**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY**
**ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY**
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**


**A COMPARISON OF PRIVATE AND STATE HIGH SCHOOL**
**EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE QUALITY OF ENGLISH**
**LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN TURKEY**


**THESIS BY**
**Evindar ÇEPİK**


**SUPERVISOR**
**Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU**


**MASTER OF ARTS**

**MERSİN, January 2014**

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We **certify** that thesis under the title of "**A COMPARISON OF PRIVATE AND STATE HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE QUALITY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN TURKEY** " is satisfactory for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Teaching**.

Supervisor- Head of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr Kim Raymond HUMISTON

**I certify that this thesis conforms to formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.**

20 / 01 / 2014

Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# ÖZET

## TÜRKİYEDE'Kİ ÖZEL LİSELERDE VE DEVLET LİSELERİNDE ÇALIŞAN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN  İNGİLİZCE EĞİTİMİNİN NİTELİĞİ BAKIMINDAN ALGILARININ MUKAYESESİ

**Evindar  ÇEPİK**

**Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı**

**Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya YUMRU**

**Ocak 2014, 72 sayfa**

Bu çalışmada İngilizce öğretmenlerinin bulundukları okullardaki İngilizce öğretimi kalitesini nasıl algıladıklarını belirlenmesi ve devlet sektöründe ve özel sektörde çalışan öğretmenlerin görüşlerini karşılaştırılması amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmada betimleyici yaklaşım araştırma yöntemi olarak belirlenmiş ve araştırma soruları bu bağlamda değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışmaya katılan öğretmenler Türkiye'nin Güneydoğu bölgesinde yer alan şehirlerden seçilmiştir. Araştırmada nitel ve nicel ölçüm araçları birlikte kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada gruplar arası karşılaştırmalar ki kare istatistikleri kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Daha sonra öğretmenlerin fikir ve önerilerini öğrenmek amacı ile bir görüşme sağlanmıştır. Araştırmada kullanılan anket Kabaharnup (2010) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Anket soruları 11 farklı alt alanda yer almaktadır: hedefler, materyal ve teknoloji, öğretmenlerin teknoloji kullanımı, öğretmenlerin materyal kullanımı, öğretmenlerin akademik nitelikleri, yöntemler, öğrenci-öğretmen ilişkisi, motivasyon, değerlendirme, fiziksel durum, aile ve diğer. Araştırma sonucunda elde edilen bulgulara göre anket maddelerine verilen cevapların çoğunda özel ve devlet okul öğretmenlerinin farklılaştığı görülmektedir. Ayrıca bu farklılıkların büyük çoğunluğunun okul türleri arasındaki ekonomik kaynak farklılıklarından kaynaklandığı görülmüştür. Elde edilen bu bulgular ilgili literatür ışığında incelenmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Program, Program Değerlendirme, Öneri

**ABSTRACT**

**A COMPARISON OF PRIVATE AND STATE HIGH SCHOOL
EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE QUALITY OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN TURKEY**
**Evindar Çepik**

**Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department**

**Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU**

**January 2014, 72 pages**

This study is an attempt to identify how English language teachers perceive the quality of English language education in high schools and to compare teachers' perceptions based on the school type they have been working. A descriptive research approach was used to answer the research questions. The participants who took part in the study were English language teachers working in state and private high schools in the Southeastern Anatolian Region. In this study qualitative and quantitative tools were used together The comparison of the groups was achieved by using Chi Square Statistics. A questionnaire developed by Kabaharnup (2010) was used as a data collection tool. Then an interview was given to teachers so as to learn their ideas and recommendations. The questionnaire is composed of 11 subgroup of questions such as objectives, materials and technology, teacher's use of technology, teacher's use of materials, teacher's academic qualifications, methods, teacher-student relationship, motivation, assessment, physical conditions, family (of students) and some other issues under the category "other". According to the results of the study, for most of the items in the questionnaire the significant differences found between the groups partly because of difference between private and state schools' economic resources. Those findings were discussed in the light of the current literature.

