions of the participants in terms of the student teachers' performance on speaking tasks.

Table 4.5.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of their speaking abilities in performing the related tasks

	Very Important/Important		Not Sure		Not Very Important/Unimportant	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
oral presentations	82.6	80	13	20	4.4	-
oral presentations using multimedia tools	84.8	80	13	20	2.2	-
state opinions on different topics (discussions/debates)	70	100	10.9	-	19.1	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As reported in Table 4.5., the performance in tasks namely, giving oral presentations (ST: M=1.60, SD=1.02 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44), giving oral presentations using multimedia tools (ST: M=1.65, SD=0.79 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.89) and stating opinions on different topics (discussions/debates) (ST: M=2.26, SD=1.21 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83) were considered crucial for the progress in speaking.

Apart from the perceptions of the student teachers' performance related to the four language skills, the results gathered from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire were also used to report the difficulties the student teachers had while using the language strategies in related tasks.

To begin, Table 4.6. displays the perceptions of the student teachers and the course instructors in terms of the difficulty experienced with the application of the reading strategies in the course requirements.

2

² The means are based on a 5-point Likert scale where a represents always, b frequently, c sometimes, d rarely and e never. (Low mean indicates high agreement; high mean indicates low agreement.)

Table 4.6.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the reading strategies in performing the related tasks

	Always/Frequently		Sometimes		Rarely/Never	
	STs	CIIs	STs	CIIs	STs	CIIs
recognize words automatically	67	80	30.8	20	2.2	-
guess the meaning of an unknown word from context	78	80	22	20	-	-
recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships	79.2	100	19.7	-	1.1	-
identify key information	73.7	80	26.3	20	-	-
predict the content of a text	69.3	100	30.7	-	-	-
understand information in a text when not openly stated	77	100	23	-	-	-
read and respond critically	74.8	100	25.2	-	-	-
distinguish fact from opinion	80.2	100	19.8	-	-	-
ask questions about a text	76.9	100	23.1	-	-	-
read carefully and understand the details of a text	3.3	-	26.4	20	70.3	80

go through a text quickly to get the general idea	75.8	100	24.2	-	-	-
read quickly and selectively to find important information	79.1	100	20.9	-	-	-
search for simple information	79.1	100	20.9	-	-	-
distinguish the main idea from the supporting details	78	100	22	-	-	-
identify cause-effect relationships	76.9	100	23.1	-	-	-
understand writer's aim/attitude	74.8	100	25.2	-	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As can be seen from Table 4.6., both groups agreed that the student teachers had problems while using the following reading strategies: recognizing words automatically (ST: M=2.12, SD=0.86 / CI: M=2.20, SD=0.44), distinguishing the main idea from supporting details (ST: M=1.94, SD=0.70 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.00), predicting the content of a text (ST: M=1.95, SD=0.81 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), reading and responding critically (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.71 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), asking questions about a text (ST: M=2.02, SD=0.66 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), going through a text quickly to get a general idea (ST: M=1.60, SD=0.54 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), searching for simple information (ST: M=2.03, SD=0.67 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), and identifying key information (ST: M=2.02, SD=0.71 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83).

The participants also shared the viewpoint that the student teachers found it difficult to read quickly and selectively to find important information (ST: 1.95, SD=0.68 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), guess the meaning of an unknown word from context (ST: M=1.94, SD=0.70 / CI: M=2.20, SD=0.44), recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships (ST: M=1.89, SD=0.75 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), identify cause-effect

relationships (ST: M=1.96, SD=0.70 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), understand writer's aim/attitude (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.99 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), understand information when not openly stated (ST: M=2.13, SD=0.77 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54) and distinguish fact from opinion (ST: M=1.90, SD=0.70 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54).

On the contrary, both groups indicated that the student teachers did not experience much difficulty with '*reading carefully and understanding the details of a text*' (ST= M=3.96, SD=0.87 / CI: M=4.20, SD=0.83). Since the students are usually expected to read a text carefully, understand the details and then answer the related questions, this particular strategy was perceived easier than the others.

Additionally, according to the pre-needs analysis questionnaire, the student teachers and the course instructors perceived the application of the writing strategies in related tasks to be problematic as well (See Table 4.7.).

Table 4.7.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the writing strategies in performing the related tasks

	Always/Frequently		Sometimes		Rarely/Never	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
summarize information in your own words	67	80	30.8	20	2.2	-
combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment	80.3	80	18.7	20	1	-
organize writing to express major and minor ideas	79.2	80	19.8	20	1	-

organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes	74.8	80	33	20	2.2	-
organize ideas to show cause and effect relationships	77	100	22	-	2	-
organize ideas for argumentative purposes	79.2	80	20.8	20	-	-
organize ideas to describe events	67	80	30.8	20	2.2	-
write references and quotations	79.2	80	19.8	20	1	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As Table 4.7. shows, both groups pointed out that the student teachers could not apply the writing strategies such as, summarizing information in their own words (ST: M=2.04, SD=0.88/ M=1.80, SD=0.83), combining information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment (ST: M=1.86, SD=0.79 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), organizing writing to express major and minor ideas (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.81 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), organizing ideas for compare and contrast purposes (ST: M=1.90, SD=0.81 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), organizing ideas to show cause and effect relationships (ST: M=1.92, SD=0.87 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54) and organizing ideas for argumentative purposes (ST: M=1.94, SD=0.84 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70).

Organizing ideas to describe events (ST: M=2.04, SD=0.88 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83) and writing references and quotations (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.81 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70) were also among the writing strategies where the student teachers faced difficulty in the given requirements as well.

Furthermore, when asked about the perceptions of the student teachers' application of the listening strategies, both groups asked for some training. The percentages are shown in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the listening strategies in performing the related tasks

	Always/Frequently		Sometimes		Rarely/Never	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
understand information when not openly stated in a lecture	62.7	100	37.3	-	-	-
predict the content of a lecture	1.1	100	25.3	-	73.6	-
understand the subject matter of a lecture	82.4	100	17.6	-	40	-
listen for specific information	80.2	100	19.8	-	-	-
distinguish fact from opinion	80.2	100	19.8	-	47.8	-
listen to a lecture to take effective notes	73.7	100	25.2	-	1.1	-
follow question/answer sessions	75.9	100	24.1	-	-	-
understand spoken instructions	75.9	100	24.1	-	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CI=Course instructors.

Looking at the table above, it can be stated that the use of listening strategies in the given tasks was also problematic among the student teachers. Specifically, they experienced problems while: listening for specific information (ST: $M=1.92$, $SD=0.68$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), distinguishing fact from opinion (ST: $M=1.92$, $SD=0.68$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), understanding spoken instructions (ST: $M=1.97$, $SD=0.71$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), understanding the subject matter of a lecture (ST: $M=1.89$, $SD=0.67$ / CI: $M=1.80$, $SD=0.54$), understanding information when not openly stated in a lecture (ST: $M=2.13$, $SD=0.77$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), listening to a lecture to take effective notes (ST: $M=2.02$, $SD=0.74$ / CI: $M=2.00$, $SD=0.00$), and following question/answer sessions (ST: $M=1.97$, $SD=0.71$ / CI: $M=2.00$, $SD=0.00$).

The only disagreement between the two groups was in terms of '*predicting the content of a lecture*'. While the student teachers stated that they could use this strategy in their assignments (ST: $M=4.03$ / $SD=0.78$), the course instructors believed that they needed some training (CI: $M=1.80$, $SD=0.54$). A possible explanation of this finding might be that the student teachers perceived this strategy as predicting the content of a lecture by simply looking at the visual aids and giving one word answers, whereas the course instructors wanted the student teachers to be able to talk about the content of the lecture by expressing their ideas in more details during peer led discussions.

Finally, according to the perceptions of the participants, the student teachers had difficulty in using speaking strategies as shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9.

Percentages for the student teachers' perceptions in terms of the difficulty experienced with the speaking strategies in performing the related tasks

	Always/Frequently		Sometimes		Rarely/Never	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
ask relevant questions in class	74.8	100	23	-	2.2	-
participate in discussions/debates	67.1	100	31.7	-	1.2	-
give oral presentations	77	100	17.6	-	5.4	-
react to speech and lecture	75.9	100	24.1	-	-	-
produce correct pronunciation	73.7	100	25.2	-	1.1	-
provide solutions to given problems	62.7	100	37.3	-	-	-
summarize information in your own words	65.3	100	17.4	-	17.3	-
express your ideas in your own words	63	100	28.3	-	8.7	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As illustrated above, the student teachers could not use the following strategies in the speaking tasks effectively: reacting to speech and lectures (ST: $M=1.97$, $SD=0.71$ / CI: $M=1.40$, $SD=0.54$), expressing their ideas in their own words (ST: $M=2.02$, $SD=1.04$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), producing correct pronunciation (ST: $M=2.02$, $SD=0.74$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), providing solutions to given problems (ST: $M=2.13$, $SD=0.77$ / CI: $M=1.40$, $SD=0.54$) and giving oral presentations (ST: $M=2.28$, $SD=1.06$ / CI: $M=1.40$, $SD=0.54$).

They could not summarize information in their own words (ST: M=2.26, SD=1.16 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), participate in discussions/debates (ST: M=2.28, SD=1.34 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44) and ask relevant questions in class (ST: M=2.34, SD=1.26 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54) either. Similar to the previous findings related to the application of the reading, listening and writing strategies in given tasks, the student teachers also needed training on the effective use of the speaking strategies.

4. 2. 2. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews related to the Student Teachers'

Perceived Language Needs

4. 2. 2. 1. *The General Views of the Course Instructors and Student Teachers related to the Language Preparatory Program*

When asked what the primary aim of the ELT program should be, both the student teachers and the course instructors stated that it should provide training to teachers who are open to learning, competent in the basic language skills and strategies, and serve as good models to the students not only as a teacher but also as a whole person. In relation to this issue, the participants made the following comments:

I always stress the importance of being a good model for the students both as a teacher and as a whole person. Being competent in English and open to learning helps teachers grow as idealist and professional individuals (Course instructor 1, Interview).

I think that one of the most important things in our profession is to serve as a good model. We as future teachers should master the language skills and strategies effectively both for our academic studies and future career (Student teacher 1, Interview).

In addition, the two groups pointed out that all basic language skills and strategies should be mastered by the student teachers. As they are the future teacher models, they will be responsible for developing the fluency and accuracy of their students. In other words, they are the ones who will teach students to “learn how to learn” by transferring their content knowledge effectively.

They also added that the four language skills are equally important, and the teachers should have full competence in each of them to attain success in their academic studies and future career. Particularly, they should improve their productive (speaking and writing) and receptive (listening and speaking) skills to use the language effectively in different contexts. Therefore, the ELT program should focus on strategy training considering the four language skills as shown in the excerpts below:

Strategy training is one of the most important concepts to be focused on in the program. As long as the student teachers are trained how to use strategies related to the language skills effectively, they can transfer their content knowledge, and teach their future students learn how to learn (Course instructor 2, Interview).

Learning how to learn is the motto that should be used by the student teachers. They should not just know the language but also be able to use it effectively. Shortly, they should be able to transfer their content knowledge. To achieve this, the program should provide them with strategy training in terms of the four language skills (Course instructor 3, Interview).

Being competent in the four language skills is crucial. We as future teachers should especially improve both our receptive and productive skills to be able to use language more effectively in our classrooms in the future (Student teacher 2, Interview).

I think that we need to learn how to use the language strategies in our course requirements. As future teachers, we should master the four language skills (Student teacher 3, Interview).

4. 2. 2. 2. Reading

Considering the student teachers' reading abilities, both groups stated that various tasks such as, course handouts, lecture notes, textbooks or instructions for projects should be included in the program, which would enhance the student teachers' background knowledge on different topics and provide them with the opportunity to use the related strategies in meaningful contexts. Some of the participants expressed the following viewpoints:

Student teachers should not just read passages from textbooks but they should be engaged in different reading types like, course handouts or instructions for projects. They should see different uses of language, which will enhance their background knowledge on different topics (Course instructor 4, Interview).

Reading seems to be boring. We usually follow the textbook and it becomes monotonous after a while. I believe that if reading is supported with different tasks from course handouts or magazines, it can be more enjoyable (Student teacher 4, Interview).

Furthermore, the course instructors argued that the student teachers face some comprehension difficulties since they are not aware of the strategies as, skimming, scanning or making inferences they could apply while reading. The student teachers also made this argument as follows:

The passages are sometimes very long and I get lost after some time. I cannot find the main idea or the key information easily. I think if we are taught how to use the reading strategies, reading can be more fun (Student teacher 5, Interview).

Strategy training is very important in reading. As long as the students are guided in how to use the reading strategies as, skimming or scanning, they can become more successful readers (Course instructor 5, Interview).

Finally, according to the participants, careful reading, critical reading, synthesizing information from different resources and extensive reading play a crucial role to improve the student teachers' reading ability and thus, should be included in the program. As indicated in the excerpts below, the two groups of participants made the following comments:

Reading is not just moving down the lines but it is actually reading between lines. Reading carefully and critically and being able to synthesize information is what is needed for effective reading. To achieve this, student teachers should not just read in the course but outside the classroom as well (Course instructor 6, Interview).

I always wanted to read some English books outside the class, but I need some guidance on understanding what I read. I believe that if we are given some choices of different books and provided with training on how to use the reading strategies effectively, reading can be fun (Student teacher 6, Interview).

4. 2. 2. 3. Writing

The participants stated that writing book reports, term papers, essay-type questions and essays in reactions to reading are important for the development of writing ability. Two of the participants commented on this issue as follows:

Writing is one of the most important skills to be developed. Thereby, the student teachers should be involved in different writing tasks such as, book reports, reaction papers and term papers in order to learn how to use the language effectively (Course instructor 7, Interview).

The writing course should especially focus on the process of writing. We should be taught how to organize our ideas and discuss the given topic in details. Book reports and essays can help us improve our writing ability effectively (Student teacher 7, Interview).

The two groups also drew attention to the importance of research in writing. Searching for different topics and synthesizing information were identified as the two fundamental components to help the student teachers become better writers as stated below:

Student teachers should be taught how to search for different topics and be able to synthesize what they read. I believe, this will help them develop their critical thinking skills (Course instructor 8, Interview).

We as future teachers should also be researchers. We should search for different topics, express our ideas clearly and develop our background knowledge to be able to transfer it to our future students (Student teacher 8, Interview).

Lastly, when asked about the weaknesses in writing, both groups claimed that the student teachers experienced difficulty while using the writing strategies in their requirements. The course instructors indicated that the reason for this might be the fact that the student teachers have not developed their surface (grammar based) and deep (meaning based) structures yet. To put it differently, they cannot do spell check, paraphrase and synthesize information, and use rhetoric structures which raises the problems of plagiarism and incoherence in writing. In relation to this issue, the two groups made the following comments:

Student teachers need training particularly in using the writing strategies effectively in their assignments. They should be taught how to introduce the topic, support their ideas and write concluding remarks. In order to do this, they should develop their surface and deep structures. They should be able to do spell check, paraphrase, synthesize information and use rhetoric questions (Course instructor 9, Interview).

Plagiarism and incoherence in writing are two most common problems in student teachers' writing. They search for certain information and state other people's opinion without giving any citations. They also express their ideas without extracting the key information and combining the related ideas. To avoid these two problems of plagiarism and incoherence in writing, there should be more focus on paraphrasing and synthesizing information (Course instructor 10, Interview).

Although I love writing, I have difficulty with transferring what I read while writing. I cannot use my own words and find it very difficult to express others' ideas efficiently (Student teacher 9, Interview).

I think that there should be more focus on how to write. We need more guidance on using writing strategies to be able to use the language effectively in our paragraphs or essays (Student teacher 10, Interview).

4. 2. 2. 4. Listening

In relation to this component, both groups mentioned that the process of preparing effective class presentations and following lectures to take notes and take part in question/answer sessions are crucial for the improvement of listening ability. Particularly, the course instructors stated that the student teachers cannot listen between the lines due to lack of their critical thinking skills. To put it more simply, they cannot synthesize and analyze what has been said. The participating course instructors and student teachers said:

Listening to lectures and taking notes are essential components of the listening course. However, the student teachers have difficulties while listening between lines and identifying the key information. To overcome this problem, they should be trained in how to use the listening strategies in order to synthesize and analyze what has been said effectively (Course instructor 11, Interview)

I really like asking questions or sharing my ideas after listening to a lecture. Preparing a presentation on what I just listened is also fun. But sometimes I find it difficult to understand what has been said and need more guidance (Student teacher 11, Interview).

Additionally, the significance of selective listening was also emphasized by the participants. In other words, the student teachers should be able to identify key information or the important details while listening.

Finally, both groups agreed that the instructors should not use Turkish but rather simplify their English during the course. A course instructor and a student teacher explained:

Listening between lines should be focused in the courses to help the student teachers become selective listeners. When a student cannot understand a point, the teacher can use simple sentences in English (Course instructor 12, Interview).

Listening to lectures can be sometimes boring. If we are taught how to select key information while listening, it can be easier. Although it might be difficult to understand some information, I think that the course instructors can provide us with simplified explanations in English (Student teacher 12, Interview).

4. 2. 2. 5. Speaking

On being asked about the importance of doing oral presentations (with or without multimedia tools) and taking part in discussions/debates, both groups pointed out that these two components were crucial to improve the student teachers' use of language and thus, should be integrated in the speaking course.

Furthermore, the course instructors indicated that the student teachers lacked fluency and accuracy in English due to their incompetence in critical thinking skills which should be given more attention in the program as indicated below:

Speaking is one of the most difficult skills to be developed. Fluency and accuracy should be particularly emphasized to overcome the incompetence in critical thinking skills. In this way, the student teachers can prepare more effective presentations and express their ideas on different topics clearly (Course instructor 13, Interview).

I love speaking but I am afraid of making grammar and pronunciation mistakes. So, although I want to participate, I resist. In my opinion, there is need for more guidance on how to use the language effectively in our presentations and discussions/debates (Student teacher 13, Interview).

4. 3. Findings Related to the Goals, Objectives, Materials and the Language Teaching Approach of the Language Preparatory Program

In an attempt to answer the sub-research questions namely, 1b, 1c and 1d, the goals, objectives, materials and the language teaching approach of the Language Preparatory Program were identified according to the findings obtained through the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview. In other words, the nature of the program was based upon the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs.

The present study employed an integrated syllabus design to meet the perceived language needs of the student teachers and help them reach the expected level of proficiency in English. To fulfill these goals, a skills-based and a structural syllabi were developed which aimed to promote both receptive and productive skills by mastering and internalizing the grammatical rules, stimulating interactive language use and encouraging personal involvement during the learning process. The syllabi were designed for three different proficiency levels namely, intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced.

The program was based on Social Constructivist Approach to teaching and learning. The student teacher was a negotiator-between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning being engaged in authentic tasks which reflect real-life situations and demands. The course instructor was no longer a dominant figure but rather a facilitator of communication who provided meaningful input and used the target language fluently and appropriately. The aim of language (and thus the aim of language teaching) was communication. The achievement of effective and fluent communication was crucial as opposed to a focus on accuracy and control of errors (Stetsenko and Arieviditch, 1997; Au, 1998; Roberts, 1998).

Furthermore, considering the student teachers who participated in the study, most of them will work at schools approved by the Ministry of Education where the foreign language instruction is mostly based on Social Constructivism. The lesson plans including goals and objectives, materials, tasks, tests etc. are usually prepared according to this approach. Thus,

they should go under training of the Social Constructivist Approach in their undergraduate program.

Based on the discussion above, the preparatory program was designed within this framework. Materials were selected and developed accordingly. The primary emphasis was on the development of the four language skills as well as grammar of the language.

The major goal of the program was to introduce the student teachers to the strategies related to the four language skills which were sequenced from simple to more complex based on the data gathered from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and semi-structured interview.

The program comprised twenty-eight hours of instruction weekly: six hours for each of the four skills (24) and four hours of grammar (4).

By the end of the program, the student teachers were expected to reach the competence to use English in oral and written form both accurately and fluently.

In the following sections, the syllabus of the program is defined in terms of each component at three different proficiency levels.

4. 3. 1. The Reading Syllabus

In relation to the findings gathered from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, the main goal of the reading syllabus is to raise the student teachers' awareness of reading strategies and give them the opportunity to practice using them in meaningful contexts.

“Basic Reading Power”, “More Reading Power” and “Advanced Reading Power” by Mickulecky and Jeffries (2004) are the main textbooks used for the three different proficiency levels.

In all three books, reading is perceived as an interactive, goal-oriented and strategic process. The books have a similar format. Each unit starts with a pre-reading activity which gives the student teachers the opportunity to activate their background knowledge on a

variety of high-interest topics, such as news media, education, global business, fashion or population growth, and connect it to their current knowledge. This previewing activity also helps the student teachers develop expectations about the content and organization before they start reading.

After familiarizing the student teachers with the content of the reading text, the course instructors provide them with strategy training. Similar in nature to the spiral syllabus, the reading strategies are introduced to the student teachers by engaging them in reading tasks suitable for their proficiency level. For instance, the student teachers in the intermediate and upper-intermediate classes are asked to read paragraphs or dialogues to make inferences by providing one or two word answers. However, the student teachers at the advanced level are engaged in reading longer and more complex texts followed by open-ended questions that require making inferences according to the given facts or situation (See Appendix J for sample reading practice at three different proficiency levels).

Parallel to the training provided for making inferences, the student teachers are familiarized with other crucial strategies such as, skimming, scanning or predicting the content of a text. The course instructors first raise the student teachers' awareness by providing them with practice related to the effective strategy use in reading tasks which differ according to their level of proficiency. For instance, while the intermediate student teachers are engaged in simpler reading activities as, reading paragraphs or conversations, the upper-intermediate and advanced groups are provided with longer and more complex reading passages. As for the strategy training, all three groups of student teachers are first guided on the process of identifying the supporting details in a reading text, which helps them identify the main idea and the topic sentence. Then, they are introduced to the process of recognizing the patterns of organization such as, listing, sequencing, cause/effect or problem/solution which serve as main guides to understand and follow writer's ideas more efficiently. Next, the student teachers are asked to identify context clues including examples, synonyms,

antonyms and comparisons for the purposes of searching for simple information, guessing the meaning of an unknown word from context and predicting the content of a text. Finally, they are taught how to go over a text quickly and look for a specific piece of information (scan a text) and skim a text to get the general idea.

On the other hand, there are some differences among the three groups in terms of the instruction on the reading strategies. To illustrate, apart from the training provided to the three groups of students on the reading strategies mentioned above, the advanced and the upper-intermediate student teachers are introduced to the concept of fast reading. In other words, they learn how to read meaningful phrases or chunks by dividing up longer sentences to form connections among the information provided in the text with what they already know about the given subject. They also receive instruction on skipping over unknown words and practicing timed readings following certain guidelines such as, recording the reading rate and the exact time of the beginning and ending of the reading process. All these strategies help the student teachers become faster readers.

Furthermore, the student teachers are provided with some course handouts, computer-presented texts and articles related to the key concepts in ELT (See Appendix K). The main purpose is to introduce them to different reading texts which gives them the opportunity to use the related strategies effectively, and also improve their vocabulary knowledge on teaching.

Finally, the student teachers are required to do some extensive reading and write book reports according to the guidelines provided by the course instructors (See Appendix L). Specifically, they have to provide some information about the author of the book, briefly summarize the book by focusing on descriptions related to the characters, setting and theme, and also express their personal ideas about the book. The aim is to improve the student teachers' reading ability, develop their vocabulary knowledge and help them gain a reading habit outside the class.

4. 3. 2. *The Writing Syllabus*

As in the reading syllabus, the aim of the writing syllabus is to raise the student teachers' awareness of the writing strategies and their use in meaningful contexts.

“Introduction to Academic Writing (Levels 2 and 3)” by Oshima and Hogue (2007) and “Gateways to Academic Writing” by Meyers (2005) are the major textbooks used for the three different levels of proficiency. The main reason why these books were chosen is because they focus on strategy training ranging from organizing and expressing ideas clearly to form simple paragraphs to composing well-organized essays.

Parallel to the reading course, according to their proficiency level, the student teachers receive training considering the effective use of the writing strategies. To begin, all three groups of student teachers are first provided with some model paragraphs on different topics in order to familiarize them with the basic structures namely, the topic sentence, supporting sentences and the concluding sentence. Then, they are introduced to the actual process of writing. First, they are asked to explore ideas by having three questions in mind namely, “*What is my subject? What is my purpose? and Who is my audience?*”. In other words, before writing the student teachers should have something to say, a reason for saying it and someone to say it before they start writing. Then, the student teachers are required to list their thoughts freely. In other words, they are introduced to the process of prewriting by learning the techniques of brainstorming, clustering and freewriting. Once they decide on their ideas, they are required to organize them by selecting, subtracting, and adding them. Shortly, they learn how to prepare an outline before they start writing a paragraph on a given topic. After the student teachers finish prewriting, select their best ideas, expand on them and arrange them in a reasonable order, they are introduced to different types of paragraphs suitable for their proficiency level. To illustrate, the student teachers at the intermediate and upper-intermediate levels are taught how to write narrative, descriptive, process and compare/contrast paragraphs. On the other hand, the student teachers at the advanced level

received guidance on writing for/against and definition/informative paragraphs in addition to the ones previously mentioned for the lower groups.