**Key Words:** Program, Curriculum Evaluation, Recommendations.

## ABBREVATIONS

EFL : English as Foreign Language

SPSS : Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

ELT : English Language Teaching

EARGED : Education Research Development Unit

# LIST OF TABLES

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**CHAPTER I**

**CHAPTER II**

**CHAPTER III**

**CHAPTER IV**

**CHAPTER V**

# CHAPTER I

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Introduction

This study is an attempt to identify how English language teachers perceive the quality of English language teaching in high schools. This chapter firstly presents background to the study, the aim of the study and the research questions. Then the importance of the study is discussed. Finally, definitions of terms are listed respectively.

### 1.2. Background of the Study

In this developing world, quality of education in specific lesson programs also should progress. Only in this way, the system can keep up the developments in the community as well as private individuals (Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimer, 1995). Education programs, teaching practice and assessment need to be revised regarding teaching policies of the country so as to succeed in this. In this process, the success of evaluation and the quality of the progress mostly relies on collecting effective and useful feedback about the effectiveness of planned and implemented educational actions from the implementers of the program (Ültanır, 2003).

The success of an educational program is mostly in close relationship with teachers' understanding it while implementing the program. It can be said that teachers using the program can recommend new ideas while implementing it (Ekiz, 2004). For this reason, Ekiz (2004) states any efforts to evaluate the quality of education program should include instructors' experiences. Hence, this research aims to look for the views of teachers who teach English language in private and state high schools with regards to the quality of English language teaching program. Given the shortage of research on this topic, the study is an attempt to contribute information about how teachers perceive the quality of English language teaching in high schools.

Teaching programs need to be evaluated in terms of their quality owing to the reasons such as to reach intended effect, to see the effects of the program, to improve necessary parts from the views of the teachers. However, it is logical to start with the definition of the evaluation first.

There are plenty of descriptions on what evaluation is. Generally evaluation means gathering all the relevant and important information in an organized way which will enable to improve the curriculum and see its effect. In other words, evaluation can be considered as an organized effort including the necessary analysis to develop and assess a teaching program.

Program evaluation, then, can be defined as goals and analysis, which aim to collect necessary information for curriculum. Thus, "program evaluation" is referred as systematic collecting of information about all aspects of current teaching program with the aim of implementing innovations and improvements.

Research studies on English Language Teaching program evaluation date back to 1963, which is the time when Keating's large-scale evaluation of language teaching methods was first used. As for Turkey, there are very limited numbers of secondary school program evaluation studies.

## 1.3. The Aim of the Study

Evaluation of the current 9th grade English language-teaching program and its possible results need to be reflected on as it has gone through reform actions. For this reason, English language teaching program for secondary schools in Turkey has been chosen as the core point of this research study. Thus, the main aim of this study is to evaluate the current 9th grade English language teaching program in secondary private and state schools in terms of its general characteristics, aims/outcomes and content considering English language teachers' points of view.

## 1.4. Research Questions

This study attempted to find answers to the following research questions:

1. What are English language teachers' perceptions about the quality of English language education in high schools?

2. What are English language teachers' perceptions about the factors that affect the quality of English language teaching in high schools?

3. What are English language teachers' recommendations to improve current situation, if any?

## 1.5. Significance of the Study

The quality of foreign language teaching and learning depends largely on many factors such as teachers, students and materials. Teachers are dynamic; they need to have positive views about the program and develop continuously and only effective program evaluation can provide this. On the other hand, it is also very important to have teachers who have positive views regarding the program because it is the teachers having logical aims take students' needs, level, interests and age into account (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Therefore, the English teaching program in high schools needs to be evaluated in order to make necessary renovations and have a more effective teaching program.

Firstly, this research may be helpful to different parties such as program designers and developers since it intends to point the strengths and the weaknesses of 9th grade English language-teaching program used currently in high schools in Turkey. The data collected may guide them while making the necessary alterations by including or excluding some parts and they may use the efficient and effective sides of the program.