After being familiarized with the process of writing a paragraph, the student teachers in all three groups receive training on essay organization. Specifically, they are provided with model essays based on their level of proficiency and introduced to the fundamental steps of writing a well-organized essay. First, they learn how to plan an essay by prewriting, organizing, grouping ideas logically and making an outline. Then, they are instructed on the essay structure including the introductory paragraph, body paragraphs and the concluding paragraph. They particularly received training in using linking words effectively to provide transitions between paragraphs.

Once the student teachers receive training on writing a well-organized essay, they are actively engaged into the writing process. To exemplify, while the intermediate student teachers are asked to write a compare/contrast essay, the upper-intermediate student teachers are involved in the writing process, for/against, compare/contrast and opinion essays. As for the advanced student teaches, they are required to write more academic essays such as, cause and effect, classification, and argumentative apart from the ones introduced at the lower levels.

Finally, all three groups of student teachers are required to write one or two drafts, which the course instructors carefully evaluate in terms of the content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics. Finally, they produce the final copy by editing and proofreading their last draft and submit it to their course instructor (See Appendix M for sample writing practice at three different proficiency levels).

Apart from essay writing, the student teachers are expected to write reaction papers following specific guidelines (See Appendix N) after reading different articles on the key concepts in ELT as, native-speakerism, fluency or accuracy. In this way, they get familiarized with the key concepts of teaching which helps them follow the undergraduate courses more

efficiently. It also aids with the development of their critical skills by providing the opportunity to clearly express ideas related to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT).

4. 3. 3. The Listening Syllabus

As in the other components of the Language Preparatory Program, the listening syllabus also attempts to raise the student teachers' awareness in terms of the application of the listening strategies while performing related tasks, and to help the student teachers use them in meaningful contexts.

The following books were chosen for the three proficiency levels: "Contemporary Topics 2" by (Kisslinger and Rost, 2002) (the intermediate level), "Academic Encounters 1" by (Sarabria, 2004) (the upper-intermediate level) and "Academic Encounters 2" by (Espeseth, 1999) (the advanced level).

All three books aim to introduce the student teachers to the fundamental listening strategies by engaging them in three main sections namely, before listening, while listening and after listening. In all three sections, the student teachers receive training in the application of the listening strategies in tasks suitable for their proficiency levels. For example, while the intermediate and the upper-intermediate student teachers are asked to listen for specific information (e.g. main idea) and choose the correct option, the student teachers at advanced levels listen for specific details followed by answering open-ended questions

To begin, in all three books, a unit starts with a previewing activity to stimulate interest and elicit background knowledge and vocabulary related to the topic before listening. The student teachers try to predict the content of the lecture by reading the title and looking at the pictures. Then, they are provided with some key vocabulary they will hear in the lecture which helps them to form expectations about the subject.

As for the second section, the student teachers are asked to listen to a lecture or a conversation and take some notes. Specifically, they are required to take notes to identify the main idea and the specific details followed by activities such as, sentence completion (one word answer for intermediate and two/three word answers for upper-intermediate levels) or summary completion (for advanced levels).

For the last section, the student teachers are engaged in post-listening activities like, writing a short summary by paraphrasing ideas from the lecture (intermediate), think critically about the topic by exchanging their ideas with their peers (upper-intermediate) or discuss the information they hear by comparing it from other resources such as, magazines (advanced). The aim is to provide the student teachers with the opportunity to deepen their understanding about the subject (See Appendix O for sample listening practice at three different proficiency levels).

Finally, all three groups are asked to prepare a class presentation after being introduced to the fundamental steps of preparing a good presentation. The aim of this task is to improve their background knowledge, and teach them how to become effective listeners as well as speakers.

4. 3. 4. The Speaking Syllabus

The findings of the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview indicated that there was a need for strategy training regarding the student teachers' speaking abilities as well. Specifically, the speaking course emphasizes the fundamental stages of speech preparation and delivery including the integration and development of audio and visual aids.

The course includes a coursepack gathered from various resources like, the internet, magazines or books. The reason of using various resources rather than a single book is to provide the student teachers with as many resources as possible that would give them the opportunity to see the use of language in different contexts effectively.

At the beginning of each course, all student teachers are provided with some warm up activities like, listening to a brief lecture or watching a short video. Then, they are asked to react on what they listened by exchanging their ideas with their peers. The aim is to provide the student teachers with some background knowledge on various topics.

Furthermore, the course instructors engage the student teachers in a variety of tasks according to their level of proficiency. For example, the student teachers at the intermediate level receive guidance on making a small talk on various subjects such as, weather or traffic. In other words, they are given some samples of short conversations focusing on the features of opening and closing a conversation which shows the transition among the participants. Then, they are provided with certain situations like, shopping, meeting someone at a movie or waiting at the bus stop and expected to prepare a short conversation in pairs or groups.

As for the student teachers at the upper-intermediate level, the course instructors engage them in tasks that require more production. For instance, they want the student teachers to provide solutions to specific problems as, AIDS or smoking. To put it more simply, after familiarizing the student teachers with the key vocabulary related to the subject, the course instructors demonstrate a model discussion by asking the student teachers to read a short conversation or watch a video suggesting solutions to the given problem. Then, the student teachers are asked to work in groups, think of possible solutions and discuss them with their peers.

Similar to the discussion above, the student teachers at the advanced level are provided with tasks that require more advanced vocabulary and complex grammatical structures. To illustrate, the student teachers are asked to debate or perform a role play on different topics

like, obesity or cannibalism according to the following three stages offered by Richards (2008): *preparing* (reviewing vocabulary related to the content), *modeling and eliciting* (demonstrating the stages that are typically involved in the transaction, eliciting suggestions, and teaching the functional language) and *practicing and reviewing*: assigning student teachers' roles and begin practicing. In this way, the student teachers are given the opportunity to use the speaking strategies such as, express their ideas in their own words or ask relevant questions to exchange ideas with their peers effectively (See Appendix P for sample speaking practice at three different proficiency levels).

After the student teachers are familiarized with the speaking strategies, they are required to prepare a presentation on current topics like, the technology age, cultural diversity or language acquisition according to specific guidelines provided by the course instructor. This gives them with the opportunity to use the language effectively and interact with their peers.

4. 3. 5. *The Structural Syllabus*

The primary aim of the structural syllabus is to enhance the student teachers' grammatical knowledge and to give them the opportunity to practice the grammatical structures at three different proficiency levels. Another aim of this component is to focus on the areas that the student teachers generally have grammatical problems observed by the course instructors.

The preparatory program includes only four hours of grammar because the content mainly consists of controlled activities for grammar practice to help them fill in their grammatical knowledge gaps. It is also assumed that the student teachers already came with some grammatical knowledge from high school since they all graduated from language departments at their high schools. In this way, this component is considered as a structural support to the skills component.

“First Certificate Language Practice and Destination C1&C2” by (May and Taylore-Knowles, 2007), “CPE Use of English 1” by (Evans, 2002) and “First Certificate Language Practice” by (Vince and Emmerson, 2003) are the main textbooks used for the intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced classes.

The books have similar formats. Each unit starts with an explanation of the structure, which will be studied in detail throughout the unit. This also serves as a brainstorming activity, giving the teacher the chance to elicit useful language and ideas on the structure.

After familiarizing the student teachers with the target structures, they are required to practice grammar mainly in controlled activities such as, choosing the correct answer, gap filling or matching and editing (finding errors in a text) according to their proficiency level. To exemplify, while the intermediate group is engaged in exercises related to basic grammatical structures as, tenses or modals (present and past), the upper-intermediate student teachers are asked to perform tasks on complex grammatical structures like, passive or conditionals (type 1 and 2). As for the advanced level, the student teachers practice grammar that requires knowledge of more advanced structures such as, relative clauses or reported speech (See Appendix Q for sample grammar practice at three different proficiency levels).

4. 4. Summary of Part 1

The first part of the study related to the design of the Language Preparatory Program aimed to identify the perceptions of the student teachers’ language needs. Statistical analysis of the data showed that the student teachers needed a program specific to their own context that would provide them with strategy training in terms of improving the four language skills and give them the opportunity to practice them in meaningful contexts.

The program is based on Social Constructivist Approach to teaching and learning. The learners are considered as active participants while the course instructors are guides who scaffold them during the learning process.

Based on the results gathered from the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, an integrated syllabus design is employed to meet the perceived language needs of the student teachers and help them to reach the expected level of proficiency in English.

Specifically, skills-based syllabus and a structural syllabus are designed for three proficiency levels namely, intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced. As for the skills-based syllabus, relative emphasis is given to each language skill. The primary purpose is to raise the student teachers' awareness of the language strategies appropriated for their proficiency levels, and provide them with the opportunity to use them in meaningful contexts. Additionally, the aim of the structural syllabus is to enhance the student teachers' grammatical knowledge and provide them with the opportunity to practice the related structures in tasks based on three levels of proficiency namely, intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced.

At the end of the program, the student teachers are expected to reach the competence to use English accurately, by internalizing and mastering the grammatical structures, and also fluently, by applying the language strategies in related tasks effectively.

4. 5. Findings Related to the Evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program

As for the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, the findings of the needs analysis questionnaire about the student teachers' assumed learning needs, the post-needs analysis questionnaire in relation to the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs together with the semi-structured interviews were administered both to the student teachers and the course instructors to find out their feelings about the Language Preparatory Program.

4. 5. 1. The Findings of the Needs Analysis Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers (ST) in terms of their Feelings whether the Program has met their Assumed Learning Needs

Based on the data obtained through the needs analysis questionnaire given to the student teachers after they completed the Language Preparatory Program, Table 5.1. illustrates the results whether it has met their assumed learning needs.

Table 5.1.

Percentages for the student teachers' feelings of whether the program has met their assumed learning needs

	Strongly Agree/Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Disagree/Disagree
improve listening skills with active participation in the lessons	79.2	18.7	2.1
improve speaking skills with active participation in the lessons	70.8	25	4.2
apply different writing strategies effectively in various tasks	71.6	9.5	19
apply different speaking strategies effectively in various tasks	90.5	9.5	-
apply different listening strategies effectively in various tasks	76.2	19	4.8
apply different reading strategies effectively in various tasks	81	4.8	14.2
apply the grammar rules in various tasks	-	28.6	71.4

improve note taking skills	1.1	29.3	69.6
improve presentation skills	85.7	9.5	4.8
learn key terms related to English Language Teaching (e.g. portfolio, feedback)	67.1	32.9	-
speak English effectively in the given assignments	76.2	23.8	-
write a reaction paper on a given topic effectively	76.2	23.8	-
express ideas clearly on a given topic	66.7	33.3	-
think critically on a given topic	81	19	-
summarize texts	66.6	28.6	4.8

3

Looking at Table 5.1., the student teachers shared a common belief that the Language Preparatory Program has met their assumed learning needs regarding the four language skills. To exemplify, after the implementation of the preparatory program, the student teachers argued that they have improved their listening (ST: M=0.76, SD=1.00) and speaking (ST: M=0.89, SD=1.00) skills by participating actively in the lessons. They also stated that they could apply necessary writing (ST: M=1.16, SD=1.00), speaking (ST: M=0.64, SD=1.00), listening (ST: M=0.94, SD=1.00) and reading (ST: M=1.04, SD=1.00) strategies effectively in their course requirements.

Additionally, the participants stated that the program has also aided the performance in the use of following learning strategies: preparing presentations effectively (ST: M=1.71, SD=0.84), learning key terms related to English Language Teaching (e.g. portfolio, feedback) (ST: M=2.33, SD=0.65), speaking English effectively in the given assignments (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.70), writing a reaction paper on a given topic effectively (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.79),

³ The means are based on a 5-point Likert scale where a represents strongly agree, b agree, c somewhat agree, d disagree and e strongly disagree. (Low mean indicates high agreement; high mean indicates low agreement.)

expressing ideas clearly (ST: M=2.19, SD=0.67), thinking critically on a given topic (ST: M=1.80, SD=0.74) and summarizing the text in your own words (ST: M=2.33, SD=0.65).

Nonetheless, the student teachers ranked the following two items lower in the questionnaire: '*applying the grammar rules in various tasks*' (ST: M=3.95, SD=0.74) and '*improving note taking skills*' (ST: M=4.03, SD=0.78).

As for the former item, it was assumed that grammar was indirectly practiced in the program with the primary focus on using the language strategies in the tasks related to the four language skills correctly. Additionally, in the grammar course, the student teachers were mostly engaged in controlled activities such as, multiple choice, gap filling or matching. To put it in another way, there was not much emphasis on practicing grammar through communicative tasks like, role plays or information gap.

As for the latter item, the participating student teachers pointed out that note taking was not integrated much in the program. Rather, the student teachers were required to listen to a lecture and answer the related questions, which caused them to experience difficulty while taking notes.

4. 5. 2. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews in terms of the Student Teachers'

Assumed Learning Needs

Apart from the perceived language needs, the student teachers were also asked whether the Language Preparatory Program met their assumed learning needs. According to the gathered data, the student teachers have improved their performance in the application of the learning strategies with respect to reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities. To illustrate, they learned how to prepare effective presentations in the listening and speaking courses, write book reports in the reading course and write a well-organized essay in the writing course.

The program also introduced them to some key concepts in ELT such as, inductive and deductive teaching and peer feedback by providing them with some simple articles related to their own field of study.

Additionally, the student teachers stated that after being enrolled in the program, they could express their ideas clearly and think critically on a given topic. Some of the participants commented on this issue as follows:

The program has helped us to use the language strategies in given tasks effectively. For example, we could easily find a general idea after reading a long text or organize our ideas clearly while writing an essay (Student teacher 1, Interview).

I am really happy that I have learned how to prepare effective presentations. I have learned how to search for specific information using different resources and present my subject to the class (Student teacher 2, Interview).

The Language Preparatory Program did not just help me learn how to write essays or prepare presentations, but also learn vocabulary items related to ELT. I am so excited that I have learned some key concepts in ELT like, inductive and deductive teaching and peer feedback (Student teacher 3, Interview).

On the other hand, the student teachers pointed out that the number of grammar hours should be increased in the Language Preparatory Program. They particularly asked for more training on using the grammatical structures accurately while forming complex sentences to express and organize their ideas clearly. To fulfill this aim, they need more guidance related to mastering and internalizing the grammatical structures to form complex sentences effectively as shown below:

I think that the number of grammar hours should be increased in the Language Preparatory Program. We need to be engaged in tasks that will help us to make complex sentences using the grammatical structures accurately (Student teacher 4, Interview).

We need more practice in grammar to help us improve the use of language effectively. In other words, we need more guidance on how to form complex sentences to express and organize our ideas clearly (Student teacher 5, Interview).

4. 5. 3. The Findings of the Post-Needs Analysis Questionnaire given to the Student Teachers (ST) and Course Instructors (CI) in terms of their Feelings of whether the Program has met the Student Teacher’s Perceived Language Needs

According to the results obtained through the post-needs analysis questionnaire, the student teachers’ and course instructors’ feelings of whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the perceptions student teachers’ language needs related to the four language skills are presented in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2.

Percentages for student teachers’ and course instructors’ feelings of whether the program has met the perceptions of the student teachers’ language needs related to the four language skills

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CIs	STs	CIs	STs	CIs
Reading	90.2	100	4.6	-	5.2	-
Writing	95.1	100	4.9	-	-	-
Listening	90.2	100	9.8	-	-	-
Speaking	95.1	100	4.9	-	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

4

As the table shows, both groups of participants agreed that the Language Preparatory Program has fulfilled the student teachers’ needs in terms of their performance on the four language skills namely, reading (ST: M=1.51, SD=0.67 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), writing (ST:

⁴ The means are based on a 5-point Likert scale where a represents always, b frequently, c sometimes, d rarely and e r never. (Low mean indicates high agreement; high mean indicates low agreement.)

M=1.21, SD=0.52 / CI: M: 1.40, SD=0.54), speaking (SD: M=1.24, SD=0.53 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54) and listening (ST: M=1.34, SD=0.65 / CI: M=1.40, SD: 0.54).

Furthermore, Table 5.3. below shows the percentages gathered from the post- needs analysis questionnaire with respect to the feelings considering the student teachers' perceptions while performing the reading tasks.

Table 5.3.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of reading related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
textbooks	68.2	100	14.8	-	17	-
articles in journals	46.4	80	14.5	20	39.1	-
reference tools (e.g. dictionaries)	85.4	100	14.6	-	-	-
course handouts	75.6	100	19.5	-	4.9	-
texts on the Internet	73.2	100	24.4	-	2.4	-
computer-presented texts	64.6	100	26.2	-	9.2	20
instructions for projects	67.1	80	18.4	20	14.5	-
newspapers/magazines	7.3	-	29.3	40	63.4	60
lecture notes	63.4	100	26.8	-	9.8	-
works of literature	63.4	80	31.7	20	4.9	20
graphs/ charts/ diagrams/ tables	10.2	-	19.3	20	70.5	80

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

Looking at the table, we can see that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs while reading: textbooks (ST: $M=1.97$, $SD=0.82$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), articles in journals (ST: $M=1.85$, $SD=0.88$ / CI: $M=2.00$, $SD=0.70$), reference tools (e.g. dictionaries) (ST: $M=1.85$, $SD=0.65$ / CI: $M=1.80$, $SD=0.44$), course handouts (ST: $M=1.92$, $SD=1.03$ / CI: $M=1.20$, $SD=0.44$), and texts on the Internet (ST: $M=1.85$, $SD=0.88$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$).

It can be said that after the implementation of the program the student teachers could also handle computer presented texts (ST: $M=2.17$, $SD=0.97$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), instructions for projects (ST: $M=2.29$, $SD=1.00$ / CI: $M=2.00$, $SD=0.70$), lecture notes (ST: $M=2.17$, $SD=0.97$ / CI: $M=1.40$, $SD=0.54$), and works of literature (ST: $M=2.07$, $SD=1.08$ / CI: $M=1.80$, $SD=0.83$) more effectively.

On the other hand, the participants indicated that the program has not facilitated the student teachers' performance in the following reading tasks: '*newspapers/magazines*' (ST: $M=3.75$, $SD=0.85$ / CI: $M=3.80$, $SD=0.83$) and '*graphs/charts/diagrams/tables*' (ST: $M=4.26$, $SD=0.77$ / CI: $M=4.00$, $SD=0.70$). One possible explanation might be the fact that the Language Preparatory Program mainly focused on engaging the student teachers in academic tasks such as, reading academic texts from the internet, textbooks or course handouts. Therefore, these two tasks were not emphasized much during the process of designing the program.

Additionally, in Table 5.4. the percentages for the feelings of the participants whether the preparatory program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs related to their writing abilities are displayed.

Table 5.4.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of writing related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
a resume (CV)	-	-	33.3	20	66.7	80
essays in reactions to readings	85.3	100	9.8	-	4.9	-
references for a report or project	73.8	100	26.2	-	-	-
book reports	80.4	100	19.6	-	-	-
workbook exercises	75.6	80	19.5	20	4.9	-
essay-type questions	92.7	100	7.3	-	-	-
term papers	65.9	80	34.1	-	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As indicated in the table above, the student teachers and the course instructors reported that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs in terms of writing essays in reaction to readings (ST: $M=1.63$, $SD=0.85$ / CI: $M=1.40$, $SD=0.54$) and citing references for a report or project (ST: $M=2.00$, $SD=1.00$ / CI: $M=1.40$, $SD=0.54$).

Besides, the student teachers learned how to write book reports (ST: $M=1.85$, $SD=0.72$ / CI: $M=1.60$, $SD=0.54$), do workbook exercises (ST: $M=2.09$, $SD=0.76$ / CI: $M=1.80$, $SD=0.44$), answer essay-type questions (ST: $M=1.58$, $SD=0.63$ / CI: $M=1.20$, $SD=0.44$) and write term papers (ST: $M=2.04$, $SD=0.80$ / CI: $M=1.20$, $SD=0.44$) after the implementation of the program.

On the other hand, 'writing a resume (CV)' was the only task the course instructors and the student teachers stated the Language Preparatory Program has not fulfilled (ST: M=3.71, SD=0.56 / CI: M=4.20, SD=0.44). As previously explained in the first part of the study, the preparatory program was primarily designed to help the student teachers develop their academic language skills and strategies such as, writing reaction papers or well-organized essay. Thus, it was thought that writing a resume (CV) was more appropriate to be in the undergraduate program.

With reference to the feelings of the participants in relation to the student teachers' perceptions of performance on listening tasks, both groups expressed positive feelings (See Table 5.5.).

Table 5.5.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of listening related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
lectures	85.4	100	14.6	-	-	-
question/answer sessions	73.2	100	26.8	-	-	-
class presentations	80.5	100	19.5	-	-	-
dialogues	36	-	12.2	40	51.8	80

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

According to the table, both groups of participants shared the view that the Language Preparatory Program has helped the student teachers make progress in the following strategies: listening to lectures (ST: M=1.60, SD=0.83 CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), participating in question/answer sessions (ST: M=1.82, SD=0.83 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54) and doing class presentations (ST: M=1.56, SD=0.80 / CI: M=1.20, SD=0.44).

The only task that was ranked lower was *'listening to dialogues'* (ST: M=3.17, SD=0.99 / CI: M=3.80, SD=0.83). A possible explanation behind this finding might be due to the fact that in the preparatory program, the listening course is mostly based on listening to a lecture followed by activities such as, matching or sentence completion which is parallel to what is generally done in the undergraduate program. Thus, listening to dialogues was not integrated much while designing the preparatory program.

Finally, Table 5.6. illustrates the feelings of the participants considering the student teachers' performance on tasks related to their speaking abilities.

Table 5.6.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has met the student teachers' language needs in terms of speaking related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
oral presentations	90.2	100	9.8	-	-	-
oral presentations using multimedia tools	95.1	80	4.9	20	-	-
state opinions on different topics (discussions/debates)	92.7	80	7.3	20	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As reported in Table 5.6., the Language Preparatory Program has improved the perceptions of the student teachers' performance in the following tasks: giving oral presentations (ST: M=1.51, SD=0.67 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), giving oral presentations using multimedia tools (ST: M=1.70, SD=0.55 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83) and stating opinions on different topics (discussions/debates) (ST: M=1.73, SD=0.59 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.89).

Moreover, the findings gathered from the post-needs analysis questionnaire were analyzed to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has aided the application of the strategies in the given assignments.

To begin, Table 5.7. shows the feelings of the student teachers and the course instructors whether the Language Preparatory Program has developed the ability of the student teachers to use the reading strategies in the related tasks effectively.

5

Table 5.7.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the reading strategies in related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
recognize words automatically	70.7	80	29.3	20	-	-
guess the meaning of an unknown word from context	70.7	60	29.3	40	-	-
recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships	78	80	22	20	-	-

⁵ The means are based on a 5-point Likert scale where a represents always, b frequently, c sometimes, d rarely and e never. (Low mean indicates high agreement; high mean indicates low agreement.)

identify key information	68.5	80	31.5	20	-	-
predict the content of a text	70.7	80	29.3	20	-	-
understand information in a text when not openly stated	90.5	100	9.5	-	-	-
read and respond critically	63.9	60	36.1	40	-	-
distinguish fact from opinion	80.5	80	19.5	20	-	-
ask questions about a text	75.6	100	24.4	-	-	-
read carefully and understand the details of a text	80.4	100	19.6	-	-	-
go through a text quickly to get the general idea	85.1	100	14.9	-	-	-
read quickly and selectively to find important information	80.5	100	19.5	-	-	-
search for simple information	82.9	100	17.1	-	-	-
distinguish the main idea from the supporting details	70.7	80	29.3	-	-	-
identify cause-effect relationships	80.5	80	19.5	20	-	-
understand writer's aim/attitude	85.4	80	14.6	20	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As can be seen from the table above, both groups confirmed that after completing the program, the student teachers showed progress in using reading strategies such as, recognizing words automatically (ST: M=1.95, SD=0.80 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83), guessing the meaning of an unknown word from context (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.77 / CI: M=2.00, SD=1.00) and recognizing the organization of ideas to see their relationships (ST: M=1.92, SD=0.72 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83).

In the same way, after the implementation of the program the student teachers could: identify key information (ST: M=2.26, SD=0.70 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83), predict the content of a text (ST: M=2.09, SD=0.70 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), understand information when not openly stated (ST: M=1.71, SD=0.64 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), read and respond critically (ST: M=2.14, SD=0.79 / CI: M=2.20, SD=0.83), distinguish the main idea from supporting details (ST: M=1.95, SD=0.80 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), distinguish fact from opinion (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.72 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83) and ask questions about a text (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.70 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54).

Furthermore, the preparatory program has aided the student teachers in performing the tasks namely, reading carefully and understand the details of a text (ST= M=1.73, SD=0.77 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), going through a text quickly to get a general idea (ST: M=1.90, SD=0.76 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), reading quickly and selectively to find important information (ST: M=2.09, SD=0.70 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70), searching for simple information (ST: M=1.78, SD=0.72 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), identifying cause-effect relationships (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.63 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70) and understanding writer's aim/attitude (ST: M=1.80, SD=0.67 / CI: M=1.80, SD: 0.83).

Additionally, based on the findings obtained through the post-needs analysis questionnaire, the student teachers' and the course instructors' feelings whether the Language Preparatory Program has provided the student teachers with necessary training to apply the writing strategies in the given tasks are presented below (See Table 5.8.).

Table 5.8.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the writing strategies in related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CIs	STs	CIs	STs	CIs
summarize information in your own words	85.4	100	14.6	-	-	-
combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment	70.7	100	29.3	-	-	-
organize writing to express major and supporting ideas	82.9	80	17.1	20	-	-
organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes	80.5	100	19.5	-	-	-
organize ideas to show cause and effect relationships	90.2	80	9.8	20	-	-
organize ideas for argumentative purposes	85.4	80	14.6	20	-	-
organize ideas to describe events	90.2	100	9.8	-	-	-
write references and quotations	-	-	14.2	20	85.8	80

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

According to Table 5.8., both groups of participants expressed positive feelings when asked about the student teachers' use of the following writing strategies: summarizing information in their own words (ST: M=1.70, SD=0.71 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44) and combining information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment (ST: M=2.04, SD=0.73 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54).

Likewise, the preparatory student teachers could: organize their writing to express major and minor ideas (ST: M=2.02, SD=0.90 / M=2.00, SD=0.70), organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes (ST: M=1.80, SD=0.74 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), show cause and effect relationships (ST: M=1.80, SD=0.60 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83), organize ideas for argumentative purposes (ST: M=2.13, SD=1.18 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83) and describe events (ST: M=1.80, SD=0.67 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54) effectively.

In contrast, the two groups felt that the preparatory program has not fulfilled the student teachers' needs with respect to '*writing references and quotations*' (ST: M=4.04, SD=0.74 / CI: M=4.20, SD=0.44). A possible explanation might be the fact that the primary goal of the preparatory program is to provide the student teachers with strategy training related to the four language skills and give them the opportunity to practice them in meaningful contexts. Therefore, it was assumed that writing references and quotations is more appropriate to be introduced in the undergraduate program.

Furthermore, the Language Preparatory Program has aided the student teachers with their performance in applying the necessary listening strategies in related tasks as illustrated in Table 5.9.

Table 5.9.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the listening strategies in related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
understand information when not openly stated in a lecture	70.7	80	29.3	20	-	-
predict the content of a lecture	80.5	80	19.5	20	-	-
understand the subject matter of a lecture	70.7	100	29.3	-	-	-
listen for specific information	70.7	80	29.3	20	-	-
distinguish fact from opinion	85.4	100	14.6	-	-	-
listen to a lecture to take effective notes	-	-	23.8	20	76.2	80
follow question/answer sessions	65.9	80	34.1	20	-	-
understand spoken instructions	75.6	100	24.4	-	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

As indicated in the table above, the participating student teachers and course instructors stressed that after the implementation of the preparatory program, the student teachers were able to use the following strategies effectively: listen for specific information (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.77 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83), predict the content of a lecture (ST: M=1.97, SD=0.65 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83), distinguish fact from opinion (ST: M=1.60, SD=0.73 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.54), understand spoken instructions (ST: M=1.75, SD=0.73 / M=1.60,

SD=0.54), understand the subject matter of a lecture (ST: M=1.92, SD=0.81 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.44), understand information when not openly stated in a lecture (ST: M=1.92, SD=0.81 / CI: M=2.20, SD=0.44) and follow question/answer sessions (ST: M=1.92, SD=0.87 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83).

Nonetheless, the participants argue that the program has focused much on *'listening to a lecture to take effective notes'* (ST: M=4.04, SD=0.74 / CI: M=4.00, SD=0.70). The student teachers were rather involved more in while listening tasks such as, gap filling or matching.

Finally, the student teachers and the course instructors shared the same opinion concerning the fact that the program has raised the student teachers' awareness related to their performance in using the necessary strategies in the speaking tasks appropriately (See Table 6.1.).

Table 6.1.

Percentages for the student teachers' and course instructors' feelings of whether the program has helped the student teachers to improve their use of the speaking strategies in related tasks

	Strongly Agree/Agree		Somewhat Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	STs	CI	STs	CI	STs	CI
ask relevant questions in class	78	80	22	20	-	-
participate in discussions/debates	75.6	100	19.5	-	4.9	-
give oral presentations	80.5	80	19.5	20	-	-
react to speech and lecture	90.2	80	9.8	20	-	-
produce correct pronunciation	70.7	80	29.3	20	-	20
provide solutions to given problems	75.6	60	24.4	40	-	-

summarize information in your own words	75.6	80	24.4	20	-	-
express your ideas in your own words	90.2	80	9.8	20	-	-

Note: STs=Student teachers; CIs=Course instructors.

Related to the findings shown in Table 6.1., the student teachers could react to speech and lectures (ST: M=1.68, SD=0.64 / CI: M=2.20, SD=0.83), express their ideas in their own words (ST: M=1.56, SD=0.67 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54), produce correct pronunciation (ST: M=2.00, SD=0.77 / CI: M=1.60, SD=0.89), provide solutions to given problems (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.79 / CI: M=2.00, SD=1.00) and give oral presentations (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.82 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83) after completing the Language Preparatory Program.

Likewise, they could summarize information in their own words (ST: M=1.85, SD=0.79 / CI: M=1.80, SD=0.83), participate in discussions/debates (ST: M=2.04, SD=0.80 / CI: M=1.40, SD=0.54) and ask relevant questions in class (ST: M=1.82, SD=0.77 / CI: M=2.00, SD=0.70).

4. 5. 4. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the Student Teachers' Perceived Language Needs

4. 5. 4. 1. The General Views of the Student Teachers and the Course instructors related to the Language Preparatory Program

When asked about the primary aim of the Language Preparatory Program, both groups of participants mentioned that the main focus was introducing the student teachers to strategies related to the four basic skills and providing them with the opportunity to practice the related strategies in meaningful contexts. Specifically, the course instructors tried to raise the student teachers' awareness with respect to the effective use of the language strategies in related tasks as indicated below:

In my opinion, the program mainly focused on strategy training. The course instructors raised the student teachers' awareness on how to use the language strategies effectively in the given tasks to improve the four language skills (Course Instructor 1, Interview).

I think that the program tried to help us learn language strategies we can apply in different tasks. We learned how to organize our ideas or get the main idea after reading a long passage. Shortly, we learned what strategies can be used in the given tasks which helped us improve our reading, writing, listening and speaking skills (Student Teacher 1, Interview).

Besides, the two groups agreed that the program stressed the importance of the equal improvement of the four language skills. The student teachers received intensive training related to their reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities. The tasks and activities employed in the program were adapted according to Social Constructivist Approach to teaching and learning. The aim of language (and thus the aim of language teaching) was communication with the active involvement of the student teachers during the learning process. To exemplify, they were required to prepare presentations, read and respond critically, combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment, predict the content of a lecture and participate in discussions/debates. Some of the student teachers commented on this issue as follows:

In my opinion, the program helped us to improve all four language skills equally. The course instructors asked us to participate in many tasks and use different strategies in our reading, writing, listening and speaking courses (Student Teacher 2, Instructor).

In the program, we were required to read different passages, write essays, listen to lectures or prepare presentations. In other words, the program focused on improving our reading, writing, listening and speaking skills equally. The course instructors guided us during the course and helped us actively participate in the follow up activities (Student Teacher 3, Interview).

As for the course instructors, they were facilitators providing meaningful input and engaging the student teachers in meaningful tasks as shown in the excerpts below:

Since the student teachers are going to study in their undergraduate program and also become English teachers in the future, they need to be fully competent in all four language skills. Thus, the program focused on active involvement of the student teachers via engaging them in meaningful tasks to improve the four language skills (Course Instructor 2, Interview).

The program was mainly designed to meet the student teachers' perceived language needs. It was based on the Social Constructivist Approach to teaching and learning. The course instructors provided the student teachers with the necessary input and asked them to participate in meaningful tasks such as, preparing a presentation or participating in discussions/debates to improve the four language skills equally (Course Instructor 3, Interview).

4. 5. 4. 2. Reading

Considering the student teachers' improvement of their reading ability, the two groups argued that the Language Preparatory Program mainly focused on strategy training by engaging the student teachers in various tasks as, reading course handouts or texts on the internet followed by the application of the reading strategies like, making inferences or identifying key information in the given tasks. Related to this issue some of the course instructors said:

The program provided the student teachers with reading tasks from various resources such as, textbooks or the internet. The course instructors raised their awareness on how to use the necessary strategies such as, skimming or scanning in the given tasks and guided them during their learning process (Course Instructor 4, Interview).

The course instructors asked for active involvement of the student teachers in the courses. They introduced the student teachers to the reading strategies and helped them with the performance while using them in the given tasks (Course Instructor 5, Interview).

Parallel to the comments of the course instructors, the student teachers also stated that after being engaged in the preparatory program, they learned how to apply the reading strategies in their requirements, and thus, started to enjoy reading more. Two of the student teachers explained:

Reading seemed to be very boring at the beginning. However, during the program we have learned the necessary strategies we could apply in the tasks and started to enjoy reading more (Student Teacher 4, Interview).

I actually did not enjoy the reading course at the beginning. But after learning the strategies I could use, I have started to have fun while reading (Student Teacher 5, Interview).

Furthermore, both groups of participants agreed that getting familiar with the strategies like, reading for general information, careful reading, critical reading and synthesizing information was crucial for the improvement of the student teachers' reading ability as indicated below:

The primary goal of the program was to help the student teachers read between the lines rather than simply getting the information as it was written. In other words, they were expected to synthesize what they read by reading more carefully and also critically (Course Instructor 6, Interview).

In the reading course, we first had to get the general idea and the key information after reading a passage. Then, we were asked to think about the topic and be able to express our ideas on a given topic. Although it was difficult at the beginning, we started to have more fun once we learned what strategies used in the given tasks (Student Teacher 6, Interview).

Consequently, when asked about the most frequent problems experienced in the reading course, both groups thought that there was not much emphasis on extensive reading. They suggested that the student teachers could choose some of their favorite readers different from ones they were assigned by the course instructors, which would help them enjoy reading more and also, develop a reading habit outside the class. They commented on this issue as follows:

Extensive reading is crucial in terms of improving the student teachers' reading ability. Although the student teachers were asked to read some readers out of the class and prepare a book report, I think that the number of readers should be increased. Asking the student teachers to choose some of their favorite readers might be a good solution for developing a reading habit outside the classroom (Course Instructor 7, Interview).

Although I did not like the idea of reading outside the class very much at the beginning, I have changed my mind after I had realized that I could actually understand what I read. I think, reading can be more enjoyable if we are asked to choose some of our favorite readers in addition to the ones assigned by the course instructor (Student Teacher 7, Interview).

4. 5. 4. 3. *Writing*

When asked to make comments about the writing course, the two groups stated that writing was considered as an interactive process of detailed planning, writing, editing, rewriting and reediting. To put it differently, the student teachers were disciplined process writers actively involved in every single step during the process as illustrated below:

The student teachers need to become disciplined writers in which they plan, write, edit, rewrite and reedit. This was actually the primary goal of the writing course during which the student teachers had to follow every single step to come up with a well-organized paragraph or essay (Course Instructor 8, Interview).

The course instructors introduced us to the effective steps of writing. We made an outline, organized our ideas, included some details, received feedback and revised our essays. In this way, we have learned how to become more disciplined writers (Student Teacher 8, Interview).

Moreover, according to what the participants said, the student teachers experienced some difficulty in using the grammatical structures to form complex sentences. Considering this problem, they expressed the following viewpoints:

The student teachers need more training considering the use of the grammatical structures to make complex sentences while expressing their ideas in a paragraph or an essay (Course Instructor 9, Interview).

I experienced certain problems with using the grammatical structures while writing. Although my course instructors provided me with some help me during the writing process, I think that we need more practice in forming complex sentences to express our ideas clearly in a paragraph or an essay (Student Teacher 9, Interview).

Another problem mentioned by the two groups was plagiarism. Specifically, the course instructors thought that the student teachers needed more instruction on expressing others' ideas in their own words while writing book reports and reaction papers. One of the instructors commented on this issue as follows:

Plagiarism is another problem that requires more attention in the program. The student teachers need to be able to express others' ideas in their own words while writing book reports or reaction papers effectively (Course Instructor 10, Interview).

Additionally, the student teachers and the course instructors stated that doing research and writing reaction papers were the two fundamental components of the writing course which helped the student teachers' activate their background knowledge on the key concepts in teaching as shown in the two excerpts:

Research was a crucial component in the writing course. The student teachers need to have some background knowledge before they write on a given topic. Thus, they were asked to do some research at home before they came to the class (Course Instructor, 11, Interview).

Writing a reaction paper was considered to be important in the writing course. It helped the student teachers to learn some key concepts in ELT and improve their vocabulary knowledge (Course Instructor, 12, Interview).

I could write easily after doing some research on a given topic. I think doing research gives me a chance to learn new words on different topics and express my ideas more effectively (Student Teacher 10, Interview).

We learned some new words related to teaching such as, inductive/deductive teaching or schema which helped us to follow our courses in the undergraduate program more efficiently (Student Teacher 11, Interview).

4. 5. 4. 4. Listening

Related to the listening course, both groups of participants stressed the importance of strategy training by engaging the student teachers in various tasks to improve their listening ability such as, following lectures to answer related questions, preparing a presentation on a given topic and presenting them to the class, and taking part in question/answer sessions.

When asked specifically about their ideas considering this issue, they said:

Listening is one of the most difficult skills to develop because the classroom is the only context the student teachers can hear English. Therefore, the program particularly focused on engaging the student teachers in various tasks and give them the opportunity to practice them by applying the strategies such as, listening to lectures, asking questions and preparing presentations (Course Instructor, 13, Interview).

The Language Preparatory Program has helped me to improve my listening ability by being actively engaged in the process of preparing presentations and presenting them to the class, and listening to lectures to answer related questions (Student Teacher 12, Interview).

On the other hand, the course instructors and the student teachers stated that the listening course was mostly based on while listening tasks. The student teachers listened to a lecture during which the student teachers generally had to fill in charts or graphs, listen for the gist and complete cloze (fill-in) exercises.

To put it differently, note taking was not given much attention in the program which was considered to be a problem since the student teachers were required to take notes while listening to lectures in the undergraduate program. Considering this issue, the two groups made the following comments:

The listening course was mostly based on while listening tasks. The student teachers listened to a lecture and tried to answer the related questions. Taking notes was of secondary importance which was actually a problem because the student teachers have to take notes while listening to lectures in their undergraduate program (Course Instructor, 14, Interview).

I found it difficult to take notes effectively while listening to a lecture. I think that in the Language Preparatory Program, more practice on improving our note taking skills should be included (Student Teacher 13, Interview).

Besides, the participants mentioned that the student teachers had some difficulties with selective listening such as, identifying key information or finding the gist of a lecture. Regarding the importance of selective listening the participants expressed the following opinions:

Selective listening is very difficult to improve because the student teachers are only exposed to English in the classroom. Thus, the Language Preparatory Program should engage the student teachers in more tasks that will help them to improve their selective listening such as, identifying key information or finding the gist of a lecture (Course Instructor, 15, Interview).

Listening is one of the most difficult skills to improve. Although we were engaged in some tasks to select specific information while listening to a lecture, I think, we still need some practice to become selective listeners (Student Teacher 14, Interview).

Lastly, the two groups indicated that although they sometimes cannot understand what they hear in English, there is no need for providing Turkish explanations. Since English is the medium of instruction both in the preparatory and undergraduate programs, the student teachers should be exposed to the target language as much as possible. Thus, If the student

teachers have difficulties with understanding the spoken instructions, the course instructors could simplify the input. A course instructor and a student teacher commented on this issue:

Although the student teachers cannot understand what they hear, I don't think that there is need for Turkish explanations. The course instructors could just simplify the spoken instructions (Course Instructor, 16, Interview).

Although it is sometimes difficult to understand the lectures, we can understand them when the course instructors simplified the complex information. There is no need for Turkish explanations because we need to be exposed to the language (Student teacher 15, Interview).

4. 5. 4. 5. *Speaking*

When asked about their views in terms of the speaking course, the two groups stressed the importance of doing presentation (with or without using the multimedia tools) and participating in discussions/debates to gain self-confidence and become more competent in English. Some of the participants commented on this subject as follows:

The speaking course particularly focused on how to make effective presentations and participate in discussions/debates. This is actually what the student teachers need to improve their speaking ability (Course Instructor, 17, Interview).

In the speaking course, the student teachers were actively engaged in tasks they could use English effectively. In other words, they prepared presentations and participated in discussions/debates which gave them the opportunity to improve their speaking ability effectively (Course Instructor, 18, Interview).

We used to prepare presentations and were engaged in discussions on different topics in the course which provided us with the opportunity to express our ideas and become more self confident speakers (Student teacher 16, Interview).

We prepared presentations, asked questions on different topics and joined discussions in the speaking course. We improved our speaking skills and became more self-confident and competent English speakers (Student teacher 17, Interview).

Finally, as for the most frequent problems faced with the speaking skill, the two groups argued that the number of hours of the speaking course were not enough. To put it differently, they asked for more hours of the speaking course since the classroom was the only context in which the student teachers could use the language. In relation to this subject, one of the course instructors and the student teachers said:

The speaking course is important since that is the only time the student teachers find a chance to use the language effectively. Thus, if the number of speaking hours is increased, the student teachers can become accurate and fluent speakers (Course Instructor, 19, Interview).

I think that the program should include more hours of speaking because it is the only time we can use the language. In this way, we can improve our English (Student teacher 18, Interview).

4. 6. The Findings related to the Proficiency of the Student Teachers before and after the Implementation of the Language Preparatory Program

For the fourth research question, a repeated-measures design (Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991) was used to compare the performance of the student teachers before and after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program.

Following that, a paired sample *t*-test was used to analyze the pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program to find out whether the program has helped them improve their proficiency in terms of the four language skills. Since four comparisons were conducted, a Bonferroni adjustment was carried out on the alpha level. Thus, the observed *p* values were evaluated against the adjusted *p* value of .01.

As demonstrated in Table 6.2., the findings indicated significant differences between the pre- and post- program proficiency scores with respect to the student teachers' performance on all four skills. Large effect sizes were calculated for the performance on reading ($r^2=.64$), writing ($r^2=.80$), listening ($r^2=.92$) and speaking ($r^2=.95$) abilities.

Table 6.2.

Paired samples t-test results of pre- and post- program proficiency scores of the student teachers enrolled in the language preparatory program on the four language skills

	M	SD	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i> ²
Reading	41.48	10.07	59.86	8.55	-9.362	20	.000	.64
Writing	42.56	7.73	63.02	11.82	-8.892	20	.000	.80
Listening	48.95	6.61	71.16	8.27	-15.374	20	.000	.92
Speaking	46.00	5.96	71.43	7.89	-18.69	20	.000	.95

The results indicate that after the implementation of the Language Preparatory Program, the student teachers developed their reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities. In other words, their proficiency in performing tasks related to the four language skills greatly improved after they studied in the program.

4. 7. The Findings in relation to the Proficiency of the Student Teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the Ones who directly started the Undergraduate Program

As for the fifth research question, a between-groups design (Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991) was used to compare the performance of two different groups in terms of their proficiency in the four language skills. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the gain scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program (the difference of the proficiency scores obtained before and after the program) and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program after they had completed their freshmen courses (the difference of the proficiency scores obtained at the beginning and end of the freshmen year).

First, as shown in Table 6.3., based on Bonferroni adjustment, there was not a significant difference in the proficiency level of the student teachers who studied in the preparatory program and the ones who directly began the freshmen academic year with respect to their reading, writing and listening abilities. On the other hand, a statistically significant difference was found in relation to the two groups' performance on the listening ability. The effect size was large ($d= .94$, $r^2= .42$).

Table 6.3.

Independent samples t-test results comparing the proficiency gain scores of PSTs and USTs in terms of the four language skills

Gain Scores	PSTs		USTs		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>	r^2
	M	SD	M	SD					
Reading	11.29	4.02	11.38	4.20	-.075	40	.941	-	-
Writing	15.10	5.35	13.67	6.16	.801	40	.428	-	-
Listening	17.05	8.00	11.52	6.74	2.419	40	.020	-	-
Speaking	17.29	5.58	12.19	5.47	-2.985	40	.005	.94	.42

Note: PSTs=Preparatory Student Teachers; USTs=Undergraduate Student Teachers.

Looking at these results, the undergraduate students outperformed the preparatory students in terms of their speaking proficiency. One possible explanation might be due to the variety of the types of speeches the two groups are introduced in the program. To illustrate, while the preparatory students receive training only on the process of preparing an informative speech followed by an assignment of preparing a presentation on a given topic, the undergraduate students are introduced to more than one speech type namely, informative, descriptive and argumentative. Then, they are asked to prepare at least three presentations based on the speech types they have learned. This provides the opportunity to use the language effectively in various contexts which might be a reason why the undergraduate group performed better than the preparatory group.

4. 8. The Findings of the Semi-Structured Interviews in terms of the Possible Positive and Negative Side Effects of the Language Preparatory Program

For the last research question of the present study, the student teachers and the course instructors were asked about the major strengths and weaknesses of the Language Preparatory Program in order to identify the possible positive and negative side effects.

First, both groups shared the same viewpoint that the program was effective in terms of improving the four language skills equally. Since the student teachers are going to study in the undergraduate program for four years, and also become teachers in the future, they need to be fluent and accurate in English. In other words, they need to learn how to use the language strategies effectively in the related tasks and get familiar with the basic key concepts in ELT which would help them fulfill both their academic and professional goals. Thus, designing a specific program has highly met their perceived language needs. Regarding the positive side effects of the program, two of the course instructors said:

The student teachers studying at the ELT Department have different language needs compared to students from other departments. They need to be fully competent in all four language skills to be able to transfer their knowledge to their undergraduate courses and their future career as well. Considering this issue, the major strength of this program was that it was particularly designed to meet the student teachers' perceived language needs to help them become fluent and accurate in English to fulfill both their academic and professional goals (Course Instructor, 1 Interview).

As future teachers, the ELT students have to be accurate and fluent speakers of English. They need some strategy training to help them develop their four language skills. Therefore, they need a program specific to their context that will increase their awareness on using language strategies in the tasks and activities effectively. I believe, this was the major strength of this program (Course Instructor, 2, Interview).

Parallel to the comments made by the course instructors, two student teachers expressed the following ideas:

I think that this program has helped me learn how to use English effectively. Being a student in a preparatory program related to our own field of study has helped me improve my reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities (Student teacher 1, Interview).

Being a student of a specific program is a privilege for us. I am happy to be in a program that will help me improve my English effectively. I have learned the strategies such as, making inferences or organizing my ideas clearly. I have also learned many key terms related to teaching (Student teacher 2, Interview).

On the other hand, when asked about the major weaknesses of the program, some of the participants' major concern was related to the grammatical knowledge of the student teachers. They argued that the hours of the grammar course should be increased and that, the student teachers should be engaged both in controlled and communicative tasks to help them bridge the gap between knowing the grammatical structures and internalizing them. In relation to this issue, one of the course instructors made the following comment:

I think that there should be more hours of grammar in the program. The course instructors should engage the student teachers both in controlled and communicative tasks that would help them use the grammatical structures efficiently (Course Instructor 3, Interview).

Additionally, both groups believed that the program did not focus much on improving the student teachers' note taking skills in the listening course as shown in the excerpts below:

Although the note taking skill is crucial to follow the undergraduate courses, the listening course was mainly based on while listening tasks in the Language Preparatory Program. The student teachers listened to a lecture and then answered the related questions. To overcome this problem, they need more guidance on the process of taking notes which will help them to follow their courses in the undergraduate program (Course Instructor 4, Interview).

Listening is one of the most difficult skills to develop. In the preparatory program, we mainly listened to a lecture and answered the follow up questions. We were just briefly introduced to the process of taking effective notes. I believe that there is a need for more training on this issue because we are required to take some notes while listening to lectures in our undergraduate courses (Student teacher 3, Interview).

Finally, the two groups stated that extensive reading was very important for the development of the reading skill, and thus, should be given more emphasis in the program. They suggested that the student teachers can choose some of their favorite readers apart from the ones assigned by the course instructors. This would help them to enjoy reading more, and also develop a reading habit outside the class. Specifically, they made comments about extensive reading as follows:

Most of our students start reading books at university. Although in the Language Preparatory Program the student teachers were asked to read outside the classroom and write book reports, I think that the number of books should be increased. For example, the student teachers can choose one of their favorite readers. In this way, they can develop a reading habit outside the class and reading will also become more enjoyable (Course Instructor 5, Interview).

Extensive reading is very important for our reading development. Although I like the books assigned in the class, I think that some small changes could be made.. For example, we can be asked to choose some of the books we like so that, we can enjoy reading more and develop a reading habit outside the class (Student teacher 4, Interview).

4. 9. Summary of Part 2

The second part of the study namely, program evaluation was conducted for four different purposes. First, it aimed to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' assumed learning needs after they had completed the program. Second, the feelings in relation to the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs were evaluated at the end of the freshmen academic year. Additionally, the proficiency level of the student teachers was compared before and after the implementation of the program to find out whether the program has helped them to improve their proficiency in the four language skills. Finally, the performance of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program was compared to see whether there were any differences in their level of proficiency considering their performances in listening, reading, speaking and writing abilities.

To begin, according to the results of the needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview carried out after the student teachers were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program, they have highly improved their ability to use the learning strategies as, preparing a presentation or thinking critically on a given topic.

Nonetheless, the student teachers argued that the Language Preparatory Program should focus more on the two learning strategies namely, using grammatical structures to form complex utterances and taking effective notes after listening to a lecture. They pointed out that these two components are crucial to follow the undergraduate courses effectively and thus, the student teachers should receive more training during the preparatory program.

Additionally, in an attempt to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs, the data obtained through the post-needs analysis questionnaires and the semi-structured interviews indicated that the student teachers have become more competent in English after studying in the program. Specifically, they have developed their abilities to use the strategies related to the four language skills effectively.