Secondly, the implications of this study may help English language teachers to become aware of the strengths and the weaknesses of the English language-teaching program used currently in high schools in Turkey. This research may also assist English language teachers to prepare their lessons and to evaluate their students. That is, English language teachers may adapt, change or support the program in accordance with their students' language learning needs, levels, backgrounds, interests, and learning styles and strategies

Thirdly, evaluation of the English language-teaching program used currently in high schools in Turkey may be in need of improvement. Thus, the findings of this research study may set an important example in the field of English language teaching program evaluation for further research studies in Turkey.

## 1.6. Definitions of the terms

**Evaluation:**

It is a decision for a subject or a case by using some standards which are set to assess or reach some goals.

**Program Evaluation:**

Brown defines program evaluation as " a systematic collection and analysis of information necessary to improve a curriculum, assess its effectiveness and its efficiency, and determine participants' attitudes within the context of a particular institution" (Brown, 1995, p. 227).

**CHAPTER II**

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the key concepts and relevant studies conducted in this area so far. The first part presents the discussions on second and foreign language learning, current paradigms in language teaching and the current situation of language teaching in Turkey. Finally, the chapter ends with current studies related to the aim of this study.

### 2.2. Second Language Learning

According to Tough (1991), children and adults develop strategies for first language acquisition, and children use some of these strategies to learn another language, too. Tough argues that it is possible to compare native language acquisition with second language learning in many aspects. For this reason, Tough suggests second language teachers may put into practice some characteristics of first language acquisition in language teaching contexts.

Drawing on the above argument, it might be assumed that foreign language learners' situation resembles first language learners'. In this case, one of the most important issues seems to provide foreign language learners the need for communication. They need to be exposed to native-like input in different environments to enhance communication. As stated by MacIntyre (1995) learning atmosphere can be encouraging for meaningful communication. Secondly, Krashen (1985) mentions that the input should be simplified, natural, interesting and comprehensible if it is possible. Krashen (1985) adds there must be comprehensible utterances while acquiring first language. Next, Krashen (1985) "focuses on the importance of the caretaker for the second language learner as much as it is for the first language learner since the caretaker provides the learner with 'a comprehensible input but a low 'affective filters'" (p.10). Similarly, Wood (1999) argues that children learn the language when she/he is actively involved in the task. Wood further states the importance of supporting the learning process with audio-visual aids, real objects and meaningful successive actions. Likewise, a child learning his/her first language also focuses on what is going on in the

immediate environment. Following the same line of argument, Nunan (2000) states "grammar drills and imitation contributes a lot when he lists the things that help second language learning" (p.175).

Tough (1991) points out that communication between adult and child improves via gestures, actions and vocalization. He adds that the child tends to imitate the utterances adults produce. Facial gestures and actions facilitate communication as it is seen in the first language acquisition. There is a resemblance in foreign language learning and first language acquisition. At the beginning of mother tongue learning, the learner is observed as silent and passive privates till s/he uses sounds, actions, imitation and utterances.

Chastain (1976) states that learners need time for second language learning to take place. This process is similar to first language acquisition. Krashen (1985) implies that until linguistic competency is caught, learners experience being silent. Likewise, Chastain (1976) implies that there are some benefits of silence while acquiring a language. Learners see that mistakes are inevitable component in natural language development. The importance of imitation and reinforcement cannot be denied, as it is one of the ways that is used to practice the newly learned items (Clark & Clark, 1977).

Another point that Chastain (1976) emphasizes is the importance of motivation in language learning. He emphasizes that in English language classes motivation has an important effect on students' success. For this reason, teachers should be careful while correcting them. Continual encouragement while correcting students' mistakes is an important factor in increasing students' motivation towards learning languages.

Similar ideas can be observed in the Behaviorist Theory and the Generative theory (Chastain, 1976). Chastain (1976) states that proficiency in language learning process is not only significant in first language but it is also vital for second language. It can be said that if a learner is exposed to authentic learning environments, he/she is able to use suitable utterances. Learners generally focus on not the structures but the meaning. Krashen (1985) emphasizes the importance of meaningful input, which is beneficial for not speaking until he/she feels ready.