Nonetheless, as in the previous discussions on the learning strategies, the two groups of participants pointed out that the Language Preparatory Program should include more tasks that would help the student teachers develop their grammatical knowledge, note taking skills and extensive reading habits which would positively affect their performances in the undergraduate program.

Apart from the assumed learning needs and the perceived language needs of the student teachers, the present study compared their proficiency level before and after the implementation of the program. According to the findings, the student teachers' proficiency in the four language skills has greatly improved after they were exposed to intensive strategy training in the Language Preparatory Program.

Besides, the performances of the student teachers who studied at the Language Preparatory Program and the ones who directly started the undergraduate program were compared in terms of their proficiency in the four language skills. As a result, while the preparatory students outperformed the ones who directly started the undergraduate program in the listening and writing abilities, there was not a significant difference between the two

groups in relation to their reading proficiency. As for the speaking ability, the undergraduate student teachers performed better which shows that more attention should be given to the development of the effective use of English in the Language Preparatory Program. To put it simply, the number of hours of the speaking course should be increased which would provide them with the opportunity to use English in meaningful contexts.

Finally, according to the results considering the possible positive and negative sides of the Language Preparatory Program, both the student teachers and the course instructors expressed their positive feelings in relation to designing a specific program to meet the student teachers' perceived language needs. However, as previously discussed, they argued that there should be more focus on the improvement of the student teachers' grammatical knowledge and note taking skills to aid with their performance in the undergraduate courses. Extensive reading should also be emphasized more in the program which would make the reading process more enjoyable, and help the student teachers develop a reading habit outside the class.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5. 1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to design and evaluate a Language Preparatory Program based on the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs at Yeditepe University. The study included two parts: a) program design and b) program evaluation.

In relation to the first part of the study namely, program design, the returned pre-needs analysis questionnaires and semi-structured interviews indicated a need for development of a specific program based on the perceptions of the student teachers and the course instructors considering the student teachers' language needs.

After the Language Preparatory Program was designed, the second part of the study aimed to evaluate the program considering the student teachers' perceived language needs, their assumed learning needs and their proficiency in the four language skills.

To begin, the data obtained through the needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview reported that the preparatory program has met the student teachers' assumed learning needs such as, applying different strategies in tasks related to the four language skills, improving the presentation skills, or learning key terms related to language teaching.

Besides, the results of the post-needs analysis questionnaire gathered from the student teachers and the course instructors revealed that the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs as well. These findings were supported via semi-structured interviews.

Additionally, according to the proficiency scores obtained before and after the implementation of the program, the performance of the student teachers on the four language skills has highly improved.

Finally, the comparison of the gain scores of the preparatory and undergraduate student teachers provided evidence for the proficiency on reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities.

The remaining of this chapter first discusses the findings of the two parts of the study namely, program design and program evaluation. After that, the pedagogical implications are briefly explained. In the final section, the limitations of the present study are included followed by suggestions for further research.

5. 2. The Design of the Language Preparatory Program

As previously discussed, for the first part of the study, a Language Preparatory Program was designed for the prospective student teachers at the Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) at Yeditepe University. The primary goal was to meet their perceived language needs and help them reach the expected level of proficiency in English.

According to the data obtained through the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews, a Language Preparatory Program was developed. The nature of the program was based upon the student teachers' perceived language needs, goals and objectives, materials and the language teaching approach.

Social Constructivism was taken as an approach to teaching and learning. The learners are actively involved in the learning process whereas the course instructors are scaffolders who guide them during their learning. Language is learned through meaningful interaction between the learner(s), the teacher, the task and the context. Within this framework, the preparatory program focused on the development of the four language skills as well as the grammar of the language.

The major goal of the program was to raise the student teachers' awareness of strategies related to the four language skills, and provide them with the opportunity to use them in meaningful contexts. According to the findings of the pre-needs analysis

questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, the strategies were sequenced from simple to complex.

The program contained twenty-eight hours of instruction weekly: six hours for each of the four skills (6) and four hours of grammar (4).

The present study employed an integrated syllabus design. A skills-based and a structural syllabi were developed for three different proficiency levels namely, intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced.

To begin, the reading syllabus aimed to introduce the student teachers' to the reading strategies such as, identifying the main idea, recognizing the patterns of organization, searching for simple information, guessing the meaning of an unknown word from context and predicting the content of a text and give them the opportunity to use them in tasks suitable for their proficiency level. For instance, while the student teachers at the intermediate level were asked to identify the main idea or predict the content of a short paragraph or a conversation, the upper-intermediate and the advanced student teachers were asked to use these two strategies in longer and more complex reading passages.

On the other hand, the upper-intermediate and the advanced student teachers were familiarized with the concept of fast reading. They received instruction on how to skip unknown words, reading meaningful chunks or phrases, and practice timed readings.

Besides, the student teachers were given some course handouts, computer-presented texts and articles related to the key concepts of English Language Teaching (ELT) which provided them with some background knowledge related to teaching.

Finally, the student teachers were expected to do extensive reading followed by the assignment of writing a book report based on specific guidelines which aided them to develop their reading ability and vocabulary knowledge, and also help them gain a reading habit outside the class.

Parallel to the reading syllabus, the major goal of the writing syllabus was to raise the awareness of the student teachers on using the writing strategies as, expressing and organizing ideas in a paragraphs or an essay effectively. After being familiarized with the basic structures in paragraphs and essays namely, the topic sentence, supporting sentences and the concluding sentence, the student teachers received guidance on strategy use according to their level of proficiency.

Firstly, the previewing techniques namely, brainstorming, clustering and freewriting were introduced to the three groups of student teachers. Then, they were introduced to the essay structure comprising the introductory, body and concluding paragraphs emphasizing the use of linking words to provide transitions among paragraphs. This training was based on the student teachers' level of proficiency. For example, while the intermediate and the upper-intermediate student teachers learned how to express and organize their ideas in compare/contrast and process essays, the student teachers at the advanced level were engaged in more academic essay types as, argumentative or cause/effect.

Besides, writing a reaction paper on articles related to the key concepts in ELT like, fluency, accuracy, peer feedback, inductive and deductive learning was another assignment included in the syllabus. The aim was to increase the student teachers' background knowledge on the key concepts in teaching and also, help them develop their critical thinking skills.

Furthermore, the listening syllabus was designed to familiarize the student teachers with the strategies they could use in three sections namely, pre-, while and post-listening. As in the previous two syllabi, the student teachers were engaged in tasks suitable for their proficiency level.

To begin, before listening to the lecture, all three groups tried to predict the content of the lecture by looking at the title or pictures. As for the while listening section, the intermediate student teachers were asked to listen for specific information (e.g. main idea)

and circle the correct answer whereas the upper-intermediate and the advanced student teachers had to identify the details of a lecture by answering open-ended questions. Finally, after listening to the lecture, the lowest group briefly summarized the lecture, the middle group thought critically on the given topic by exchanging ideas with other peers, and the highest group discussed the information provided in the lecture by comparing it from other resources such as, magazines or the internet.

In addition, the student teachers had to prepare a class presentation on a given topic which provided them with some background knowledge on various subjects, and also helped them to become effective listeners as well as speakers.

Finally, in the speaking syllabus, the fundamental stages of speech preparation and delivery including the integration and development of audio and visual aids were emphasized.

At the beginning of the course, the student teachers were engaged in warm up activities like, listening to a short lecture or video and then, were asked to exchange their ideas briefly with the other peers.

Moreover, the student teachers were provided with tasks according to their level of proficiency. Specifically, the intermediate group was asked to prepare a short talk on the given subject (e.g. at the supermarket) after being introduced to the features of opening and closing a conversation. As for the upper-intermediate student teachers, they were provided with a model discussion (e.g. a short conversation or video) stressing the importance on the organization of ideas. Then, they had to think of possible solutions to the given problem like, AIDS or obesity, and discuss it in the class. Finally, the advanced group was involved in more academic tasks like, debates or role plays after being introduced to the three stages of preparing, modeling and eliciting, and practicing and reviewing (Richards, 2008). In this way, they were provided with the opportunity to use the language in authentic and meaningful contexts.

Apart from a skills-based syllabus, a structural syllabus was designed for the Language Preparatory Program which tried to enhance the student teachers' grammatical knowledge and give them the opportunity to practice the grammatical structures in different contexts.

Since the student teachers graduated from language departments at high school, it was assumed that they already came with some grammatical knowledge. Based on this assumption, only four hours were dedicated to grammar teaching during which the student teachers were involved in controlled activities appropriate for the three proficiency levels.

To put it simply, while the intermediate student teachers were engaged in matching or gap filling tasks related to the correct use of tenses, the upper-intermediate and the advanced groups were asked to perform similar tasks using more complex grammatical structures as, passive or reported speech.

The findings related to the first part of the study are in accord with the previous research which shed light on the fact that identifying the language needs of the students is the primary step to be taken before designing a preparatory program (Daylan, 2001; Örs, 2006; Payam and Sariçoban, 2006; Tavil, 2006, Yılmaz, 2009; Akyel and Özek, 2010). All these studies provided evidence for the importance of identifying the students' language needs, specifying the goals and objectives, deciding on the language teaching approach, and adopting, developing and adapting materials of a program.

5. 3. The Evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program

As for the second part of the study, the reported findings provided insights for the evaluation of the Language Preparatory Program in relation to the student teachers' assumed learning needs, their perceived language needs and their performances considering reading, writing, listening, and speaking abilities.

To begin, based on the data obtained through the needs analysis questionnaire, the preparatory student teachers agreed that after the implementation of the program, they could use the learning strategies like, preparing presentations, expressing their ideas clearly, and using English fluently to meet course requirements.

Apart from the student teachers' assumed learning needs, the findings obtained through the post-needs analysis questionnaire, the semi-structured interview and the pre- and post-proficiency exam scores indicated that the student teachers have developed their performances both in the receptive (reading and listening) and productive (writing and speaking) skills after they completed the preparatory program. Specifically, the student teachers and the course instructors stated that after being exposed to intensive training in the program, the student teachers could apply the language strategies in reading, writing, listening and speaking tasks effectively.

On the other hand, the participating student teachers and course instructors asked for more hours of grammar and speaking in the program.

As for the grammar component, they particularly asked for more practice in using grammatical structures to form complex sentences. Since the structural syllabus was mostly based on controlled activities like, gap filling or matching, the student teachers experienced difficulty in performing communicative tasks such as, debates or role plays. Thus, the number of the grammar hours should be increased in the program and more communicative tasks should be integrated in the structural syllabus.

Likewise, the number of hours of the speaking course should be increased because classroom is the only context that the student teachers have exposure to English. As they are going to become teachers in the future, they need to be involved in productive tasks as much as possible which would help them improve their fluency. Therefore, as in the structural syllabus, the number of hours of the speaking course should be increased for the following academic year.

Moreover, the two groups stated that more emphasis should be given to note taking and extensive reading in the program.

To begin, in the listening course, the student teachers were mostly engaged in while listening tasks as, matching or gap filling. To put it differently, they did not receive much instruction on the process of taking notes which is what they actually need in the undergraduate program. Therefore, while redesigning the listening syllabus, note taking should be integrated more in the program.

As for the extensive reading, the participants pointed out that apart from the books assigned by the course instructors, the student teachers could be asked to choose one of their favorite readers and write a book report. This would make the reading process more enjoyable and also help them gain a reading habit outside the class.

Furthermore, the analysis of the gain scores of the student teachers who were enrolled in the Language Preparatory Program and comparing their performances with the ones who directly started the undergraduate program revealed there were significant and nonsignificant differences between the two groups with respect to their proficiency in the four language skills.

To begin, there were no significant differences between the two groups of learners considering their performances in reading, writing and listening. In other words, both the preparatory and the undergraduate programs engaged the student teachers in various tasks which aided the improvement of reading, writing and listening skills.

On the other hand, statistically significant difference was found between the performance of the two groups on their speaking skills. To put it simply, the undergraduate group of student teachers outperformed the preparatory group in speaking. A possible reason behind this finding might be due to the extent of exposure to the use of English in the classroom. While the preparatory students were asked to prepare only an informative speech in their speaking course, the undergraduate students were required to prepare at least three

presentations regarding three speech types namely, informative, demonstrative and persuasive in their Oral Communication courses. To fill this gap, the number of hours of the speaking course should be increased by integrating different speech types in the syllabus for the following academic year.

In relation to the second part of the study namely, program evaluation, the findings indicated that the Language Preparatory Program has highly met the student teachers' perceived language needs, their assumed learning needs and their performances on the four language skills which provided evidence for identifying the major strengths and weakness of the program. In this respect, this study produced results which corroborate with the findings of the previous studies on evaluation of preparatory programs (Toker, 1999; Gerede, 2005; Özkanal, 2009).

5. 4. Implications

The present study has both practical and empirical implications for program design and evaluation. To begin, the first part of the study provided insights into the fundamental steps of designing a program. According to the findings obtained through the pre-needs analysis questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, the nature of the Language Preparatory Program should be based upon the student teachers' perceived language needs which served as a main guide to identify the goals and objectives, to adopt, develop and adapt materials, and to decide on the language teaching approach.

As for the second part of the study, the findings provided evidence for the evaluation of a program. The findings of the needs analysis questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and proficiency exam scores provided evidence for identifying the major strengths and weaknesses of the program. In this sense, program designers can take the results of this study when evaluating a language preparatory program aiming to meet the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs.

According to what's been discussed above, training programs should be included for preservice teachers to raise their awareness about the important steps of program design and evaluation. Full collaboration is needed between the program developers, the course instructors and the student teachers throughout this process in order to attain success in the program. In this sense, the results of this study can be taken for granted while designing and evaluating language preparatory programs in different contexts.

Finally, in the light of the present study, the current Language Preparatory Program designed for the prospective students at the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department at Yeditepe University is decided to be redesigned for the following academic year.

5. 5. Limitations

Although the present study revealed some interesting and important findings, they should be taken as suggestive rather than definitive due to following limitations.

First, the program designed for the purposes of this study simply rely on the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs. The learning needs were not thoroughly identified because of time constraints, and the fact that the student teachers' were not consciously aware of what they actually were before they were enrolled in the preparatory program. Therefore, while designing the program, the student teachers' assumed learning needs were based on Social Constructivist approach to teaching and learning, and were reflected in the goals and objectives, and the materials used in the program.

After the implementation of the program, the learning needs were evaluated assuming that the program has raised the student teachers' awareness on how to apply them in their course requirements. Last but not least, because this was a process evaluation, the learning needs were also identified during the implementation of the semi-structured interviews.

Another limitation of this study lies in the fact that the researcher herself evaluated the program. In other words, the lack of an external evaluator might have affected the credibility and objectivity of program evaluation.

Data collector bias might be considered as another limitation of this study. Since the researcher worked at the same department, the participants might have been hesitant to reveal their genuine opinions about the program.

Finally, the present study focused on the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs in the ELT Department at Yeditepe University. Thus, it has limited external validity which prevents generalization of the results to different contexts.

Despite these limitations, the present study is significant for the field of program design and evaluation since it provides foundation for the further research.

5. 6. Recommendations for Further Research

This study has several recommendations for further research. First of all, the student teachers' perceived language needs is believed to vary across tasks and contexts. Therefore, it is recommended to replicate the present study in different preparatory programs to see the differences between the perceptions of the student teachers' language needs across Turkey and other countries.

Additionally, future research should also investigate the students' different types of needs such as, communicative, situation, objective and subjective needs which would provide insights into the design and evaluation of a program for different groups of learners.

Finally, previous research primarily focused either on program design or evaluation. Thus, there need to be more experimental and longitudinal studies that integrate both concepts and investigate their effectiveness in different contexts.

REFERENCES

- Alkin, M. C. (1969). Evaluation theory development. *Evaluation Comment*, 2, 2-7.
- Altschuld, J. W., & Witkin, B. R. (1995). *Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Akyel, A., & Özek, Y. (2010). A language needs analysis research at an English medium university in Turkey, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 969-975.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education*. (6th ed). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Au, K. H. (1997). Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students of diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 30(2), 297-319.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Baştürkmen, H., & Al-Huneidi, A. (1996). *Refining Procedures: A needs analysis project at Kuwait University*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED413762).
- Beretta, A., & Davies, D. (1985). Evaluation of the Bangalore Project. *ELT Journal*, 32(2), 121-127.
- Betty, M. (2005). *Building the next generation of leaders: An evaluation of the city of Saskatoon's Management Development Program*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Royal Road University.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Allyn & Bacon: Needham Heights, MA.
- Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Doing second language research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, A. L., & Therivel, R. (2000). Principles to guide the development of strategic environmental assessment methodology. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 18(3), 183-189.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Language teaching approaches: An overview in teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Heinle and Heinle.
- Chan, V. (2001). Determining students' language needs in a tertiary setting. *English Teaching Forum* July, 16-27.
- Chia, H., Johnson, R., Chian, H., & Olive, F. (1999). English for college students in Taiwan: A study of perceptions of English needs in a medical context. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 107-119.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Çelik, S. (2003). *An investigation into students' academic and occupational English needs at Office Management and Secretarial Studies Departments of Nigde University's Vocational Colleges*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University.
- Daylan, S. (2001). *A syllabus design for the basic English classes in the preparatory program at Abant İzzet Baysal University*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Abant İzzet Baysal University.
- Dolmans, H. J. M., Snellen-Ballendog, H., Wolfhagen, H.A.P., & Vleuten, C.P.M. (1997). Seven principles of effective case design for a problem-based curriculum. *Medical Teacher*, 19(3), 185-189.
- Dubin, F., & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Edwards, N. (2000). Language for business: Effective needs assessment, syllabus design and materials preparation in a practical ESP case study. *English for Specific Purposes* 19, 291-296.
- Ellis, R. (1996). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ekici, N. (2003). *A needs assessment study on English language needs of the tour guidance students of Faculty of Applied Sciences at Başkent University: A Case Study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Erozan, F. (2005). *Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergraduate ELT curriculum at Eastern Mediterranean University: A case study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Espeseth, M. (1999). *Academic Listening Encounters: Human Behavior. Listening Note taking, Discussion. High Intermediate to Low Advanced*. Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, V. (2002). *CPE Use of English 1*. Express Publishing.
- Far, M. M. (2008). An overview of syllabuses in English language teaching. *Karen's Linguistic Issues*. Retrieved September 23, 2011, from: <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/syllabi>.
- Fitzpatrick, J. I., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Freeman, D. L. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

- Gaies, S. J. (1992). An approach to the evaluation of ELT prep programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED369276).
- Gaber, J. (2000). Meta-needs assessment. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23, 139-147.
- Gerede, D. (2005). *A curriculum evaluation through needs analysis: perceptions of intensive English program graduates at Anadolu University*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Eskişehir Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Gliem, J. A. & Gliem, R. R. (2003). *Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales*. Presented at the Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, The Ohio State University.
- Graves, K. (1996). A framework of course development processes. In K. Graves (Ed.), *Teachers as course developers* (pp. 12-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Retrieved September 23, 2011, from http://books.google.com/books?id=3fxGAAAAMAAJ&q=guba+and+lincoln+%2Beffective+evaluation&dq=guba+and+lincoln+%2Beffective+evaluation&hl=tr&ei=1p4gTJuZN8_csAafh8HSDg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCoQ6AEwAA
- Hammond, R. L. (1973). Evaluation at the local level. In B. R. Worthen & J. R. Senders, *Educational evaluation: Theory and practice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Henry, A., & Roseberry, R.L. (1999). Raising awareness of the generic structure and linguistic features of essay introductions. *Language Awareness*, 8(3), 190-200.
- Hogan, L. R. (2007). The historical development of program evaluation: Exploring the past and present. *Online Journal of Workforce Education and Development*, 2(4), 1-14.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Karataş, H. (2007). *Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi modern diller bölümü İngilizce II dersi öğretim programının öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerine göre bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün (CIPP) modeli ile değerlendirilmesi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Yıldız Technical University.

- Kisslinger, A. & Rost, M. (2002). *Contemporary Topics: Academic Listening and Note-Taking Skills. Second Edition*. Pearson: Longman
- Kittidhaworn, P. (2001). *An assessment of the English-language needs of second-year Thai undergraduate engineering students in a Thai public university in Thailand in relation to the second-year EAP program in engineering*. Unpublished dissertation. West Virginia University.
- Knight, P. T. (2001). Complexity and curriculum: a process approach to curriculum making. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(3), 369-381.
- Koçoğlu, Z. B. (2006). *The role of portfolios in EFL student teachers' professional development: A case study*. Unpublished dissertation. Boğaziçi University.
- Krahnke, K. (1987). *Approaches to syllabus design for foreign language teaching*. Prentice-Hall.
- Küçük, O. (2008). *An evaluation of English language teaching program at key stage I and the opinions of teachers regarding the program*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.
- Lepetit, D., & Cichocki, W. (2002). Teaching language to future health professionals: A needs assessment study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 384-396.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littlejohn, S. (2002). *Theories of human communication*. California: Wadsworth Thomson Learning. Retrieved December 20, 2011, from: <http://www.google.com/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=YR6ZENi7NecC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=%2Blittlejohn+attitudes+%2Btheories+of+human+communication&ots=5er7Z1UbvI&sig=xnwqIf5B5SfBvAAp2mPjwXkM68#v=onepage&q=%2Blittlejohn%20attitudes%20%2Btheories%20of%20human%20communication&f=false>
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation. Theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- MacDonald, J. B. (1976). Evaluation and the control of education. In D. Tawney (Ed.), *Curriculum evaluation today: Trends and implications*. Schools Council Research Studies Series. London: Macmillan.
- Mann, M. & Taylore-Knowles, S. (2007). *Destination CI & C2. Grammar & Vocabulary*. MacMillan.
- Marcinkoniene, R. (2005). Lessons to be learnt from the course evaluation: A case study of Kaunas University of Technology. *Studies About Languages*, 7, 1648-2824.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative & qualitative approaches*. Sage Publications.

- Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Sentences, Paragraphs and Essays*. Pearson Longman.
- Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (2007). *Advanced Reading Power: Second Edition*. Pearson: Longman.
- Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (2004). *More Reading Power: Second Edition*. Pearson: Longman.
- Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (1998). *Reading Power: Second Edition*. Pearson: Longman.
- Muşlu, M. (2007). *Formative evaluation of a process-genre writing curriculum at Anadolu university school of foreign language*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Anadolu University.
- Mutlu, Ö. (2004). *A needs analysis study for the English-Turkish translation course offered to management students of the faculty of economic and administrative sciences at Başkent University: A case study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Nam, J. M. N. (2005). *Perceptions of Korean language students and teachers about communication-based English instruction: Evaluation of a college EFL curriculum in South Korea*. Unpublished Dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Syllabus design*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Orkwis, R., & McLane, K. (1998). *A curriculum every student can use: Design principles for student access*. ERIC/OSEP Special Project. ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. Council for Exceptional Children.
- Owen, J. M. (2007). *Program evaluation: forms and approaches*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Örs, M. (2006). *An analysis of the preparatory students' attitudes towards the appropriateness of the preparatory school program at the University of Gaziantep*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Gaziantep.
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2007). *Writing Academic English: Fourth Edition*. Pearson: Longman.
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing: Third Edition*. Pearson: Longman.
- Özek, Y. (2000). *Motivation of foreign language learners in Turkey*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Essex.

- Özkanal, Ü. (2009). *The Evaluation of English preparatory program of Eskişehir Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department and a model proposal*. Unpublished dissertation. Anadolu University.
- Parlett, M., & Hamilton, D. (1976). Evaluation as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovative programs. In G. V. Glass (Ed.), *Evaluation studies review annual* (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research evaluation methods*. Sage Publications.
- Payam, M. M., & Sariçoban, A. (2006). Opinions of Preparatory Students, Graduates and Lecturers at Police College on Their Foreign Language Needs. *Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 6, 157-176.
- Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (2003). *Program evaluation methods and case studies* (6th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Priest, S. (2001). A program evaluation primer. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 24 (1), 34-40.
- Provus, M. M. (1971). *Discrepancy evaluation*. Berkley, CA: McCutchan.
- Rabbini, R. (2002). An introduction to syllabus design and evaluation. *TESL Journal*, 8 (5), Retrieved December 20, 2011, from: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Rabbini-Syllabus.html>.
- Reviere, R., Berkowitz, S., Carter, C. C., & Ferguson, C. G. (1996). *Needs assessment: A creative and practical guide for social scientists*. Washington: Taylor & Francis.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rippey, R. M. (Ed.). (1973). *Studies in transactional evaluation*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage Publications. Retrieved December 20, 2011, from <http://www.google.com/books?id=e6EO83ZKGYoC&printsec=frontcover&dq=%2Britchie+and+lewis+%2Bqualitative+research&lr=&hl=tr&cd=1#v=onepage&q=&f=false>
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. New York: Arnold.

- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Sage Publications. Retrieved December 20, 2011, from http://books.google.com/books?id=8K3Ax5s7x5oC&pg=PA68&dq=rossi+and+freeman+%2Beffective+evaluation&hl=tr&ei=kJ8gTKjVI9KTsQaemaipDg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCcQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=rossi%20and%20freeman%20%2Beffective%20evaluation&f=false
- Sarabria, K. (1999). *Academic Listening Encounters: Life in Society. Listening, Note Taking, Discussion. Intermediate to High Intermediate*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sari, R. (2003). *A suggested English language teaching program for Gülhane Military Medical Academy*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Sawatpanit, M., Suthers, D., & Fleming, F. (2003). *BRIX—Elements for language course creation*. Proceedings of ED-MEDIA: World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia & Telecommunications (Honolulu, June 23-28, 2003), D. Lassner & C. McNaught (Eds.), Norfolk: Association for Advancement of Computing in Education, pp. 415-422.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R. E. Stake (Ed.), *Curriculum evaluation*. (American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Evaluation, No. 1, pp. 39-83). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Shuja's, A. (2005). What is the best syllabus? *Yemen Times*, 834(13). Retrieved December 20, 2011, from <http://yementimes.com/article.shtml?i=834&p=education&a=1>.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 68, 523-540.
- Stake, R. E. (1975b). *Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation* (Occasional paper No. 5). Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Stein, M., Carnine, D., & Dixon, R. (1998). Direct instruction: integrating curriculum design and effective teaching practice. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 33(4), 227-233.
- Stetsenko, A., & Arievitch, I. (1998). Constructing and deconstructing the self: Comparing post-Vygotskian and discourse-based version of social constructivism. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 4 (3), 159-172.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2002). The CIPP model for evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (Eds.). *Evaluation models: viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (pp. 279-318). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sysoyev, P. V. (2000). Developing an English for specific purposes course using a learner centered approach: A Russian experience. *Internet TESOL Journal*, 4(3).

- Şahin, V. (2006). *Evaluation of the in-service teacher training program "the certificate for teachers of English" at the Middle East Technical University school of foreign languages*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Tarnapolsky, O. (2000). Writing English as a foreign language: A Report from Ukraine. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 209-226.
- Tavil, Z. M. (2006). The reading needs of the students' at Hacettepe University English Preparatory School. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26(3), 207-211.
- Toker, O. (1999). *The attitudes of teaching staff and students towards the preparatory curriculum of the department of foreign languages in the University of Gaziantep*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Gaziantep University.
- Tyler, R.W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instructio*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Vince, M. & Emerson, P. (2003). *First Certificate: Language Practice*. Macmillan.
- Visser, R. M. S. (2006). *Trends in program evaluation literature: The emergence of pragmatism*. TCALL Occasional Research Paper, Texas Center for Adult Literacy & Learning.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Worthen, B. (1990). Program evaluation. H. Walberg & G. Haertel (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of educational evaluation* (pp. 42-47). Toronto, ON: Pergammon Press.
- Wulf, M. K., & Schave, B. (1984). *Curriculum design: A handbook for educators*. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Yıldız, Ü. (2004). *Evaluation of the Turkish language teaching program for foreigners at Minsk State Linguistic University in Belarus: A case study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Yılmaz, F. (2009). English language needs analysis of university students at a voluntary program. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi*, 1, 148-166.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Application of case study research*. Sage Publication.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO THE STUDENT TEACHERS ABOUT THEIR
LANGUAGE NEEDS BEFORE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Dear Friend,

This questionnaire has been prepared to serve as a data collection instrument for an academic study and aims to find out the perceptions of your language needs. The results are to be used for the design of a Language Preparatory Program at our university.

The questionnaire consists of two main parts. The first part aims to get information about your personal profile which is important for the research, while the second includes three sub parts which aim to identify your perceived language needs related to the reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities.

Frank and sincere answers that you are going to mark will affect the results of the study positively. The information will be coded, remain confidential and used for research purposes only. I appreciate your cooperation and hope you will seriously consider taking part in this study. Thank you for your contribution.

Enisa Mede
Department of ELT
PhD Candidate
enisa.mede@yeditepe.edu.tr

PART 1-Participant Profile

1. Gender F () M ()
2. Proficiency Level: Intermediate () Upper-Intermediate () Advanced ()
3. Please write down your age.

4. Please write down the name of the high school that you graduated from.

PART 2-Language Needs About the Language Preparatory Program

Circle one of the items below.

2a. In relation to your studies in the undergraduate program evaluate the importance of the following language skills. Circle the appropriate number according to the following scale. (Do not mark if not applicable).

a : very important b: important c: slightly important d: not very important e: unimportant

1	Reading	a	b	c	d	e
2	Writing	a	b	c	d	e
3	Listening	a	b	c	d	e
4	Speaking	a	b	c	d	e

2b. How important is the performance of the following tasks related to the four language skills important in the undergraduate program? Circle the appropriate number according to the following scale. (Do not mark if not applicable).

a: very important b: important c: slightly important d: not very important e: unimportant

Reading						
1	textbooks	a	b	c	d	e
2	articles in journals	a	b	c	d	e
3	reference tools (e.g. dictionaries)	a	b	c	d	e
4	course handouts	a	b	c	d	e
5	texts on the Internet	a	b	c	d	e
6	computer-presented texts	a	b	c	d	e
7	instructions for projects	a	b	c	d	e
8	newspapers/magazines	a	b	c	d	e
9	lecture notes	a	b	c	d	e
10	works of literature	a	b	c	d	e
11	graphs/ charts/ diagrams/ tables	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	a resume (CV)	a	b	c	d	e
2	essays in reaction to readings	a	b	c	d	e
3	references for a report or project	a	b	c	d	e
4	book reports	a	b	c	d	e
5	workbook exercises	a	b	c	d	e
6	essay-type questions	a	b	c	d	e
7	term papers	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	lectures	a	b	c	d	e
2	question/answer sessions	a	b	c	d	e
3	class presentations	a	b	c	d	e
4	dialogues	a	b	c	d	e

Speaking						
1	oral presentations	a	b	c	d	e
2	oral presentations using multimedia tools	a	b	c	d	e
3	state opinions on different topics (discussions/ debates)	a	b	c	d	e

2c. How often do you have difficulties with the application of the following strategies in tasks related to the four language skills in the undergraduate program? Circle the appropriate number according to the following scale. (Do not mark if not applicable).

a: always b: frequently c: sometimes d: rarely e: never

Reading						
1	Recognize words automatically.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Guess the meaning of an unknown word from context.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Identify key information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Predict the content of a text.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Understand information in a text when not openly stated.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Read and respond critically.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
9	Ask questions about a text.	a	b	c	d	e
10	Read carefully and understand the details of the text.	a	b	c	d	e
11	Go through a text quickly to get the general idea.	a	b	c	d	e
12	Read quickly and selectively to find important information.	a	b	c	d	e
13	Search for simple information.	a	b	c	d	e
14	Distinguish the main idea from the supporting detail(s).	a	b	c	d	e
15	Identify cause-effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
16	Understand writer's aim/attitude.	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Organize writing to express major and minor ideas.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Organize ideas to show cause and effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Organize ideas for argumentative purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Organize ideas to describe events.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Write references and quotations.	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	Understand information when not openly stated in a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Predict the content of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Understand the subject matter of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Listen for specific information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Listen to a lecture to take effective notes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Follow question / answer sessions.	a	b	c	d	e

8	Understand spoken instructions.	a	b	c	d	e
---	---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

<i>Speaking</i>						
1	Ask relevant questions in class.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Participate in discussions/debates.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Give oral presentations.	a	b	c	d	e
4	React to speech and lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Produce correct pronunciation.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Provide solutions to given problems.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Express your ideas in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e

If you have any further suggestions, please write down:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX B
THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO THE COURSE INSTRUCTORS ABOUT THE
STUDENT TEACHERS' LANGUAGE NEEDS BEFORE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE PROGRAM

Dear Colleague,

This questionnaire has been prepared to serve as a data collection instrument for an academic study and aims to find out your perceptions of the student teachers' language needs. The results are to be used for the design of the Language Preparatory Program

The questionnaire consists of two main parts. The first part aims to get information about your personal profile which is important for the research, while the second includes three sub parts which aim to identify your perceived language needs related to the student teachers' reading, writing, listening and speaking abilities.

Frank and sincere answers that you are going to mark will affect the results of the study positively. The information will be coded, remain confidential and used for research purposes only. I appreciate your cooperation and hope you will seriously consider taking part in this study. Thank you for your contribution.

Enisa Mede
Department of ELT
PhD Candidate
enisa.mede@yeditepe.edu.tr

PART 1- Participant Profile

1. Gender F () M ()

2. Please write down your age.

3. How long have you been teaching English?

PART 2-Language Needs About the Language Preparatory Program

Circle one of the items below.

2a. In relation to the studies in the undergraduate program evaluate the importance of the following language skills. Circle the appropriate number according to the following scale. (Do not mark if not applicable).

a: very important b: important c: slightly important d: not very important e: unimportant

1	Reading	a	b	c	d	e
2	Writing	a	b	c	d	e
3	Listening	a	b	c	d	e
4	Speaking	a	b	c	d	e

2b. How important is the performance of the following tasks related to the four language skills important in the undergraduate program? Circle the appropriate number according to the following scale. (Do not mark if not applicable).

a: very important b: important c: slightly important d: not very important e: unimportant

Reading						
1	textbooks	a	b	c	d	e
2	articles in journals	a	b	c	d	e
3	reference tools (e.g. dictionaries)	a	b	c	d	e
4	course handouts	a	b	c	d	e
5	texts on the Internet	a	b	c	d	e
6	computer-presented texts	a	b	c	d	e
7	instructions for projects	a	b	c	d	e
8	newspapers/magazines	a	b	c	d	e
9	lecture notes	a	b	c	d	e
10	works of literature	a	b	c	d	e
11	graphs/ charts/ diagrams/ tables	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	a resume (CV)	a	b	c	d	e
2	essays in reaction to readings	a	b	c	d	e
3	references for a report or project	a	b	c	d	e
4	book reports	a	b	c	d	e
5	workbook exercises	a	b	c	d	e
6	essay-type questions	a	b	c	d	e
7	term papers	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	lectures	a	b	c	d	e
2	question/answer sessions	a	b	c	d	e
3	class presentations	a	b	c	d	e
4	dialogues	a	b	c	d	e

Speaking						
1	oral presentations	a	b	c	d	e
2	oral presentations using multimedia tools	a	b	c	d	e
3	state opinions on different topics (discussions/ debates)	a	b	c	d	e

2c. How often do the student teachers have difficulties with the application of the following strategies in tasks related to the four language skills in the undergraduate program? Circle the appropriate number according to the following scale. (Do not mark if not applicable).

a: always b: frequently c: sometimes d: rarely e: never

Reading						
1	Recognize words automatically.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Guess the meaning of an unknown word from context.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Identify key information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Predict the content of a text.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Understand information in a text when not openly stated.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Read and respond critically.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
9	Ask questions about a text.	a	b	c	d	e
10	Read carefully and understand the details of the text.	a	b	c	d	e
11	Go through a text quickly to get the general idea.	a	b	c	d	e
12	Read quickly and selectively to find important information.	a	b	c	d	e
13	Search for simple information.	a	b	c	d	e
14	Distinguish the main idea from the supporting detail(s).	a	b	c	d	e
15	Identify cause-effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
16	Understand writer's aim/attitude.	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Organize writing to express major and minor ideas.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Organize ideas to show cause and effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Organize ideas for argumentative purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Organize ideas to describe events.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Write references and quotations.	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	Understand information when not openly stated in a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Predict the content of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Understand the subject matter of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e

4	Listen for specific information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Listen to a lecture to take effective notes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Follow question / answer sessions.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Understand spoken instructions.	a	b	c	d	e

	<i>Speaking</i>					
1	Ask relevant questions in class.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Participate in discussions/debates.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Give oral presentations.	a	b	c	d	e
4	React to speech and lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Produce correct pronunciation.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Provide solutions to given problems.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Express your ideas in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e

If you have any further suggestions, please write down:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX C
THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO THE STUDENT TEACHERS ABOUT THEIR
LANGUAGE NEEDS AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Dear Friend,

This questionnaire has been prepared to serve as a data collection instrument for an academic study and aims to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met your language needs. The results are to be used for the evaluation of the program.

The questionnaire consists of two main parts. The first part aims to learn about your personal profile, which is important for the research, while the second includes three sub parts, which aim to identify your feelings whether the Language Preparatory Program has met your perceived language needs.

Frank and sincere answers that you are going to mark will affect the results of the study positively. The information will be coded, remain confidential and used for research purposes only. I appreciate your cooperation and hope you will seriously consider taking part in this study. Thank you for your contribution.

Enisa Mede
Department of ELT
PhD Candidate
enisa.mede@yeditepe.edu.tr

PART 1-Participant Profile

1. Gender F () M ()
2. Proficiency Level: Intermediate () Upper-Intermediate () Advanced ()
3. Please write down your age.

4. Please write down the name of the high school that you graduated from.

PART 2-Language Needs About the Language Preparatory Program

Circle one of the items below.

2a. *I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped me to improve the following language skills:*

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

1	Reading	a	b	c	d	e
2	Writing	a	b	c	d	e
3	Listening	a	b	c	d	e
4	Speaking	a	b	c	d	e

2b. *I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped me to improve my performance in the following tasks related to the four language skills:*

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

Reading						
1	textbooks	a	b	c	d	e
2	articles in journals	a	b	c	d	e
3	reference tools (e.g. dictionaries)	a	b	c	d	e
4	course handouts	a	b	c	d	e
5	texts on the Internet	a	b	c	d	e
6	computer-presented texts	a	b	c	d	e
7	instructions for projects	a	b	c	d	e
8	newspapers/magazines	a	b	c	d	e
9	lecture notes	a	b	c	d	e
10	works of literature	a	b	c	d	e
11	graphs/ charts/ diagrams/ tables	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	a resume (CV)	a	b	c	d	e
2	essays in reaction to readings	a	b	c	d	e
3	references for a report or project	a	b	c	d	e
4	book reports	a	b	c	d	e
5	workbook exercises	a	b	c	d	e
6	essay-type questions	a	b	c	d	e
7	term papers	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	lectures	a	b	c	d	e
2	question/answer sessions	a	b	c	d	e
3	class presentations	a	b	c	d	e
4	dialogues	a	b	c	d	e

Speaking						
1	oral presentations	a	b	c	d	e
2	oral presentations using multimedia tools	a	b	c	d	e
3	state opinions on different topics (discussions/ debates)	a	b	c	d	e

2c. I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped me to apply the following strategies in tasks related to the four language skills effectively:

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

Reading						
1	Recognize words automatically.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Guess the meaning of an unknown word from context.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Identify key information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Predict the content of a text.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Understand information in a text when not openly stated.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Read and respond critically.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
9	Ask questions about a text.	a	b	c	d	e
10	Read carefully and understand the details of the text.	a	b	c	d	e
11	Go through a text quickly to get the general idea.	a	b	c	d	e
12	Read quickly and selectively to find important information.	a	b	c	d	e
13	Search for simple information.	a	b	c	d	e
14	Distinguish the main idea from the supporting detail(s).	a	b	c	d	e
15	Identify cause-effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
16	Understand writer's aim/attitude.	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Organize writing to express major and minor ideas.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Organize ideas to show cause and effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Organize ideas for argumentative purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Organize ideas to describe events.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Write references and quotations.	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	Understand information when not openly stated in a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Predict the content of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Understand the subject matter of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Listen for specific information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Listen to a lecture to take effective notes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Follow question / answer sessions.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Understand spoken instructions.	a	b	c	d	e

<i>Speaking</i>						
1	Ask relevant questions in class.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Participate in discussions/debates.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Give oral presentations.	a	b	c	d	e
4	React to speech and lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Produce correct pronunciation.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Provide solutions to given problems.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Express your ideas in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e

If you have any further suggestions, please write down:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX D
THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO THE COURSE INSTRUCTORS ABOUT THE
STUDENT TEACHERS' LANGUAGE NEEDS AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE PROGRAM

Dear Colleague,

This questionnaire has been prepared to serve as a data collection instrument for an academic study and aims to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' language needs. The results are to be used for the evaluation of the program.

The questionnaire consists of two main parts. The first part aims to learn about your personal profile, which is important for the research, while the second includes three sub parts, which aim to identify your feelings whether the Language Preparatory Program has met the student teachers' perceived language needs.

Frank and sincere answers that you are going to mark will affect the results of the study positively. The information will be coded, remain confidential and used for research purposes only. I appreciate your cooperation and hope you will seriously consider taking part in this study. Thank you for your contribution.

Enisa Mede
Department of ELT
PhD Candidate
enisa.mede@yeditepe.edu.tr

PART 1- Participant Profile

1. Gender F () M ()

4. Please write down your age.

5. How long have you been teaching English?

PART 2-Language Needs About the Language Preparatory Program

Circle one of the items below.

2a. I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped the student teachers to improve the following language skills:

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

1	Reading	a	b	c	d	e
2	Writing	a	b	c	d	e
3	Listening	a	b	c	d	e
4	Speaking	a	b	c	d	e

2b. I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped the student teachers to improve their performance in the following tasks related to the four language skills:

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

Reading						
1	textbooks	a	b	c	d	e
2	articles in journals	a	b	c	d	e
3	reference tools (e.g. dictionaries)	a	b	c	d	e
4	course handouts	a	b	c	d	e
5	texts on the Internet	a	b	c	d	e
6	computer-presented texts	a	b	c	d	e
7	instructions for projects	a	b	c	d	e
8	newspapers/magazines	a	b	c	d	e
9	lecture notes	a	b	c	d	e
10	works of literature	a	b	c	d	e
11	graphs/ charts/ diagrams/ tables	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	a resume (CV)	a	b	c	d	e
2	essays in reaction to readings	a	b	c	d	e
3	references for a report or project	a	b	c	d	e
4	book reports	a	b	c	d	e
5	workbook exercises	a	b	c	d	e
6	essay-type questions	a	b	c	d	e
7	term papers	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	lectures	a	b	c	d	e
2	question/answer sessions	a	b	c	d	e
3	class presentations	a	b	c	d	e
4	dialogues	a	b	c	d	e

Speaking						
1	oral presentations	a	b	c	d	e
2	oral presentations using multimedia tools	a	b	c	d	e
3	state opinions on different topics (discussions/ debates)	a	b	c	d	e

2c. I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped the student teachers to apply the following strategies in tasks related to the four language skills effectively:

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

Reading						
1	Recognize words automatically.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Guess the meaning of an unknown word from context.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Recognize the organization of ideas to see their relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Identify key information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Predict the content of a text.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Understand information in a text when not openly stated.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Read and respond critically.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
9	Ask questions about a text.	a	b	c	d	e
10	Read carefully and understand the details of the text.	a	b	c	d	e
11	Go through a text quickly to get the general idea.	a	b	c	d	e
12	Read quickly and selectively to find important information.	a	b	c	d	e
13	Search for simple information.	a	b	c	d	e
14	Distinguish the main idea from the supporting detail(s).	a	b	c	d	e
15	Identify cause-effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
16	Understand writer's aim/attitude.	a	b	c	d	e

Writing						
1	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Combine information from multiple texts to prepare an assignment.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Organize writing to express major and minor ideas.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Organize ideas for compare and contrast purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Organize ideas to show cause and effect relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Organize ideas for argumentative purposes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Organize ideas to describe events.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Write references and quotations.	a	b	c	d	e

Listening						
1	Understand information when not openly stated in a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Predict the content of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Understand the subject matter of a lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
4	Listen for specific information.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Distinguish fact from opinion.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Listen to a lecture to take effective notes.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Follow question / answer sessions.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Understand spoken instructions.	a	b	c	d	e

<i>Speaking</i>						
1	Ask relevant questions in class.	a	b	c	d	e
2	Participate in discussions/debates.	a	b	c	d	e
3	Give oral presentations.	a	b	c	d	e
4	React to speech and lecture.	a	b	c	d	e
5	Produce correct pronunciation.	a	b	c	d	e
6	Provide solutions to given problems.	a	b	c	d	e
7	Summarize information in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e
8	Express your ideas in your own words.	a	b	c	d	e

If you have any further suggestions, please write down:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX E
THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO THE STUDENT TEACHERS ABOUT THEIR
LEARNING NEEDS AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Dear Friend,

This questionnaire has been prepared to serve as a data collection instrument for an academic study and aims to find out whether the Language Preparatory Program has met your assumed learning needs. The results are to be used for the evaluation of the program.

Frank and sincere answers that you are going to mark will affect the results of the study positively. The information will be coded, remain confidential and used for research purposes only. I appreciate your cooperation and hope you will seriously consider taking part in this study. Thank you for your contribution.

Enisa Mede
Department of ELT
PhD Candidate
enisa.mede@yeditepe.edu.tr

Circle one of the items below.

I feel that the Language Preparatory Program has helped me to...

a: strongly agree b: agree c: somewhat agree d: disagree e: strongly disagree

1	improve my listening skills with active participation in the lessons.	a	b	c	d	e
2	improve my speaking skills with active participation in the lessons.	a	b	c	d	e
3	apply different writing strategies effectively in various tasks.	a	b	c	d	e
4	apply different speaking strategies effectively in various tasks.	a	b	c	d	e
5	apply different listening strategies effectively in various tasks.	a	b	c	d	e
6	apply different reading strategies effectively in various tasks.	a	b	c	d	e
7	apply the grammar rules in various tasks.	a	b	c	d	e
8	improve my note taking skills.	a	b	c	d	e
9	improve my presentation skills.	a	b	c	d	e
10	learn key terms related to English Language Teaching (etc. portfolio, feedback)	a	b	c	d	e
11	speak English effectively in the given assignments.	a	b	c	d	e
12	write a reaction paper on a given topic effectively.	a	b	c	d	e
13	express my ideas clearly on a given topic.	a	b	c	d	e
14	think critically on a given topic.	a	b	c	d	e
15	summarize the texts in my own words.	a	b	c	d	e

APPENDIX F
THE SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE STUDENT TEACHERS
ABOUT THEIR PERCEIVED LANGUAGE NEEDS BEFORE THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Part 1. GENERAL

1. What do you think should be the primary aim of the Language Preparatory Program? Briefly explain.
2. What should be the most important language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) to be improved in the program? Should there be any order of importance? Briefly explain.
3. What are some of the effective tasks to be used in the program to improve the four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) effectively? Briefly explain.

Part 2. READING

1. What are some of the effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the reading skill? Briefly explain.
2. What are the most frequent problems you face with the reading skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?
3. To what extent should the following strategies be focused on in terms of improving the reading skill:
 - a) Reading for general information
 - b) Careful reading
 - c) Critical reading
 - d) Synthesizing information
4. To what extent is extensive reading required in terms of improving the reading skill? Briefly explain.

Part 3. WRITING

1. What are some of the effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the writing skill? Briefly explain.
2. To what extent should the following issues be mostly focused on in the written assignments:
 - a) Content
 - b) Organization
 - c) Presentation
3. To what extent should research (e.g. searching for extra sources on the Internet) be required in the written assignments? Briefly explain.
4. To what extent should synthesizing information from various sources be required in the written assignments? Briefly explain.
5. To what extent should reaction papers be required in the writing course? Briefly explain.
6. Which of the following are the most frequent problems you face with the writing skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?
 - a) Language proficiency
 - b) Providing supporting ideas via examples and proofs
 - c) Organizing ideas according to given tasks (e.g. argumentation)
 - d) Summarizing and paraphrasing
 - e) Plagiarism

Part 4. LISTENING

1. What are some of the effective methods tasks that could be used in the program to improve the listening skill? Briefly explain.
2. What are the most frequent problems you face with the listening skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?
3. To what extent is selective listening important while listening lectures? Briefly explain.

4. Do you think that providing explanations in Turkish may be necessary to follow the lectures efficiently in the listening course? Briefly explain.

Part 5. SPEAKING

1. To what extent is oral participation important in the speaking course? Briefly explain.

2. Is doing presentation (with or without using the multimedia tools) important? Briefly explain.

3. Is participation in discussions/debates important? Briefly explain.

4. What are some of the effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the speaking skill? Briefly explain.

5. What are the most frequent problems you face with the speaking skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?

APPENDIX G
THE SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE COURSE
INSTRUCTORS ABOUT THE STUDENT TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LANGUAGE
NEEDS BEFORE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Part 1. GENERAL

1. What do you think should be the primary aim of the Language Preparatory Program? Briefly explain.
2. What should be the most important language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) to be improved in the program? Should there be any order of importance? Briefly explain.
3. What are some of the effective tasks to be used in the program to improve the four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) effectively? Briefly explain.

Part 2. READING

1. What are some of the effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the student teachers' reading skill? Briefly explain.
2. What are the most frequent problems the student teachers face with the reading skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?
3. To what extent should the following strategies be focused on in terms of improving the reading skill:
 - e) Reading for general information
 - f) Careful reading
 - g) Critical reading
 - h) Synthesizing information
4. To what extent is extensive reading important in terms of improving the student teachers' reading skill? Briefly explain.

Part 3. WRITING

1. What are some of the effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the student teachers' writing skill? Briefly explain.
2. To what extent should the following issues be mostly focused on in the written assignments:
 - a) Content
 - b) Organization
 - c) Presentation
3. To what extent should research be required in the written assignments? Briefly explain.
4. To what extent should synthesizing information from various sources be required in the written assignments? Briefly explain.
5. To what extent should reaction papers be required in the writing course? Briefly explain.
6. Which of the following may be the most frequent problems the student teachers face with the writing skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?
 - a) Language proficiency
 - b) Providing supporting ideas via examples and proofs
 - c) Organizing ideas according to given tasks (e.g. argumentation)
 - d) Summarizing and paraphrasing
 - e) Plagiarism

Part 4. LISTENING

1. What are some of the most effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the student teachers' listening skill in English? Briefly explain.
2. What are the most frequent problems the student teachers face with the listening skill? What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?
3. To what extent do you think that selective listening is important while listening lectures? Briefly explain.

4. Do you think that providing explanations in Turkish may be necessary to follow the lectures effectively? Briefly explain.