Hudelson (1991) refers to "Rage's 'concrete operational stage of cognitive development' when she confirms that children learn by experiencing, accomplishing meaningful tasks" (p.2). That is, the child generally tends to comprehend the concrete instead of the abstract. Next, Hudelson (1991) mentions that in language learning process it is natural for students to make error. Moreover, Hudelson (1991) points out, "errors are accepted as a natural part of learning unless they cause serious problems in communication" (p.2). The last principle that Hudelson (1991) states is the need of the learner to communicate. She concludes that "in the light of these features, the curriculum design and applications in the class, teaching strategies, techniques and materials, arrangement of the classroom setting should be revised to accomplish the most applicable ones to fulfill children's characteristics, needs and interests" (p.3).

## 2.3. Current Paradigms in English Language Teaching

The ways of teaching foreign languages have gone through some developments from conventional grammar-based approaches into more interactive and communicative approaches. The reflections of this change that occur from conventional grammar-based approaches into more interactive and communicative approaches can be seen in the trends relevant to foreign language teaching including Communicative teaching (Lee & VanPatten, 1992), Computer-assisted language learning (Lafford & Lafford 1997), the Standards for Foreign Language Learning, Authentic assessment (Wiggins, 1994), Culture teaching (Lange, 1999), Content-based instruction (Genessee, 1998), Language for specific purposes, Courses for heritage learners (Valdes, 1995) and focus on form in classroom SLA (Doughy & Williams, 1998).

The difference between the Cognitive approach to foreign language and Krashen's Monitor Model is that internal mental activity is paid particular importance in the Cognitive approach to foreign language learning, but subconscious acquisition is focused and conscious learning is argued not to be addressed in Krashen's Monitor Model. The function of grammar instruction in a foreign language classroom is stressed or unstressed in some other theories and approaches concerning foreign language teaching such as Community Language Learning (Curran, 1976; Curran, 1982), the Silent Way (Gattegno, 1972), Suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1978), Total Physical Response (Asher, 1986), the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983), the notions of

"Communicative Competence" (Savignon, 1983) and "Proficiency" Buck, Byrnes, & Thompson, 1989), and Processing instruction (VanPatten, 1992).

## 2.4. Foreign Language Education in Turkey

In Turkey, the historical development of foreign language education may be studied under two topics as "before the promulgation of the Republic" and "after the promulgation of the Republic"**.** Madrasah and Palace schools were seen in the time of Ottoman Empire. As religious education was important Arabic was the main accepted foreign language taught in madrasah**.** On the other hand, Turkish, French and Arabic languages were, as foreign languages, taught in the palace schools with the purpose of producing polite and well-informed people for the palace (Demircan, 1988).

Modernization and westernization was seen with the Noble Edict of the Rose Chamber in 1839, a foreign language curriculum was firstly employed in the army schools and the initial foreign language from the West was French. French was given importance mainly because of the requirements of medical education. In 1908s French language was a compulsory lesson in schools; the education of English was optional. After the Edict of Reform in 1856, there was an increase in the number of private foreign schools that gave education in English, German, French, and Italian as foreign languages (Hengirmen, 1997).

Consequently, the publications in foreign language increased drastically. In 1928, the Turkish Education Association was established so as to teach foreign languages in the country. Then, in 1955, English was accepted as the first foreign language in secondary education institutions (Erdoğan, 2003). After 1970s, with the permission of jurisdiction of Turkish Ministry of National education, foreign language teacher training colleges became part of the educational system. After 1933, English native speakers were invited to construct foreign language teaching curriculum (Demircan, 1988).

With the World War II, English started to become an international language all over the world**.** In 1972, foreign language teaching policy was modernized with methods and techniques and this curriculum was used in secondary schools with the approval of Ministry of National Education (Hengirmen, 1997).