Part 5. SPEAKING

1. To what extent is oral participation important in the speaking course? Briefly explain.

2. Is doing presentation (with or without using the multimedia tools) important? Briefly explain.

3. Is participation in discussions/debates important? Briefly explain.

4. What are some of the effective tasks that could be used in the program to improve the speaking skill? Briefly explain.

5. What are the most frequent problems the student teachers face with the speaking skill?

What may be the possible reasons behind these problems?

APPENDIX H
THE SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE STUDENT TEACHERS
ABOUT THEIR LANGUAGE AND LEARNING NEEDS AFTER THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Part 1. GENERAL

1. What do you think was the primary aim of the Language Preparatory Program? Briefly explain.
2. What were the most important language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) to be improved in the program? Was any order of importance? Briefly explain.
3. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) effectively? Briefly explain.
4. Do you think the program has met your learning needs? If so, to what extent?
5. What do you think were the major strengths and weaknesses of the program? Briefly explain.

Part 2. READING

1. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the reading skill? Briefly explain.
2. To what extent were the following strategies important in the reading course:
 - a) Reading for general information
 - b) Careful reading
 - c) Critical reading
 - d) Synthesizing information
3. What were the most frequent problems you faced with the reading skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

Part 3. WRITING

1. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the writing skill?

Briefly explain.

2. To what were the following issues mostly focused on in the written assignments:

- a) Content
- b) Organization
- c) Presentation

3. Which of the following were the most frequent problems you faced with the writing skill?

What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

- a) Language proficiency
- b) Providing supporting ideas via examples and proofs
- c) Organizing ideas according to given tasks (e.g. argumentation)
- d) Summarizing and paraphrasing
- e) Plagiarism

4. To what extent was research required in the written assignments? Briefly explain.

6. To what extent was writing a reaction paper required in the writing? Briefly explain.

Part 4. LISTENING

1. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the listening skill?

Briefly explain.

2. What were the most frequent problems you faced with the listening skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

4. To what extent did you feel proficient with selective listening? Briefly explain.

5. Could you easily follow the lectures? Do you think that providing explanations in Turkish was necessary? Briefly explain.

Part 5. SPEAKING

1. To what extent was oral participation important in the course? Briefly explain.
2. Was doing presentation (with or without using the multimedia tools) important? Briefly explain.
3. Was participation in discussions/debates important? Briefly explain.
4. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the speaking skill? Briefly explain.
5. What were the most frequent problems you faced with the speaking skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

APPENDIX I
A SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE COURSE INSTRUTORS
ABOUT STUDENT TEACHERS' LANGUAGE AND LEARNING NEEDS AFTER
THE IMPLEMETATION OF THE PROGRAM

Part 1. GENERAL

1. What do you think was the primary aim of the Language Preparatory Program? Briefly explain.
2. What were the most important language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) to be improved in the program? Was any order of importance? Briefly explain.
3. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) effectively? Briefly explain.
4. Do you think the program has met your learning needs? If so, to what extent?
5. What do you think were the major strengths and weaknesses of the program? Briefly explain.

Part 2. READING

1. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the reading skill? Briefly explain.
2. To what extent were the following strategies important in the reading course:
 - a) Reading for general information
 - b) Careful reading
 - c) Critical reading
 - d) Synthesizing information
3. What were the most frequent problems the student teachers faced with the reading skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

Part 3. WRITING

1. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the writing skill?

Briefly explain.

2. To what were the following issues mostly focused on in the written assignments:

- a) Content
- b) Organization
- c) Presentation

3. Which of the following were the most frequent problems the student teachers faced with the writing skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

- a) Language proficiency
- b) Providing supporting ideas via examples and proofs
- c) Organizing ideas according to given tasks (e.g. argumentation)
- d) Summarizing and paraphrasing
- e) Plagiarism

4. To what extent was research required in the written assignments? Briefly explain.

6. To what extent was writing a reaction paper required in the writing? Briefly explain.

Part 4. LISTENING

1. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the listening skill?

Briefly explain.

2. What were the most frequent problems the student teachers faced with to improve the listening skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

4. To what extent did think that the student teachers were proficient with selective listening?

Briefly explain.

5. Could you easily follow the lectures? Do you think that providing explanations in Turkish was necessary? Briefly explain.

Part 5. SPEAKING

1. To what extent was oral participation important in the course? Briefly explain.
2. Was doing presentation (with or without using the multimedia tools) important? Briefly explain.
3. Was participation in discussions/debates important? Briefly explain.
4. What were the most effective tasks used in the program to improve the speaking skill? Briefly explain.
5. What were the most frequent problems the student teachers faced with the speaking skill? What could be the possible reasons behind these problems?

APPENDIX J
SAMPLE READING PRACTICE AT THREE DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS

1. Intermediate

Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (1998). *Reading Power: Second Edition*. Pearson: Longman.

Making inferences (pp. 139)

Read this passage from "Project Omega," a story by Elaine O'Reilly, try to infer the answers to the questions below. Underline the words or phrases that helped you. Work with another student.

"My name's Julia Baker. You saved my life."

"Oh, I do that kind of thing when I get the chance," laughed the young man. "I'm Edward West."

"Well, how can I thank you, Edward? Why don't you come in and have some coffee? I think I need a cup too, after that."

They went into the apartment. Clara brought them two cups of coffee—very good Italian coffee.

"The elevator," Julia said. "It wasn't there."

"I know."

"But you were there. Was that by chance?"

Edward looked at her. She saw that he was thinking.

"Yes," he said slowly. "I think it was."

"I think they broke the elevator door."

"Yes. That's clear."

"You don't think it was an accident?"

"No, I don't think so."

Julia drank the hot, sweet, black coffee. When she put the cup down, she began to cry. For the first time in her eighteen years of life, she knew she needed a friend. She knew it because she was with this young man—this young man with the clear, friendly eyes.

"It's all right," he said. "You're safe now."

"No, I'm not," Julia answered. "I'm in terrible danger."

And she told him the story, every part of it, from her father's disappearance to Miss Harper's telephone call. She told him about Project Omega.

1. What kind of story is this passage from? _____
2. When does this story take place? _____
3. Where are these people? _____
4. What happened before this passage in the story? _____
5. What do you think will happen after this? _____

2. Upper-intermediate

Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (2004). *More Reading Power: Second Edition*. Pearson: Longman.

Making Inferences (pp. 74-75)

Read this passage from "Til Death Do Us Part," a story by Becky Hagenston. Working with another student or a group of students, infer the answers to the questions that follow. Underline the words or phrases that helped you.

Til Death Do Us Part

Toyce watched Adam and his father playing horseshoes with Jerry and the Reverend, under the gold-washed trees. Adam's parents had insisted on having the rehearsal dinner at their house, and there were cubed cheeses, baby quiches, and shrimp cocktail laid out on picnic tables on their wooden patio.

Adam hadn't swept Joyce off her feet or made her forget herself. She would not describe herself as "crazy, wacko in love." She loved him—not madly, not crazily, but sanely and contentedly. It didn't matter that certain young men made her feel woozy, like Cousin Charlie had, or that she sometimes fell in love in elevators. That, she decided, was a sickness similar to the flu. It passed soon enough, and then you recovered and went on with things. It was what got people like Kathy and her mother into trouble.

Joyce's mother was pleased because Adam came from a "healthy family environment." His parents had been married for thirty-four years, and he'd grown up in this farmhouse on a country road that was still unpaved, five miles from Nathan Hale's house. Joyce couldn't remember what Nathan Hale had done, but she liked that his house was still there, after so many years. There was something reassuring and permanent about it.

Adam had grown up climbing these same trees, playing with the horseshoes that were now thudding and clanging across the lawn. In this place, Joyce had the same feeling she sometimes got when she went back to Ebenezer Church—that it could be ten years ago, or sixty, or a hundred. That every moment was present and intact, swirling seamlessly into right now.

Sometimes it seemed to her that she had left pieces of herself under furniture that had never belonged to her, and in schoolyards with children who had never learned her name. It made her sad, as if there were small ghosts that looked like her, wandering lost in places they didn't recognize. She had tried to explain this to Adam once, when he was showing her the remains of a rocket he and his brothers had built in the barn when he was nine.

"I don't have any relics of my childhood to show you," she'd said. "I couldn't take you to any tree houses or point out any tire swings I used to play on. It was like, with every new father, everything just began again. My mother would give a lot of stuff away, so she wouldn't be reminded of whoever it was she had just divorced. And she threw away a lot of photo albums, so I'm not even sure what certain people looked like anymore."

"Well, you've turned out great," Adam had told her. "And maybe if your life hadn't gone that way, you wouldn't be the person you are now."

"Maybe," said Joyce, doubtfully. "Besides, we've got about sixty years ahead of us to collect relics." Joyce was always relieved when he said things like that, even if she herself was not entirely convinced. Now, pulling a cube of Cheddar cheese from its red-frilled toothpick, she squinted toward the lawn and imagined her sons and daughters playing on this same grass. It was much easier to picture these people who didn't exist than to imagine the older version of herself who would be right here, watching them.

1. What is the relationship between Joyce and Adam? Does the title of the story help you to infer this? Why?
2. Where are they?
3. What can you tell about Joyce's past?
4. Which character do you think expresses the way the author feels?
5. What do you think will happen after this in the story?

3. Advanced

Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (2007). *Advanced Reading Power: Second Edition*
Pearson: Longman.

Making Inferences (p. 91)

A. *Preview the passage. Then read it and underline the facts. Working with another student, answer the questions that follow.*

Mysterious "Piano Man" Puzzles British Doctors

The photograph shows a tall, blond young man holding what looks like a musical score. His eyes scared, his shoulders rounded and slightly turned away, he appeared to avoid contact with the camera.

Found several weeks ago on a windy road beside the sea on the Isle of Sheppey in Kent, England, he was dripping wet and apparently very disturbed. He would not answer questions or speak with anyone. He was wearing a black suit and a white shirt, but since all the labels had been mysteriously cut out from his clothes, authorities had no way of even identifying his nationality. Since then he has continued to remain silent, refusing or unable to give information about who he is or where he comes from. He was taken to the accident and emergency department at the Medway Maritime Hospital in Gillingham, but later was moved to the psychiatric clinic in Dartford, where he continues to baffle doctors.

A spokesman for the hospital says that the first clue to his identity came when someone in the hospital had the idea of leaving him with a piece of paper and pencils and he drew a detailed sketch of a grand piano. Hospital staff then took him to the hospital's chapel, which contains a

piano. He sat down immediately at the piano and began to play, appearing calm and relaxed for the first time since he had been found. According to reports from the hospital, he is also a good musician and a pleasure to listen to, even if he tends to play rather melancholy music. One staff member identified a piece from Tchaikovsky's *Swan Lake*, but acknowledged that she was not an expert in classical music.

According to a social worker assigned to the case, the young man is shy in the extreme and avoids any kind of social interaction. Though interpreters in various northern and central European languages have been called to the hospital to visit him, he has failed to respond to any of them. His photograph has been circulated in newspapers around the world, prompting hundreds of phone calls to the Missing Persons Bureau. However, none of these has provided useful information about his identity.

There is, of course, the delicate question of whether the man is really in need of psychiatric care or just pretending to be ill. Doctors at the hospital say that they have no reason not to take him seriously and they have a duty to care for him as long as he needs it.

3. What has the writer inferred from the photograph of the "Piano Man"?
4. What can you infer from the fact that he was wearing a black suit and a white shirt?
5. What can you infer about the fact that the labels had been cut out of his clothes?
6. What can you infer from the fact that the police brought him to the hospital?
7. What did the hospital staff infer from his drawing of a piano?

APPENDIX K
SAMPLE ARTICLE ON KEY CONCEPTS IN ELT

ELT Journal
doi:10.1093/elt/ccl030
ELT J 60:385-387, 2006.

Native-speakerism
Adrian Holliday

Published on behalf of

<http://www.oxfordjournals.org/>

Oxford University Press

Downloaded from <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org> by on 19 June 2008

Native-speakerism is a pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that ‘native-speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology (Holliday 2005). Use of the concept follows a now established concern about political inequalities within ELT (for example, Canagarajah 1999, Kubota 2001, Pennycook 1994). However, other attempts to capture this inequality, for example ‘Centre’ vs. ‘Periphery’ (Phillipson 1992) and ‘BANA’ vs. ‘TESEP’ (Holliday 1994), have suffered from binary regional or cultural overgeneralization. Native-speakerism is seen instead as a divisive force which originates within particular educational cultures within the English-speaking West. While the adoption of and resistance to the ideology take place to a greater or lesser degree throughout the ELT world, the ‘native speaker’ ideal plays a widespread and complex iconic role outside as well as inside the English-speaking West.

Although some regard the terms ‘native-’ and ‘non-native speaker’ as unviable on linguistic grounds (for example, Jenkins 2000: 8–9) and constructed for the preservation of a privileged in-group (for example, Braine 1999: xv, citing Kramersch), they have a very real currency within the popular discourse of ELT. What is important is that their everyday use reveals how the profession thinks about itself. That there is often a lack of awareness of their deeper political significance is indicative of the way in which ideologies typically operate (Fairclough 1995: 36). As a result, nativespeakerist prejudice is often obscured by the apparent liberalism of ‘a nice field like TESOL’ (Kubota 2001, 2002). Throughout this article, thus, ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ have been placed in inverted commas in recognition of their ideological construction.

The impact of native-speakerism can be seen in many aspects of professional life, from employment policy to the presentation of language. An underlying theme is the ‘othering’ of students and colleagues from outside the English-speaking West according to essentialist regional or religious cultural stereotypes, especially when they have difficulty with the specific types of active, collaborative, and self-directed ‘learner-centred’ teaching–learning techniques that have frequently been constructed and packaged as superior within the English speaking West. Such a perspective is native-speakerist because it negatively and confiningly labels what are in effect ‘non-native speaker’ ‘cultures’ as ‘dependent’, ‘hierarchical’, ‘collectivist’, ‘reticent’, ‘indirect’, ‘passive’, ‘docile’, ‘lacking in self esteem’, ‘reluctant to challenge authority’, ‘easily dominated’, ‘undemocratic’, or ‘traditional’ and, in effect, uncritical and unthinking (Holliday 2005: 19, Pennycook 2002, Kubota 2001). Although such descriptions are claimed to be the result of professional observation, their ideological, prejudicial nature becomes apparent when they recur almost indiscriminately in much ELT professional talk, literature, and training, regardless of the specific ‘culture’ being described (Kubota 2001, Holliday 2005: 19). Such descriptions thus represent an imagined, problematic generalized Other to the unproblematic Self of the ‘native speaker’.

This cultural reduction, or culturism, falls within the broader chauvinistic narrative of Orientalism (Said 1978). The colonialist myth of the ‘autonomous’, ‘organized’, ‘inventive’ Robinson Crusoe ‘civilizing’ Man Friday (Pennycook 1998: 10–16) is implicit in the native-speakerist ‘moral mission’ to bring a ‘superior’ culture of teaching and learning to students and colleagues who are perceived not to be able to succeed on their own terms. The apparent liberalism of learner-centredness conceals the manipulative attempt to improve learner behaviour. The emphasis on close monitoring, ‘learner training’ and precise methodological staging in current practice can be seen as hiding a subtle agenda aimed at ‘correcting’ ‘non-native speaker’ culture (Anderson 2005), one which can be traced back to the behaviourist lockstep of the structural or audiolingual approach (Holliday 2005: 39).

The undoing of native-speakerism requires a type of thinking that promotes new relationships. This is already evident in discussions concerning the ownership of English and the reassessment of who we are after 9/11.¹ It is argued in the conclusion to Holliday (2005) that native-speakerism needs to be addressed at the level of the prejudices embedded in everyday practice, and that dominant professional discourses must be put aside if the meanings and realities of students and colleagues from outside the English-speaking West are to be understood.

References

- Anderson, A. 2005. Problematizing ‘Learner-Centredness’ in TESOL Professional Discourse and Practice. Unpublished paper, Department of Language Studies, Canterbury Christ Church University.
- Braine, G. 1999. *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, S. 1999. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: AddisonWesley Longman.
- Holliday, A. R. 1994. *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. R. 2005. *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language: New Models, New Norms, New Goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kubota, R. 2001. ‘Discursive construction of the images of US classrooms’. *TESOL Quarterly* 35/1: 9–37.
- Kubota, R. 2002. ‘(Un)ravelling racism in a nice field like TESOL’. *TESOL Quarterly* 36/1: 84–92.
- Pennycook, A. 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. London: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. 1998. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. 2000. ‘Development, culture and language: ethical concerns in a postcolonial world’. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Language and Development*. Retrieved 29 December 2005 from: <http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/hanoi/pennycook.htm>
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

APPENDIX L
SAMPLE BOOK REPORT GUIDELINES

A. Students are required to give a written report. It should be about 500 words roughly 2-3 pages in length on their chosen books including the six sections:

1. **Title and Author:** Include brief information about the book, the author and date of publication.
Do not directly copy it from the internet sources such as wikipedia.
2. **Summary:** Describe the major conflict in the story. Who were the protagonist and antagonist in the conflict? Was there a problem? Who had the problem? What or who was the problem? How was the conflict or problem resolved? What did you learn from the conflict's resolution? What did the main characters learn from the conflict and its resolution? What is the Point-of-View (first or third person)?
3. **Character Description:** Who was your favorite character in the book? Describe your favorite character in detail. How did s/he look, and what was her/his personality like? How well did s/he get along with other characters? Does this character teach us anything?
4. **Setting Description:** Describe the setting in detail. Where and when does the story take place? Describe the mood of the story. Does the setting change at all? Does the mood change? Describe any changes and discuss whether you felt they were important.
5. **Theme Discussion:** What is the story's main idea? Is there more than one main idea? Is there a moral to the story? Describe each and its overall importance to the story.
6. **Your Opinion:** What did you think of this book? Would you recommend it or not? Why?

B. Please follow these style guidelines for your book report:

- 1.** Papers must be typed (Times new roman, 12 point, double-spaced, justified).
- 2.** Do not forget to include your title (cover) page.
- 3.** Number your pages. Do not number your cover page.
- 4.** Grammar, spelling, and punctuation will be taken into consideration in determining the final grade.
Proof read your paper carefully.
- 5.** Check the rules on plagiarism.
- 6.** Maintain consistent tense throughout your entire paper.
- 7.** Use last names, not first names of people you discuss. First name only is too familiar and informal for an academic paper.
- 8.** Spell out contractions.
- 9.** Do not use “I” or the first person voice in your summary.
- 10.** Read finished review out loud for clarity.
- 11.** Both send an online (soft copy) as an email attachment and hand a hard copy of your assignments.

APPENDIX M
SAMPLE WRITING PRACTICE AT THREE DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS

1. Intermediate

Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing: Third Edition*. Pearson: Longman.

Narrative Paragraphs (pp. 24-28)

Organization

Narration is story writing. When you write a narrative paragraph, you write about events in the order that they happen. In other words, you use time order to organize your sentences.

As you read the model paragraph, look for words and phrases that tell when something happened?

Earthquake!

An unforgettable experience in my life was a magnitude 6.9 earthquake. I was at home with my older sister and younger brother. Suddenly, our apartment started shaking. At first, none of us realized what was happening. Then my sister yelled, "Earthquake! Get under something!" I half rolled and half crawled across the room to get under the dining table. My sister also yelled at my little brother to get under his desk. Meanwhile, my sister was on the kitchen floor holding her arms over her head to protect it from falling dishes. The earthquake lasted less than a minute, but it seemed like a year to us. At last, the shaking stopped. For a minute or two, we were too scared to move. Then we tried to call our parents at work, but even our cell phone didn't work. Next, we checked the apartment for damage. We felt very lucky, for nothing was broken except a few dishes. However, our first earthquake was an experience that none of us will ever forget.

Questions on the Model

1. In which four sentences does the word earthquake appear?

2. What words and phrases show when different actions took place? Circle them.

Time Order

In the model *narrative* paragraph, the writer used *time order* to tell what happened first, what happened next, what happened after that, and so on.

Notice the kinds of words and phrases used to show time order. These are called ***time order signals*** because they signal the order in which events happen (e.g. first, next, at the beginning etc.).

Put a comma after a time order signal that comes before the subject at the beginning of a sentence. (Exception: Then, soon, and now are usually not followed by a comma.)

At first, none of us realized what was happening.

For a minute or two, we were too scared to move.

Then we tried to call our parents at work.

Complete the paragraphs with time order signals from the lists provided, and capitalize and punctuate them correctly. Use each word or phrase once. There is more than one possible word or phrase to fill in some of the blanks.

first, on the night before Thanksgiving, about 3:00 in the afternoon, then, after that, in the morning soon, before taking the first bite, finally

Thanksgiving

Thanksgiving in the United States is a day for families to be together and enjoy a traditional meal, (a) On the night before Thanksgiving our mother bakes a pumpkin pie, the traditional Thanksgiving dessert, (b) _____ she gets up early to prepare the other traditional dishes.

(c) _____ she makes dressing. (d) _____ she stuffs the turkey with the dressing and puts the turkey into the oven to roast, (e) _____, she prepares

the rest of the meal. She cooks all day long, (f) _____ the family sits down at the table, (g) _____ everyone around the table says one thing that they are thankful for. (h) _____ we can begin to eat. We stuff ourselves just as full as Mother stuffed the turkey earlier in the day!(i) _____ we are all groaning because we have eaten too much, (j) _____ we collapse on the living room sofa and watch football games on TV. No one moves for at least two hours.

2. Use these words and phrases:

on the day of the party

first

next,

during the party

after that

finally

before the party

then (use twice)

later

at the beginning of the party

Fifteen Years

A girl's fifteenth birthday is a very special occasion in many Latin American countries and requires a lot of planning, (a) _____ the parents make many preparations, (b)

_____ they buy a special dress and order a bouquet of flowers for their daughter. They also plan a large meal for the guests and hire an orchestra. (c) _____ they decorate a big room where the party will be held. (d) _____ there are many special traditions, (e) _____ the father and daughter enter the big salon accompanied by special music, (f) _____ the father makes a speech and the daughter gets some presents (g) _____ everyone drinks champagne, (h) _____ the father and daughter dance a waltz, and the daughter and every boy dance one dance together, (i) _____ all of the guests make a line to congratulate her.

(j) _____ all of the boys stand in a group because she will throw the bouquet, and the boy who catches it dances with her. (k) _____ everyone dances to different kinds of music until six o'clock in the morning.

C. The following sets of sentences are not in correct time order. Number the sentences in the correct order.

1. _____ She put the clean dishes away.
- 2 _____ She removed the dirty dishes from the table.
- _____ She turned on the dishwasher.
- _____ She put them in the dishwasher.
- _____ She piled them in the sink and rinsed them.
- 1 _____ It was Sarah's turn to wash the dishes last night.
- _____ Finally, the dishes were clean.

2. _____ He filled it out and left.
- _____ He went to the bookshelf, but the book wasn't there.
- _____ Tom went to the library to get a book.
- _____ He went to the computer catalog.
- _____ The librarian told him to fill out a form.
- _____ He told the librarian he wanted to reserve that book.
- _____ He wrote down the title and call number of the book.

3. _____ He gave us a room with an ocean view.
_____ The airline had oversold economy class seats, so we got to sit
in first class.
_____ Our good fortune continued at the hotel.
_____ We can't wait to visit Florida again.
_____ The hotel manager also gave us coupons for lots of free
things.
_____ The hotel manager apologized for not having our room
ready when we arrived.
_____ Our vacation in Florida last month was almost perfect.
_____ The weather was warm and sunny, so we went to the
beach every day.
_____ Our good fortune began at the airport.

Try It Out!

Write the sentences from the preceding exercise as paragraphs. Try to make your paragraphs flow smoothly by using these two techniques: (1) Add time order signals at the beginning of some of the sentences. (2) Combine some of the sentences to form simple sentences with one subject and two verbs.

Example

It was Sarah's turn to wash the dishes last night. First, she removed the dirty dishes from the table. Next, she piled them in the sink and rinsed them. After that, she put them in the dishwasher and turned it on. Finally, the dishes were clean.

Writing Assignment

Write a paragraph about a memorable event or a memorable experience in your life. Let's review the steps in the writing process.

Step 1 Prewrite to get ideas. Use the freewriting that you completed in the Try It Out! exercise.

Step 2 Organize the ideas.

Put the events into time order: Make a list of the events or number them on your freewriting paper. Use your list to guide you as you write.

Step 3 Write the rough draft. Write ROUGH DRAFT at the top of your paper.

Begin your paragraph with a sentence that tells what event or experience you are going to write about.

I'll never forget the day I met my future husband.

The most memorable vacation I ever took was a bicycle trip across Canada.

Use time order to organize your paragraph. Use time order signals, and punctuate them correctly.

Pay attention to your sentence structure. Write both simple and compound sentences, and punctuate them correctly.

Step 4 Polish the rough draft.

Exchange papers with a classmate and ask him or her to check your rough draft using Peer-Editing Worksheet 2 on page 200. Then discuss the completed worksheet and decide what changes you should make. Write a second draft.

Use Self-Editing Worksheet 2 on page 201 to check your second draft for grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure.

Step 5 Write a final copy.

Hand in your rough draft, your second draft, your final copy, and the page containing the two editing worksheets. Your teacher may also ask you to hand in your prewriting paper.

Alternative Writing Assignment

Write a paragraph in which you explain how you celebrate a special day or special occasion in your culture. For example, a person living in the United States might write about Halloween, Thanksgiving Day, or St. Patrick's Day. Follow the writing process steps.