A commission was founded in 1983 to improve the English language curriculum of Anatolian high schools (Demirel, 1978). For 4th and 5th graders English lesson was not an optional but a compulsory subject in 1997. With this law, children who are under the age of ten started to take compulsory English courses in primary schools (Küçük 2008). In 1997 behaviorism was a dominant theory in English language curriculum. This theory includes lecturing, dramatization, question-answer, memorization, role-play, and repetition. This curriculum was valid till 2006. But, then it was stated that the curriculum based on behaviorism was not sufficient. For this reason, the Turkish Ministry of National Education decided to make some changes in the language-teaching curriculum with a law in year 2006 (Aslan, 2008).

**2.5. Main Characteristics of English Language Curriculum**

The general characteristics of English language curriculum are defined in the Ministry of National Education (MEB) guide as in the following:

**a**. In the Turkish education system, it is aimed at ensuring students to establish communications with other people from foreign countries in relation to the English language education, and hence enabling the country itself to make progress in the fields such as science, economy and society.

**b**. Assaying language in context will be paid particular attention according to the curriculum of the English language teaching. Some factors such as manners, knowledge and skills of students may be utilized as tools in order to improve the ability to make communication with others. Students may also improve their accuracy in linguistics and get better at language learning methods if they improve their abilities to communicate. Moreover, students may gain miscellaneous sorts of manners, knowledge and skills in:

- Interpretation, expression and negotiation meaning (communication).
- Structure, written symbols, sounds, discourse and vocabulary (language).
- The cognitive, socio-cognitive and meta-cognitive process (general language education).

- Lines of ideas, behaviors, cultural artifacts, manifestations and symbols (culture).

**c**. The aims are:

- Students will reinforce their language knowledge and language skill, gained at the previous level, and will broaden them gradually, aiming at increasing language awareness and broadening their communicative ability.
- They will deepen their understanding of their own culture and other cultures, where English is spoken as a first, or an international language.

**d** The curriculum is based on the constructivist learning theory which put the stress on that learning means a process which is active and learners utilizes sensory input and makes sense out of it in with respect to constructivism (Hein, 1991; cited in Küçük, 2008) and the process-oriented approaches to curriculum design are adopted. Besides, the content is transmitted by means of a cross-curricular model. Moreover, in the curriculum, the mixed type syllabus that bears components from the syllabuses such as skill-based, procedural/task-based, notional/functional, topical/theme-based, situational and grammatical/structural syllabuses. The curriculum covers the cyclical syllabus that provides teachers and students with opportunity to study on the same topic several times.

**e**. The curriculum suggests evaluation techniques that are in line with the European Language Portfolio. The main assessment types suggested are writing assessment, portfolio assessment, classroom assessment, self-assessment, teacher assessment, and keeping language passport, language biography, and dossier.

**f**. The teaching materials are divided into three groups: course material, supplementary materials, and additional materials. In addition, the curriculum offers the use of visual materials such as gestures, facial expressions, blackboard/whiteboard, wall charts, posters, maps, slides, pictures, realia; audio materials such as teacher talk, audio cassettes, radio programs; and printed materials such as course book, teacher's book, and workbook (MEB, 2006, pp.1-60).

## 2.6. English Language Teaching Programs in Turkey

The language-schooling program consists of a range of foreign language courses, which enable the language in question to get taught by means of some sorts of techniques with the aim of achieving goals such as accomplishing a proficiency examination or establishing a communication (MEB, 2006). Hence, English language teaching programs (ELTP) center on ensuring the English language to be taught as a foreign language as efficiently as possible through the use of convenient techniques, methods, materials, etc. An ELTP consists of the followings:

- Method, Approach, Techniques
- Goals/Outcomes
- Content
- Materials
- Assessment Procedures

Thus, all components of a good ELTP are related to each other, they go hand in hand to serve the basic goal: to teach English efficiently.

Today, in the 21st century, English has been seen by many people as a 'global' foreign language that people with different nationalities are willing to learn all over the world to communicate in various settings such as international affairs, commercial relationships, scientific conferences, the internet and in foreign countries. Erozan (2005) identifies English as world language that connects people from all over the world.

As a result of English being appreciated as a 'world language' English teaching programs have started to arouse the interest of most English language teaching academic settings seeking more effective ways to teach English as a foreign or second language. Program evaluation departments and English language teaching departments of education faculties have been questioning the effectiveness of the English language programs both in private and state schools throughout the world as well as Turkey. Main skills that are categorized as receptive and productive skills are important for Ministry of National Education, so they decided to make new reforms for English teaching (MEB, 2006).

In the field of education, "there are certain basic learning theories that direct the design of curriculum. Thus, program developers design teaching programs by taking a learning theory as a basis and organize the aims/objectives, content, materials, activities, etc of a teaching program according to that learning theory" (Bryk, 2010, p.43). Thus, Turkish Ministry of National Education used behaviorism as the basic learning theory of 1997 ELTP by stating "the English language teaching lesson should have a method that based on lecturing" (MEB 1997, p.144). Behaviorism is mainly based on the habit formation: a learned process of reacting through repetition of certain actions. According to this theory, "learning is a mechanical process of habit formation and proceeds by means of the frequent reinforcement of a stimulus response sequence" (Hutchinson and Waters 1987, p.40). Therefore, it is based on behavioral changes and focuses on a new behavioral pattern being repeated until it becomes automatic.

"On August 18, 1997, with a law enacted, primary school education increased up to 8 years from 5 years compulsory primary school education" (Official Gazette 1997, p. 4306). However, this renovation has still not been sufficient as observed in some research studies conducted both in Turkey and abroad such as Pisa (2003), Prills (2001), and Timms-R (1999). The findings of these research indicated that education in Turkey had not been accomplishing the goals in the curricula. Furthermore, EARGED (Education Research Development Unit), a research unit dependent on Ministry of National Education in Turkey, presented a report in 2002 concluding that education in the country is far from being effective and needs revision in its all aspects. Şahin (2007) states, "according to many national and international researches, the level of education in Turkish Republic is certainly not satisfactory and could not achieve the goals set in the curriculums" (2007, p.284).

As a consequence of English becoming more and more important day by day all over the world, Ministry of National Education decided to make some reform actions including the teaching of English as a foreign language all over the country starting from the year 1997 in the Primary School Key Stage I (4th and 5th Grades) as well as some significant renovations in the complete curriculum of Primary School Key Stage I (Grades 1 to 5). Among English language teaching programs' general aims, Ministry of National Education emphasizes the importance of communication by stating "according

to their levels, students can listen, understand what they read, write about their feelings and thoughts, speak and be tolerant to different cultures and cultural values" (MEB 1999, p.573). Thus, the significance and necessity of both receptive (listening, reading) and productive skills (speaking, writing) have been stressed in order for the learners to learn how to use the foreign language as a medium of effective communication (MEB, 2006).

Owing to all these national and international research reports, a reform action was initiated in Primary School Curricula, in 2004 by the Ministry of National Education. The Primary Schools' Key Stage I (Grade 1 to 5) curriculum was redeveloped based on the constructivist theory of education. All these amendments in Primary School Key Stage I curriculum gave rise to some reform actions in English language teaching program as well. With a law enacted in 2006, the 1997 English language teaching program in Primary Schools' Key Stage I (4th and 5th grades) was renewed and changed by Ministry of National Education. According to this law, the new English language teaching program was to be applied in 4th graders in 2006-2007 teaching year while it was to be applied in $5^{th}$ graders in 2007-2008 teaching year which means the number of national and international research studies on the new English language program evaluation in Primary Schools Key Stage I was too limited by then (MEB, 2006).