2. Upper-intermediate

Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2007). *Writing Academic English: Fourth Edition*. Pearson: Longman.

Compare/Contrast Essays (pp. 111-123)

In a *comparison/contrast essay*, you explain the similarities and the differences between two items. Comparison and contrast is a very common pattern in most academic fields. It is also a common type of essay test question. You might encounter questions such as these:

Compare the forms of government of Great Britain and the United States.

Compare the characters of Uncle Melik and his nephew in William Saroyan's short story "The Pomegranate Trees."

Compare and contrast methods for promoting a new business, product, or service.

As you read the following model essay, study its organization.

Japan and the United States: Different but Alike

The culture of place is an integral part of its society whether that place is a remote Indian village in Brazil or a highly industrialized city in Western Europe. The culture of Japan fascinates people in the United States because, at first glance, it seems so different. Everything that characterizes the United States newness, racial heterogeneity, vast territory, informality, and an ethic of individualism—is absent in Japan. There, one finds an ancient and homogeneous society, an ethic that emphasizes the importance of groups, and a tradition of formal behavior governing every aspect of daily living, from drinking tea to saying hello. On the surface at least, U.S. and Japanese societies seem totally opposite.

One obvious difference is the people. Japan is a homogenous society of one nationality and a few underrepresented minority groups, such as the ethnic Chinese and Koreans. All areas of government and society are controlled by the Japanese majority. In contrast, although the United States is a country with originally European roots, its liberal immigration policies have resulted in its becoming a heterogeneous society of many ethnicities—Europeans, Africans, Asians, and Latinos. All are represented in all areas of U.S. society, including business, education, and politics.

Other areas of difference between Japan and the United States involve issues of group interaction and sense of space. Whereas people in the United States pride themselves on individualism and informality, Japanese value groups and formality. People in the United States admire and reward a person who rises above the crowd; in contrast, a Japanese proverb says, "The nail that sticks up gets hammered down." In addition, while North Americans' sense of size and scale developed out of the vastness of the continent, Japanese genius lies in the diminutive and miniature. For example, the United States builds airplanes, while Japan produces transistors.

In spite of these differences, these two apparently opposite cultures share several important experiences.

Both, for example, have transplanted cultures. Each nation has a "mother" society—China for Japan and Great Britain for the United States—that has influenced the daughter in countless ways: in language, religion, art, literature, social customs, and ways of thinking. Japan, of course, has had more time than the United States to work out its unique interpretation of the older Chinese culture, but both countries reflect their cultural ancestry.

Both societies, moreover, have developed the art of business and commerce of buying and selling of advertising of mass producing, to the highest levels. Few sights are more reassuring to people from the United States than the tens of thousands of busy stores in Japan, especially the beautiful, well-stocked department stores. To U.S. eyes, they seem just like Macy's or Neiman Marcus at home. In addition, both Japan and the United States are consumer societies. The people of both countries love to shop and are enthusiastic consumers of convenience products and fast foods. Vending machines selling everything from fresh flowers to hot coffee are as popular in Japan as they are in the United States, and fast-food noodle shops are as common in Japan as McDonald's restaurants are in the United States.

A final similarity is that both Japanese and people in the United States have always emphasized the importance of work, and both are paying penalties for their commitment to it: increasing stress and weakening family bonds. People in the United States, especially those in business and in the professions, regularly put in twelve or more hours a day at their jobs, just as many Japanese executives do. Also, while the normal Japanese workweek is six days, many people in the United States who want to get ahead voluntarily work on Saturday and/or Sunday in addition to their normal five-day workweek.

Japan and the United States: different, yet alike. Although the two societies differ in many areas such as racial heterogeneity versus racial homogeneity, individualism versus group cooperation, and informal versus formal forms of behavior, they share more than one common experience. Furthermore, their differences probably contribute as much as their similarities toward the mutual interest the two countries have in each other. It will be interesting to see where this reciprocal fascination leads in the future.

Writing Technique Questions

1. In which paragraph(s) are the similarities discussed? In which paragraph(s) are the differences discussed?
2. What is the function of paragraph 4?

Organization of Comparison/Contrast Essays

The first key to writing a successful comparison/contrast essay is to organize it carefully.

Point-by-Point-Organization

One way to organize a comparison/contrast essay is to use point-by-point organization, which is similar to the logical division pattern studied in Chapter 4.

Suppose, for example, that you want to compare two jobs. First, make a list of factors that are important to you: salary, benefits, opportunities for advancement, workplace atmosphere, commuting distance from your home, and so on. Each factor, or point of comparison, is like a subtopic in a logical division essay.

In your essay, each point of comparison becomes the topic of a paragraph. You can put the paragraphs in any order you wish—perhaps in the order of their importance to you personally.

MODEL

Point-by-Point-Organization

I. Introduction

Thesis statement: *One way to decide between two job offers is to compare them on important points.*

II. Body

A. *Salary*

B. *Benefits*

C. *Opportunities for advancement*

D. *Workplace atmosphere*

E. *Commuting distance from home*

III. Conclusion

Block Organization

The other way to organize a comparison/contrast essay is to arrange all the similarities together in a block and all the differences together in a block. You could discuss either the similarities first or the differences first. You often insert a transition paragraph or transition sentence between the two blocks. The model essay comparing Japan and the United States uses block organization.

I. Introduction

Thesis Statement: *One way to decide between two job offer is to compare them on important points.*

II. Body

A. Similarities

Benefits

Commute distance from home

B. Differences

Salary

Opportunities for advancement

Workplace atmosphere

III. Conclusion

The number of paragraphs in each block depends on the topic. For some topics, you may write about all the similarities in a single paragraph; for other topics, you may need to discuss each similarity in a separate paragraph. The same is true for differences. Of course, some topics may have one paragraph of similarities and several paragraphs of differences, or vice versa.

Complete the outline of the model essay "Japan and the United States: Different but Alike."

I. Introduction

Thesis statement: *On the surface at least, U.S. and Japanese societies seem totally opposite.*

II. Body

A. _____

1. Japan is a homogeneous society.

2. _____

a. The United States builds airplanes,

b. _____

In spite of these differences, these two apparently opposite cultures share several important experiences.

C. Both have transplanted cultures.

1. _____

2. _____

D. _____

1. Department stores

2.

a.

b. Fast foods

(1) _____

(2) McDonald's restaurants

E. _____

1. _____

2. _____

III. Conclusion

Comparison and Contrast Signal Words

The second key to writing successful comparison/contrast essays is the appropriate use of comparison and contrast signal words. These are words that introduce points of comparison and points of contrast. It is not sufficient simply to describe each item that you are comparing. You must refer back and forth to, for example, Job X and Job Y and use comparison and contrast signal words to show what is the same and what is different about them. Of course, you should also use transition signals such as *first*, *second*, *one . . .*, *another . . .*, *the final . . .*, *for example*, and *in conclusion* in addition to these special ones.

The following chart lists some of the words and phrases used to discuss similarities.

Comparison Signal Words

Transition Words and Phrases	
<i>similarly</i> <i>likewise</i> <i>also</i> <i>too</i>	Human workers can detect malfunctions in machinery; <i>similarly/likewise</i> , a robot can be programmed to detect equipment malfunctions. Human workers can detect malfunctions in machinery; a robot can <i>also</i> . Human workers can detect malfunctions in machinery; a robot can <i>too</i> .
Subordinators	
<i>as</i> <i>just as</i>	Robots can detect malfunctions in machinery, <i>as/just as</i> human workers can. Note: Use a comma when <i>as</i> and <i>just as</i> show comparison even when the dependent clause follows the independent clause as in the above example.

Coordinators

and...both ... and... not only...but also...neither ... nor

Robots **and** human workers can detect malfunctions in machinery.

Both robots **and** human workers can detect malfunctions in machinery. **Not only** robots **but also** human workers can detect malfunctions in machinery. **Neither** robots **nor** human workers are infallible.

Others: like (+ noun) just like (+ noun) similar to (+ noun)

(be) like

(be) similar (to)

(be) the same as

(be) the same

(be) alike (be) similar

to compare (to/with)

Robots, **like/just like/similar to** human workers, can detect malfunctions in machinery.

Robots **are like/are similar to/are the same as** human workers in their ability to detect malfunctions in machinery.

In their ability to detect malfunctions in machinery, robots and human workers **are the same**.

Robots and human workers **are alike/are similar** in their ability to detect malfunctions in machinery.

Robots can **be compared to/be compared with** human workers in their ability to detect malfunctions in machinery.

A. Add comparison signal words to connect the following comparisons. The items contain both sentences and short phrases. You should write one complete new sentence for each item and use different comparison signal words in each. The first one has been done for you as an example.

1. The United States has a democratic form of government. Great Britain has a democratic form of government.

"The United States has a democratic form of government, just as Great Britain does. _____

2. The United States operates under a two-party system. Great Britain operates under a two-party system.

3. The British Parliament has two separate houses, the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The United States Congress has two separate houses, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

4. The U.S. House of Representatives = the British House of Commons. The U.S. Senate = the British House of Lords.

5. The members of the U.S. House of Representatives are elected by district. The members of the British House of Commons are elected by district.

6. The method of choosing cabinet members in the United States. The method of choosing cabinet members in Great Britain. (Use the comparison signal *the same*.)

7. In Great Britain, the prime minister appoints the cabinet. The U.S. president appoints the cabinet.

8. The British monarch has the right to veto any law passed by Parliament. The U.S. president has the right to veto any law passed by Congress.

Contrast Signal Words

Contrast signal words fall into two main groups according to their meaning. The words in the first group show a relationship that is called *concession*. The words in the second group show an opposition relationship.

Contrast Signal Words: Concession (Unexpected Result)

Concession signal words indicate that the information in one clause is not the result you expect from the information given in the other clause.

UNEXPECTED RESULT

Although I studied all night, I failed the exam.

My failing the exam is not the result you might expect from the information in the first clause: / *studied all night.*

Transition Words and Phrases	
however, nevertheless, nonetheless, still	Millions of people go on diets every year; however/nevertheless/nonetheless/still , very few succeed in losing weight.
Subordinators	
Although, even though, though	Although/Even though/Though most dieters initially lose a few pounds, most gain them back again within a few weeks.
Coordinators	
but, yet	Doctors say that "fad" diets do not work, but/yet many people still try them.
Others	
despite (+ noun), in spite of	Despite/In spite of 10 years of dieting, I am still fat.

Contrast Signal Words: Direct Opposition

The second group of-contrast signal words shows that two things are direct opposites.

With direct opposites, the signal word can introduce either piece of information.

I am short, whereas my brother is tall, OR My brother is tall, whereas I am short.

Transition Words and Phrases	
<p>however in contrast in (by) comparison on the other hand on the contrary</p>	<p>Rock music is primarily the music of white performers; however/ in contrast/in comparison/by comparison/on the other hand, jazz is performed by both white and black musicians.</p> <p>Jazz is not just one style of music; on the contrary, jazz has many styles such as Chicago jazz, Dixieland, ragtime, swing, bebop, and cool jazz, to name just a few.</p> <p><i>Note: On the contrary</i> contrasts a truth and an untruth.</p>
Subordinators	
<p>while whereas</p>	<p>New Orleans-style jazz features brass marching-band instruments, while/whereas ragtime is played on a piano.</p> <p><i>Note: Use a comma with <i>while</i> and <i>whereas</i> even when the dependent clause follows the independent clause.</i></p>
Coordinators	
<p>but</p>	<p>Jazz music was born in the southern part of the United States, but it now enjoys a worldwide audience.</p>
Others	
<p>differ (from) compared (to/with) (be) different (from) (be) dissimilar to (be) unlike</p>	<p>Present-day rock music differs from early rock music in several ways.</p> <p>Present-day rock music has a harder sound compared to/compared with early rock.</p> <p>The punk, rap, grunge, and techno styles of today are very different from/ dissimilar to/unlike the rock music performed by Elvis Presley 50 years ago, but they have the same roots.</p> <p>Unlike rock, a music style started by white musicians, rhythm-and-blues styles were influenced primarily by black musicians.</p>

A. Add contrast signal words to connect the following items.

1. The government of the United States/the government of Great Britain/ dissimilar in several aspects.

The governments of the United States and Great Britain are dissimilar in several aspects.

2. The chief executive in Great Britain is called the ' prime minister. The chief executive in the United States is called the president.

3. In the United States, the president fulfills the functions of both political leader and head of state. These two functions are separate in Great Britain.

4. In other words, Great Britain has both a monarch and a prime minister. The United States has only a president.

5. The president of the United States may be of a different political party than the majority of Congress. The British prime minister is the head of the political party that has the most seats in Parliament.

6. The United States has a written constitution. Great Britain has no written constitution.

7. In the United States, elections are held on a regular schedule, no matter how popular or unpopular the government is. In Great Britain, elections are held whenever the prime minister loses a vote of confidence.

8. The members of the U.S. Senate are elected. The members of the British House of Lords are appointed or inherit their positions.

9. As you can see, the two systems of government differ in several major aspects. They are both democracies.

Writing Practice

Choose one of the suggested topics and write an essay using comparison/contrast organization. Use either point-by-point or block organization.

Topic Suggestions

Two cultures or one aspect of two cultures, such as family life, schools, child-raising practices, courtship and marriage customs.

Living at home and living away from home

High school and college or university

Two authors whose books you have read

Two products (for example, digital/film cameras, gasoline-powered/hybrid automobiles,

Apple computers/PCs)

Topics on the Lighter Side

Morning people/night people

Optimists/pessimists

Spenders/savers

3. Advanced

Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Sentences, Paragraphs and Essays*
Pearson: Longman.

Causes and Effects Essays (pp. 81-87)

We analyze causes and effects every day. We need to know the reasons why something happened. Why won't my car start? Why do I have a sore throat? Likewise, we need to know the results of some action or event. If I have the car repaired, how much will it cost? If I take a new antibiotic, will it cure my sore throat?

Writing about such causes or effects is also an important part of academic and professional life. In science courses—and in scientific professions—you may investigate the causes of a chemical reaction or the effects of a new chemical. In a nursing course, you need to know the causes of a fever and the results of a treatment. In a history course, you may need to know the causes—and results—of a war. In a business course—and in actual businesses—you may examine the effects of a new method of accounting or of advertising.

This chapter will show you how to write a paragraph or essay on causes or effects by

- examining a model of causal analysis
- analyzing what makes an effective analysis on causes or effects
- thinking through ways to organize the paragraph or essay
- giving you practice writing cause or effect paragraphs and essays

A Model of Causal Analysis

A cause is the reason an event happens, while an **effect** is the result of the cause. So, for instance, the cause of passing a course may be studying hard, while the effect of passing the course may be earning a degree.

Many things, however, have more than one cause. For example, a person may become ill from lack of sleep, too much stress, poor nutrition, and exposure to a virus. Likewise, many things can have more than one effect. A violent storm may destroy trees, flood streets, blow down power lines, and even tear the roofs off of houses.

If you trace several causes or effects in your paragraph, you may organize it somewhat like you'd do with a narration or a process analysis. You can tell a story of why something happened in chronological order. You were late this morning because the alarm didn't go off, you missed your bus, and the traffic arranged in climax order—moving from the *weakest* to the strongest reason. The restaurant is popular because the location is good, the prices are low, the service is fast, and the *food* is terrific.

Here's an example of a short essay that explains the probable causes of an event. Because the causes need to be explained in detail, the essay devotes an entire paragraph to each. As you read the essay, notice that the first paragraph introduces the event while the body paragraphs explore its possible causes, or the reasons that it happened.

The Mystery of Custer's Last Stand

Probably no other battle in U.S. history has created more controversy than the Battle of Little Bighorn River. On June 25, 1876, General George Armstrong Custer made his famous last stand against members of the Great Sioux Nation. After dividing the 700 troops of the Seventh Cavalry into three groups that would surround and attack a Native American village, he took command of one group and rushed them into the battle alone. As a result, 3,000 Sioux, led by their chief, Sitting Bull, killed Custer and every one of his 250 men. No one will ever know why Custer ordered his men into such a one-sided fight in which they had no chance for survival. No one will ever know why he didn't retreat once the battle had begun. No one will know the answers because no one from Custer's side lived to tell the story. However, some information about the battle—gathered from scouts, messengers, and the members of the other two groups—suggests four reasons.

First, Custer ignored the orders of his commanding officer. He was supposed to bring his troops to the valley of the Little Bighorn River and wait there until another army division could join him. But Custer decided to attack alone. He rode his troops all night and well past dawn, and his men and horses were exhausted when they entered the valley.

Second, Custer apparently ignored the advice of his own Native American scouts. The two men, Mitch Bouyer and Bloody Knife, warned him that there were too many Sioux warriors to be captured. Custer probably thought that his Seventh Cavalry could easily defeat any Native American fighters and didn't take the warnings of the scouts seriously.

Third, Custer probably misinterpreted the movements of the Sioux. After one of the three groups into which he divided his men, led by Major Marcus Reno, charged the village, a messenger told Custer that it contained far more warriors than they had expected. Custer apparently assumed that the number of Sioux didn't matter because they were running away. He and his group *therefore* rushed to the far end of the campsite to cut off the escape. He rode hard and fast, further wearing down his men and their horses.

Fourth, after the three groups of Custer's men had separated, they probably soon lost communication with each other. Major Reno attacked the campsite, expecting Custer to follow him from the rear. But Custer was trapped at the far end of the camp. Reno finally retreated to the woods near the village, where he was forced to stop and fight. His Native American opponents not only outnumbered him, but they also had better weapons. By the time the third group of the Seventh Cavalry arrived, many of Reno's men were dead, and this last group was trapped as well. Meanwhile, Custer and every single one of his men were being killed.

To this day, when people think of Custer, they think of headstrong behavior and stupidity. Although no one knows exactly why Custer and his men lost their lives, headstrong behavior and stupidity are the likely reasons.

The Process of Writing a Causal Analysis

Write a paragraph analyzing the reasons behind an important decision you've recently made—for example, to major in a particular subject, to work part time, to move, or to buy a car. Assume you're writing to explain your decision to an academic adviser, your parents, or a friend.

Generating and Arranging the Materials

Explore your ideas by clustering or brainstorming a list of the causes. Then choose at least three reasons for your decision—the most important, clearest reasons—to develop in your paragraph. List the reasons either (1) chronologically if they happened in a time sequence, or (2) in climax order, moving from the least to most important if they happened at or near the same time:

"Finally, and most importantly, I realized . . ."

"But these reasons alone wouldn't have been enough. The strongest reason came. . ."

Using a simple chart may help you organize ideas:

Cause 1.

Example:

2.

Example:

3.

Example:

4.

Writing the First Draft

As you begin work on your first draft, write a topic sentence or thesis statement to introduce or summarize the causes you'll discuss:

"I decided to major in computer sciences *for several reasons.*" OR

"I decided to major in computer sciences *because of my interest in business, my good grades in computer classes, and the great job opportunities in this field.*"

Explore the reasons in the body of the paragraph, but don't just list them. Explain them, and, if you can, support them with specific examples. Consider introducing them through narration, description, or process analysis:

Narration: I wasn't very interested when I began my first computer class. But that changed the day a guest lecturer from one of the large firms downtown came to speak to the class...

Description: The company where I had my summer job occupies a large, modern brick building. I worked in a spacious office with a marble floor, polished metal furniture, a wall of windows overlooking the river, and the latest computer equipment. My PC had a 19-inch flat paneled monitor and wireless keyboard and mouse...

Process: My expertise in Web design developed in three stages. . .

Writing Assignment

Describe the Effects of an Event

Choose another important event in your life, one that resulted in three or more important effects—changes in your living conditions, changes in your behavior, or changes in your attitudes. Here are a few examples:

gaining a younger sibling, losing a loved one or caregiver, losing a job

being involved in an accident, moving to a new neighborhood, city, or country

Assume that your audience is a group of people who know you now but didn't know you at the time of the event. Your purpose is therefore to let these people understand you better. If you prefer not to write about yourself, choose an event in the life of someone you know well.

List at least three effects of the experience, perhaps by brainstorming. Then arrange the effects from weakest to strongest. Support each effect with explanations, details, or examples. Then compose a preliminary topic sentence or thesis statement that makes the point of your analysis clear. For example, it might claim, "The birth of my younger sister changed my life," or "Coming to the United States involved many sacrifices." You can revise this sentence after writing the first draft if your ideas change or if your focus changes.

A Student Model Paragraph

Sara Sebring, a student at Chattanooga State Community College, wrote the following paragraph. She describes an allergic reaction to a medicine—in other words, the effects of an event. As you read it, notice the reason she took the drug, the immediate results of taking it, and the longer-term results.

A Reaction to Medicine

Sara Sebring

* * * *

Some people can take medicines without having a problem. Others react mildly to some medicines. However, I had one terrible reaction to an antibiotic, one that taught me that I would never take it again. I went to the doctor to get treatment for my right eye, which had been swollen shut for the previous two days. He told me my eye was infected and gave me a prescription for Duricef and Polymeral. I then left the doctor's office, had the prescription filled, and went home to take the medicine. I took the Polymeral and had no problems; however, after taking the Duricef, I experienced an allergic reaction. First, I fell asleep and slept for fourteen hours. When I finally woke up, my speech was slurred; I couldn't eat my breath; my neck broke out in a rash; and my face was swollen all over. In addition, I kept running into walls because my balance was off. As a result, I called the doctor's office and reported my condition to the nurse, who said the doctor would return my call in two minutes. Four hours later, the doctor returned my call and said he would phone the drugstore and order a new prescription to stop my swelling. To my dismay, the new prescription was never called in, and three days later my symptoms were still present. Finally, after four days of misery, the symptoms disappeared, and I found out that Duricef was a type of penicillin to which I have an allergic reaction. From this entire episode, not only did I learn that I cannot take Duricef, but I also learned that some doctors do not respond quickly enough to their patients' medical needs. This was truly the worst experience I have ever had.

Questions for Analysis

-
1. What is the topic sentence of this paragraph? Underline it.
 2. What was Sara's first reaction to the medicine? Following that, what symptoms did she exhibit? What was the last allergic reaction she mentions, and what transition introduces it?
 3. The allergic reaction caused her to take additional actions. What were they? What results did they bring?
 4. What transitional expressions show time relationships? How much time passed between Sara's initial infection and her recovery from the allergic reaction?
 5. Two changes in Sara's attitude and behavior occurred as results of this experience. What were they? What transition introduces them? How—and why—do these changes relate to the topic sentence?

Writing Assignment

Describe the Effects of an Illness

Like Sara Sebring, you or someone you know has probably suffered from an illness or had a medical emergency. Write a paragraph or an essay in which you describe what happened and analyze the causes or the effects. Or, like Sara Sebring, you might decide to cover both the causes and the effects.

APPENDIX N

SAMPLE REACTION PAPER GUIDELINES

The topic for each of the four Reaction Papers is very straightforward: you simply have to read the assigned chapters in the textbook, think about what you've read, and then put your thoughts down on paper. The Reaction Paper is *not* a research paper that incorporates other sources of information; instead, it is a paper that contains nothing other than your own original thought and analysis.

The Reaction Paper gives you the opportunity to demonstrate that you have read the assigned chapters in the textbook carefully, that you have understood the conclusions presented in the readings as well as the reasoning that led to those conclusions, and that you have given careful thought and analysis to the implications of the textbook's arguments.

Each Reaction Paper should be equally divided between two parts: a Summary and an Evaluation, labeled as such.

The *Summary*, which must be two pages (500 words) in length, should comprise the essential ideas from the assigned readings in the textbook. Imagine that you are writing for an intelligent, curious reader who has *no knowledge whatsoever* of the book you're writing about. Your *Summary* should make your reader aware of the fundamental ideas presented in the chapters under discussion. What are the main points made by Pinker in the assigned chapters? What are his principal arguments--e.g., what are his most important premises and conclusions? Your goal in your *Summary* is to convey, in only two pages, the most significant ideas from several chapters in the textbook, which means you'll have to think very carefully about exactly which ideas are most important and why--your task is to distill the ideas from several chapters down to their critical essence that can be expressed in a very brief space. At the same time, your *Summary* will give you the opportunity to demonstrate not only that you have a very solid understanding of the ideas presented in the textbook, but that you can clearly explain those ideas to someone else.

The *Evaluation*, which must be two pages (500 words) in length, should present an original analysis of the assigned readings in the textbook. What did you think of Pinker's presentation? What did you think about the quality of his reasoning? Were his arguments well-supported by evidence? To your knowledge, did he neglect to consider any significant evidence that would have an important bearing on his conclusions, either positively or negatively? Were his arguments persuasive? Why or why not? What questions did Pinker leave unanswered? What questions did he inspire you to want to investigate? Has your thinking or understanding changed in any way as a result of having read the assignment? If so, how? How do Pinker's arguments and conclusions relate to other topics that you are personally knowledgeable about, or to other beliefs that you hold? Have you changed your mind about anything as a result of having read the assignment? In short, the *Evaluation* gives you the opportunity to express the results of your *original thoughtful analysis* of the assigned readings.

Format

Each of the Reaction Papers must be 1,000 words in length (give or take 100 words). You should compose your essay in a word-processing program using 12-point font and then submit your Reaction to your instructor. Reaction Papers will not be accepted in any other format.

Your Reaction Paper should take the form of a coherent, well-organized essay, with a logical structure that is apparent to the reader. You will be graded in part on how effectively you're able to communicate your ideas in written form, so be sure to pay close attention to such details as spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.

APPENDIX O
SAMPLE LISTENING PRACTICE AT THREE DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY
LEVELS

Kisslinger, A. & Rost, M. (2009). *Contemporary Topics: Academic Listening and Note-Taking Skills. Third Edition.* Pearson: Longman.

Chapter 2 (pp.16-18)

1. Intermediate,

BEFORE YOU LISTEN

You are about to listen to this unit's lecture on English as a global language. Do you think English will continue to be the world's *lingua franca*? Give two reasons for your answer.

LISTEN FOR MAIN IDEAS

Answer the questions based on the lecture. Circle a, b, or c.

1. What aspect of English as a global language does the speaker mainly discuss?
 - a. why people like to use English
 - b. whether English will eventually replace other languages
 - c. where English is most popular

2. What is the main reason given for the widespread use of English?
 - a. There are many Internet users.
 - b. There is a need for a common language.
 - c. English speakers want everyone to learn English.

3. Why does the speaker mention that English is the dominant language of science and international business?
 - a. to show that scientists like English
 - b. to show that a common language is necessary
 - c. to show that people prefer other languages

4. Why is English not considered a truly global language by some people?
 - a. because many people are now proficient in English
 - b. because many people don't use it for primary communication at home
 - c. because many people are studying English now

5. What is the speaker's view of English as a global language?
 - a. that it will continue to be the *lingua franca*, but not replace other languages
 - b. that it will continue to be the *lingua franca*, and replace other languages
 - c. that it will not continue to be the *lingua franca* because there are too many varieties

AFTER YOU LISTEN

Discussion Strategy: In most conversations, expressing disagreement without seeming to be too disagreeable is key! One way to do so is to first acknowledge the other person's point: "I see what you're saying, but. . ." Or you can be direct: "I simply disagree." Some people like to soften their position with an apology: "I'm sorry, but. . ." And of course, body language and tone can further "shape" your message.

B. In small groups, discuss one or more of these topics. Try to use the discussion strategies you have learned.

- Why do you think English has become the common language for globalization?
- Do you agree that as more people learn English, their desire to hold on to their own cultures will get stronger?
- If you were to establish an international standard for English, what would the rules be for grammar? Vocabulary? Pronunciation?

1. Upper-intermediate

Sarabria, K. (1999). *Academic Listening Encounters: Life in Society. Listening, Note-Taking, Discussion. Intermediate to High Intermediate*. Cambridge University Press.

Chapter 3 (pp.42-48)

4

ACADEMIC LISTENING AND NOTE TAKING:

The "Benefits of Single-Sex Education"

In this section you will hear and take notes on a two-part lecture given by Dr. Mary Forsch, a teacher and advisor at an all girls' school. The title of the lecture is *The Benefits of Single-Sex Education for Girls*. Dr JKrosch will explain why girls seem to letter better when boys are not around.

.....

BEFORE LISTENING

BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE ON THE TOPIC

Read the following report about research done in coeducational classrooms.

Various studies carried out in coeducational schools have shown that in many of these classrooms teachers interact differently with boys and girls. To begin with, it is clear that there are many more teacher-student interactions with male students - in other words, boys get more attention from their teachers. This could be because, in general, boys are more aggressive. One study reported that boys are eight times more likely than girls to call out afiswers in class.

Another way that teachers treat the sexes differently in coed settings is that they tend to gvje boys more demanding academic challenges than girls. Boys are expected to be problem solvers, to think for themselves, and to explain their answers. Girls, on the other hand, are often just corrected if they make mistakes and are encouraged to be quiet and well behaved. They are rarely asked follow-up questions and are called on for answers much less frequently than boys.

Answer the following questions with a partner.

- 1 What does the term *coeducational* mean? Check a dictionary if necessary.
- 2 According to the passage, what are the differences between the ways girls and boys are treated in coeducational classes?
- 3 Are boys and girls treated differently by teachers in coeducational schools that you have attended? If so, how?

WHILE LISTENING

Now listen to an excerpt from the lecture. Take notes as you listen, using symbols and abbreviations. Use your notes to tell your partner what you heard. Did you gather the same information?

LECTURE, PART ONE:

Disadvantages and Advantages of Single-Sex Education for Girls

GUESSING VOCABULARY FROM CONTEXT

The following items contain important vocabulary from Part One of the lecture. Work with a partner. Using the context and your knowledge of related words, take turns trying to guess the meanings of the words in bold.

- _____ 1 I'm often asked to defend single-sex education.
- _____ 2 as if girls' schools were on trial.
- _____ 3 goes against the aims and the goals of feminists.
- _____ 4 Single-sex schools do not provide a smooth transition into the adult world.
- _____ 5 Single-sex education values girls.
- _____ 6 It values girls' unique qualities.
- _____ 7 It helps girls develop self-confidence.

AFTER LISTENING

Work in a group of three students. Take turns in the "hot seat." If it is your turn, explain why you agree with one of the statements in step 1. The other two students should strongly disagree with the statement you are defending. Think of as many arguments for and against each statement as possible. Here are some ways to express disagreement or to ask for clarification:

Expressing disagreement

I'm not sure if I agree with you because . . .
I'm afraid that I disagree with you because . . .
I don't agree with your explanation of . . . because . . .
I think that you 're wrong because . . .

Asking for clarification

Excuse me - are you saying . . . ?
I'm sorry, but I don't understand what you mean when you say (that) . . . Can you explain that again?
Can you give us some more information about . . . ? Why do you think that . . .

3. Advanced

Espeseth, M. (1999). *Academic Listening Encounters: Human Behavior. Listening Note-taking, Discussion. High Intermediate to Low Advanced*. Cambridge University Press.
Chapter 3 (pp. 40-45)

BEFORE LISTENING

ACADEMIC LISTENING AND NOTE TAKING

In this section you will hear and take notes on a two-part lecture given by Marjorie Katz, a licensed psychotherapist who works with adolescents. The title of the lecture is *Common Problems of Adolescents in Mental Health Treatment*. Ms. Katz will discuss two problems that she sees frequently in her work with teenagers.

BEFORE LISTENING

Predicting the content

- Try to predict what kind of behavior teachers or parents might notice that would make them decide to send a teenager to a therapist for guidance or counseling. Write your ideas in the boxes.
- The two problems that Ms. Katz will discuss in her lecture are (a) alcohol and drug abuse and (b) poor school performance. With a partner, discuss what might cause a teenager to get involved with alcohol or drugs, or to stop caring about school.
- Compare ideas as a class.

WHILE LISTENING

LECTURE, Part One: Adolescent alcohol and drug abuse *Guessing vocabulary from context*

The following terms from Part One of the lecture are shown in **boldface** in the contexts in which you will hear them. Work with a partner. Using context, take turns guessing the meanings.

- _____ 1 problems at school, including **acting out**, poor academic performance, and truancy
- _____ 2 acting out, poor academic performance, and **truancy**
- _____ 3 not just **recreational** use of drugs
- _____ 4 **severe**, long-term addictions
- _____ 5 children who have been physically **abused** and who have negative feelings
- _____ 6 The only way to **blunt** their negative feelings is with drugs.
- _____ 7 a hospital stay for them to **detoxify**
- _____ 8 develop the **coping skills** to resist the urge to go back to drugs
- _____ 9 coping skills to **resist** the urge to go back to drugs
- _____ 10 people in treatment or **recovery** programs .

- _____ 11 adolescents who have recovered from *substance abuse*
- _____ 12 they might feel very angry and want *revenge* if it was physical abuse
- _____ 13 go through months of therapy and remain *sober*
- _____ 14 a great deal of the therapist's help consists of *nonjudgmental* acceptance

AFTER LISTENING

Discuss the following questions in a small group.

- 1 Is it common for teenagers in your country to go to psychotherapy?
- 2 In your country, how do parents respond to teenagers who start having problems in school? How do schools respond?
- 3 What do *you* think is the best way to deal with the problems presented in this lecture?

APPENDIX P
SAMPLE SPEAKING PRACTICE AT THREE DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY
LEVELS

1. Intermediate

Conversation Practice

1. Pretend you are buying something from a store.

Role play a conversation between a clerk (A) and a customer (B).

Ask for help in finding the item you want to buy.

Find out price and any other information you need.

Pay for the item at the checkout counter.

For Example,

A: May I help you?

B: Yes, do you have any brooms?

A: Yes, they're over there by the wall.

B: Thank you.

B: How much is this sweater? / are these sandals?

A: It's \$_____. / They're \$_____.

A: Is that all for today?

B: Yes, I think so.

A: That comes to \$_____.

B: Here you are.

A: Thanks.

SITUATION AT THE STORE

When you enter the store/start a conversation with the clerk:

What a clerk might say:

May I help you?

Can I help you?

Can I help you find something?

What can I do for you?

What a customer might say:

Excuse me. Do you work here?

(Can you help me?)

Can I ask you something?

What a customer might respond:

Yes. I'm looking for _____.

Do you have any _____ (s)?

Can you tell me where the _____ is/are?

When you check out/leave the store:

Clerk:

Did you find everything you needed?

Did you find what you were looking for?

Did you find everything okay?

Will that be all (for today)?

Is that everything?

(Will there be) anything else?

Customer: That's all for today.

That's it. Thanks.

SIMPLE SHOPPING

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Where are the pencils?
thanks. | They're on the second shelf. | Okay, |
| 2. How much is this mirror?
I'll take it. | It's \$19.95. | Okay. |
| 3. How much does this cost?
about this one? | That one is \$5.00. | How |
| 4. How much are these?
too expensive. | They're \$4.00 each. | That's |
| 5. Do you have any t-shirts? | What size? Medium or Large? | Large |
| 6. That comes to \$26.59.
change.....Thanks. | Here's \$30.00. | Here's your 34.1 |
| 7. That will be \$17.48. | Here's \$17.50. | Keep the change. Thanks. |

BUYING & SELLING

1. May I help you? Yes, I'd like to buy these razors. Okay, that'll be \$6.85 with tax.
2. What can I do for you? I'm looking for the cameras. They're in Aisle Two.
3. Is there something I can help you with? No, I'm just browsing. Thanks anyway. Ok.

2. Upper-intermediate

Topic: Obesity

Aim: To provide solutions to the problems of obesity.

Problem: Obesity Epidemic

Solution: The student teachers have to come up with solutions under three categorized groups:

1. *Government and Legislations*
2. *Personal Changes*
3. *Societal Changes*

Task 1. Read the following reports related to the obesity problem in Turkey.

Obesity, diabetes up in Turkey, report finds

ANTALYA - Anatolia News Agency | 10/14/2010 12:00:00 AM |

Obesity and diabetes rates in Turkey have risen over the last 13 years, according to a new report released at the 32nd Congress of Endocrinology and Metabolic Diseases of Turkey.

Obesity and diabetes rates in Turkey have risen over the last 13 years, according to a new report released at the 32nd Congress of Endocrinology and Metabolic Diseases of Turkey recently held in the southern province of Antalya.

The report, called the Turkish Diabetes Epidemiology Study 2, or TURDEP-2, is based on research done in five cities and 15 provinces of Turkey. According to preliminary findings, over the past 13 years the average weight of a woman in Turkey increased by six kilograms while the average weight of a man increased by seven kilograms. The results were compared with TURDEP-1, a study done 13 years previously.

Other research presented at the congress, which attracts doctors and politicians to discuss endocrine issues, showed that 13.7 percent of Turks have been diagnosed with diabetes, compared with 7.2 percent 13 years ago.

The TURDEP-2 study included 16,696 women and 9,327 men above the age of 20 in varying neighborhoods and towns of five provinces and was conducted between Jan. 18 and June 15 of this year.

Experts from several institutions analyzed the results. Professor İlhan Satman, who led the study, found a notable increase in hip and belly size. TURDEP-2 found that Turkish women's waists increased by six centimeters since TURDEP-1. Men's waists expanded by seven centimeters. The country's average life expectancy increased by four years during that time.

Compared to 13 years ago, women's hips expanded by seven centimeters while men's expanded by two centimeters. Another result of the research was that women became one centimeter taller overall to an average height of 1.59 meters. The height of an average Turkish man also increased by one centimeter to 1.71 meters. An average Turkish woman weighs 72 kilos, while an average Turkish man weighs 80 kilos, according to the results of TURDEP-2.

"Physical activity patterns played a crucial role in obesity," said Satman.

Satman said the average life expectancy of the Turkish population rose by four years. However, the prevalence of obesity increased to 31.2 percent from 22.3 percent due to a lack of physical activity

He urged people to exercise regularly.

"There should be warnings on food packaging just like the warning messages on cigarette packages," Dr. Turan Buzgan, deputy secretary at the Health Ministry, said during the conference.

"We should also put calorie information on menus in restaurants," said Buzgan, adding that the ministry would run advertisements in the media to raise awareness about the issue. He said they have put valuable exercise courses in school schedules instead of routine exercise courses.

Smoking rates decreased by 42 percent over 13 years, the report highlighted. "The Constitutional Court is considering repealing the smoking ban in teahouses, but the ministry expects the ban to remain in place," said Buzgan.

Healthy food market grows, obesity still problem in Turkey

ISTANBUL - Hürriyet Daily News | 4/25/2010

Health awareness among Turkish consumers is increasing, but obesity remains a major issue, according to a report by Euromonitor International. Even though the sales of health products at hypermarkets grew by 130 percent between 2008 and 2009, Turkey still ranks third in the European obesity league table, behind Belarus and the United Kingdom

Although Turkish consumers increasingly opt for healthy foods, obesity still remains a big problem, according to a report by Euromonitor International, a leading independent provider of business intelligence on industries, countries and consumers.

The "Newly Emerging Health and Wellness Markets - Turkey" report states between 2008 and 2009 sales of health and wellness products in Turkish hypermarkets grew by 130 percent. Young, urban families are currently the core consumer group for health food products and supplements.

"Although the 45- to 49-year-old segment of the population enjoys the highest average gross annual income in Turkey, couples with young children have the highest per household expenditure. Almost half of Turkey's population is below the age of 25, and couples with children make up about two-thirds of total households," Euromoney said. With the population growth rate in Turkey, by 2015 the country will have 83 million inhabitants, overtaking Germany as the largest market in Europe.

In Turkish cities, middle-class consumers are keen to adopt European trends and are quickly developing a taste for food and drink fortified by vitamins and minerals. Such products are particularly popular with mothers of young children, a Euromoney report said. "Health and wellness offerings are also benefiting from increased distribution in Turkey's rapidly evolving retail market. Sales through hypermarkets, supermarkets and discounters increased by 130 percent, 71 percent and 182 percent respectively, over the years 2008-2009."

[HH] Slimming product sales booming. Despite the growth of health food sales, Turkey's obesity statistics remain "quite disconcerting." According to Euromonitor, Turkey ranked third-highest in the European obesity league table behind Belarus and the United Kingdom with 22.6 percent of its population weighing in at a Body Mass Index of 30 or above in 2009.

"Unfortunately, over a review period between 2004 and 2009, Turkey rose to prominence as the region's most dynamic market for meal replacement slimming products. Category value sales increased by almost 300 percent to 33 million Turkish Liras," the report stated.

Direct seller Herbalife dominates the market with a 92 percent value share in 2008. In 2009, 95 percent of all meal replacement slimming product sales were made via direct selling with the remaining 5 percent coming from health and beauty retailers.

"Although some retail brands were available, many consumers distrust these products as potentially damaging to health," the Euromoney report said.

[HH] Multivitamin sales double. Female-specific formulas began to gain importance in the vitamins and dietary supplements sector from 2007 onward, with many new launches focusing on fertility and menopausal benefits, the Euromoney report said. "Heavy promotion of these products in women's magazines and endorsements from doctors and pharmacists are partly the reason why multivitamin sales almost doubled over the review period to 115 million liras. Multivitamins currently account for 40 percent of total vitamin and dietary supplement, or VDS, sales.

The sale of child-specific vitamins and dietary supplements also increased over the review period between 2003 and 2008, reaching sales of 18 million liras in 2008.

On the other hand, there is virtually no market in Turkey for several of the VDS categories hugely popular in most other Western European countries, the report said. These include eye health supplements, St John's Wort, glucosamine and co-enzyme Q10. "Of course, it is obvious that these types of products mainly appeal to fairly well-educated, mature and elderly consumers – a demographic that is not very prominent in Turkey."

Task 2

Work in groups and try to provide solutions to the problem of obesity in Turkey by referring to the three categories:

1. *Government and Legislations*
2. *Personal Changes*
3. *Societal Changes*

You can use the following patterns to help you organize your ideas effectively:

1. Introduction Paragraph
 - a. Outline the issue
 - b. Provide thesis statement
2. Problem: Obesity in Turkey
3. Solution 1
4. Solution 2
5. Conclusion paragraph.
 - a. Summarize main points
 - b. Express final thoughts

3. Advanced

Topic: The Principle of Utility

Resource: <http://www.econlib.org/library/Bentham/bnthPML1.html>

Aim: To express ideas through hypothetical cases.

Task 1. Read the following text on the principle of utility.

I. Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure*. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire: but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The *principle of utility* recognizes this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and of law. Systems which attempt to question it, deal in sounds instead of sense, in caprice instead of reason, in darkness instead of light.

But enough of metaphor and declamation: it is not by such means that moral science is to be improved.

II. The principle of utility is the foundation of the present work: it will be proper therefore at the outset to give an explicit and determinate account of what is meant by it. By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever. according to the tendency it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever, and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government.

III. By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness, (all this in the present case comes to the same thing) or (what comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered: if that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community: if a particular individual, then the happiness of that individual.

IV. The interest of the community is one of the most general expressions that can occur in the phraseology of morals: no wonder that the meaning of it is often lost. When it has a meaning, it is this. The community is a fictitious *body*, composed of the individual persons who are considered as constituting as it were its *members*. The interest of the community then is, what is it?— the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it.

V. It is in vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding what is the interest of the individual. A thing is said to promote the interest, or to be *for* the interest, of an individual, when it tends to add to the sum total of his pleasures: or, what comes to the same thing, to diminish the sum total of his pains.

VI. An action then may be said to be conformable to then principle of utility, or, for shortness sake, to utility, (meaning with respect to the community at large) when the tendency it has to augment the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it.

VII. A measure of government (which is but a particular kind of action, performed by a particular person or persons) may be said to be conformable to or dictated by the principle of utility, when in like manner the tendency which it has to augment the happiness of the community is greater than any which it has to diminish it.

VIII. When an action, or in particular a measure of government, is supposed by a man to be conformable to the principle of utility, it may be convenient, for the purposes of discourse, to imagine a kind of law or dictate, called a law or dictate of utility: and to speak of the action in question, as being conformable to such law or dictate.

IX. A man may be said to be a partisan of the principle of utility, when the approbation or disapprobation he annexes to any action, or to any measure, is determined by and proportioned to the tendency which he conceives it to have to augment or to diminish the happiness of the community: or in other words, to its conformity or unconformity to the laws or dictates of utility.

X. Of an action that is conformable to the principle of utility one may always say either that it is one that ought to be done, or at least that it is not one that ought not to be done. One may say also, that it is right it should be done; at least that it is not wrong it should be done: that it is a right action; at least that it is not a wrong action. When thus interpreted, the words *ought*, and *right* and *wrong* and others of that stamp, have a meaning: when otherwise, they have none.

XI. Has the rectitude of this principle been ever formally contested? It should seem that it had, by those who have not known what they have been meaning. Is it susceptible of any direct proof? it should seem not: for that which is used to prove every thing else, cannot itself be proved: a chain of proofs must have their commencement somewhere. To give such proof is as impossible as it is needless.

XII. Not that there is or ever has been that human creature at breathing, however stupid or perverse, who has not on many, perhaps on most occasions of his life, deferred to it. By the natural constitution of the human frame, on most occasions of their lives men in general embrace this principle, without thinking of it: if not for the ordering of their own actions, yet for the trying of their own actions, as well as of those of other men. There have been, at the same time, not many perhaps, even of the most intelligent, who have been disposed to embrace it purely and without reserve. There are even few who have not taken some occasion or other to quarrel with it, either on account of their not understanding always how to apply it, or on account of some prejudice or other which they were afraid to examine into, or could not bear to part with. For such is the stuff that man is made of: in principle and in practice, in a right track and in a wrong one, the rarest of all human qualities is consistency.

XIII. When a man attempts to combat the principle of utility, it is with reasons drawn, without his being aware of it, from that very principle itself. His arguments, if they prove any thing, prove not that the principle is *wrong*, but that, according to the applications he supposes to be made of it, it is *misapplied*. Is it possible for a man to move the earth? Yes; but he must first find out another earth to stand upon.

XIV. To disprove the propriety of it by arguments is impossible; but, from the causes that have been mentioned, or from some confused or partial view of it, a man may happen to be disposed not to relish it. Where this is the case, if he thinks the settling of his opinions on such a subject worth the trouble, let him take the following steps, and at length, perhaps, he may come to reconcile himself to it.

Task 2. Choose one of the following situations. Choose one side (for or against) and discuss it with your peers.

Harming the Innocent

According to the principle of utility, we should always do whatever will produce the greatest amount of happiness and whatever is necessary to prevent the greatest amount of unhappiness. But what if the only way to produce happiness, and to prevent unhappiness, is to harm or even kill innocent people?

1. Suppose you are driving through a narrow tunnel and a worker falls onto the road in front of you. There is not enough time for you to stop. If you keep straight, you will hit the worker and kill him, but if you swerve left into oncoming traffic, you will collide with a school bus and kill at least five children. What's the right thing to do? Does utilitarianism get the right answer?
2. Suppose ten thousand innocent civilians live next to a munitions factory in a country at war. If you bomb the factory, all of them will die. If you don't bomb the factory, it will be used to produce bombs that will be dropped on fifty thousand innocent civilians in another country. What's the right thing to do? Does utilitarianism get the right answer?

3. Suppose a man has planted a bomb in New York City, and it will explode in twenty-four hours unless the police are able to find it. Should it be legal for the police to use torture to extract information from the suspected bomber? Does utilitarianism get the right answer?
4. Now suppose the man who has planted the bomb will not reveal the location unless an innocent member of his family is tortured. Should it be legal for the police to torture innocent people, if that is truly the only way to discover the location of a large bomb? Does utilitarianism have the right answer?

Telling the Truth

The principle of utility tells us to do whatever is necessary to minimize pain and unhappiness, but pain and unhappiness have many sources. There are times when telling people the truth would make them very unhappy. Should you lie to a person whenever lying is the only way to spare his or her feelings and prevent unhappiness?

1. Suppose your friend likes to sing in the shower, and he thinks he is an excellent singer. In fact, however, he sounds truly awful. Should you tell him the truth, even if it will ruin his self-confidence? Does utilitarianism have the right answer?
2. Suppose a man has been missing for many years, and you have just learned that he is dead. Should you tell the man's father, even if it will crush his hopes and send him into despair? Does utilitarianism have the right answer?
3. If you think it would be wrong to lie in one or both of these cases, do you think there is sometimes a moral duty to tell the truth despite the consequences? Does this duty mean that the principle of utility is mistaken?

Living Your Life

The principle of utility says that we should always maximize happiness. It does not matter whether we are deciding on the laws of our country as citizens and officials, or whether we are deciding what to do in our own private lives. In every possible case, the principle of utility tells us to choose the course of action that will produce the greatest amount of happiness. Is that right?

1. There are many needy people in the world who could benefit from your help. If you were to volunteer one evening per week, you could reduce need and thereby increase the sum of happiness. But if you were to volunteer all of your evenings, then you could produce even more happiness. Should you volunteer all of your spare time to helping the needy? Would it be wrong not to do so?
2. There are many poor people in the world who lack the money to buy food, clothing, shelter, and medicine. If you were to donate \$100 to a charity such as Oxfam, then some of these people would get what they desperately need and you would thereby increase happiness. But if you were to donate all of your spare income each month, then even more people would get what they desperately need and you would produce even more happiness. Should you donate all of your spare income to charities such as Oxfam? Would it be wrong not to do so?

APPENDIX Q
SAMPLE GRAMMAR PRACTICE AT THREE DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY
LEVELS

1. Intermediate

Mann, M. & Taylore-Knowles, S. (2007). *Destination CI & C2. Grammar & Vocabulary*.
MacMillan.

Present Time (p. 8)

Write the verb in brackets in the correct form, present simple or present continuous, in each gap.

1. My brother (do) a degree at university so I..... (see) hi very often, unfortunately.
2. Darrenusually(get) home until about eight o'clock.
3. I'm sorry to hear that your parents (get) divorced.
4. You..... (go) to the end of the street and..... (turn) right.
5. Why.....ice.....(float)?

2. Upper-intermediate

Evans, V. (2002). *CPE Use of English 1*. Express Publishing.

Conditionals (p. 140)

Write the correct conditional for the following sentences.

1. He hasn't got a free weekend. He would have visited us, then.
If he had a free weekend, he would have visited us.

2. He has made a lot of friends. He isn't lonely now.
If he hadn't made a lot of friends, he would be lonely now.

3. You are soaked. Why didn't you bring an umbrella with you?
If you had brought an umbrella with you, you wouldn't be soaked.

4. He can't be in trouble. He would have called by now.
If he were in trouble, he would have called by now.

5. He has lost his security pass. He won't be allowed to enter the building.
If he has lost his security pass, he won't be allowed to enter the building.

3. Advanced

Vince, M. & Emerson, P. (2003). *First Certificate: Language Practice*. Macmillan.

Indirect Time (p. 32)

Rewrite each sentence as direct speech.

a) Graham told Ian he would see him the following day.

b) Pauline told the children their swimming things were not there.

c) David told me my letter had arrived the day before.

d) Shirley told Larry she would see him that evening.