It is known that these approaches and theories to language learning and teaching moved away from the traditional, structure-based ones to more interactive ones where learners learn the language by using it in real communication-"essentially constructing their own knowledge of the language from their interactive experiences, rather than learning systems by rote" (Carrier, 2006, p. 5). This way has been novel in the field and has been called communicative language teaching and learning. Nowadays, many of ELT departments have been influenced from this way of language teaching and have introduced it to the prospective teachers designing their instruction with the integration of this approach (Gilmore, 2007; Kahraman, 2001; Yılmaz, 2003).

In 2005-2006 teaching year, curriculum of primary schools began to be implemented in accordance with the constructivist theory of learning with program amendments designed by Ministry of National Education. It was first implemented in

Key Stage I (1st -5th grades) in Turkish, Math, Life Sciences, Social Sciences and Science and Technology lessons. Then, in 2006-2007 academic year, it began to be implemented in the complete curriculum of Key Stage I learners, including English lessons. Thus, it is a necessity to investigate constructivism in detail.

According to Hein, learning means a process that is active and learners utilize sensory input and make sense out of it. Constructivism centers on getting learners ready for problem solving under specific circumstances. It also covers social constructivism that is a kind of learning theory which puts the stress on the fact that learning is regarded to be a dynamic social process in which people extrapolate by means of the interactions they make with each other and their living space. Hence, knowledge is a product, which is manufactured by humans, and it has a structure of society and culture (Hein 1991).

Constructivism gives importance to schema, which is pre-knowledge in learning process. A learner can create a new knowledge by him/herself if he/she uses the pictures in his/her mind that he/she has before (Teyfur, Teyfur and Çınar 2006). According to constructivist theory if a learner takes part in the construction of information actively, s/he will be much more effective in her/his learning process (Hein, 1991).

As mentioned above, new constructivist teaching programs for all primary school lessons were prepared and presented to primary school teachers in that academic year; and primary school syllabuses and teaching programs were designed in accordance with the constructivist approach (Teyfur, Teyfur, and Çınar 2006). As being a part of the primary school curriculum; English language teaching program was re-prepared in accordance with the constructivist approach taking the Key stage I (4th and 5th grades) English language teaching program as a starting point.

Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory is another current and fashionable theory affecting the applications in the field of English language learning and English language teacher education. According to MI theory, teachers should enhance their repertory of methods, strategies and tools as students may have different intelligences as described by Gardner (1993). This shows us the biggest supplement of the given theory to education (Armstrong, 2000). It is also widely used in English language teaching and

favored by the teacher educators (Harmer, 2001); as it is believed that it can "systematically help students develop their full intellectual potential in, through and across the curriculum" (Lazear, 2000, p. 6).

Moreover, brain-based learning, critical thinking, cooperative learning, problem solving, and active learning are some of the other concepts, theories, or approaches which are different but have important implications for English language teaching (ELT). The importance of technology cannot be denied in ELT. To give an instance, some of their application and introduction are done with the help of technological aids and qualified instructors put them into practice. As a result, this also leads the English language teacher education to be more involved in the technology. As Carrier (2006) states teachers should update themselves with the changing situations and they also should enrich their knowledge with the usage of technology.

## 2.7. Globalization and English as a foreign language in Turkey

As greater emphasis has been placed upon the global environment, language teaching has become more important in the curricula of schools and universities bringing the issue of education of those teachers to teach the language considering the current technologies, approaches, and application in the field of English language teaching (Jenkins, 2000). The importance of teacher education for a learner cannot be denied. Each teacher should be ready for language development.

With the promotion of early foreign language education at public schools, it is primarily important to be able to choose and teach a foreign language which will address to rural kids' and communities' needs and interests in Turkey. In other words, as King and Mackey (2007) said, this is a crucial step to clarify "who can do what with which language and (how they feel doing it!)" in foreign language education" (p. 44).

In today's globalizing world, English is by far the most widespread language (Balteiro, 2011). The English language was initially started to spread worldwide as a result of the colonial power of Britannia in the 19th century (Spichtinger, 2003). Then, the role of England as the leading country in industrialization led to the association of the language with development, thereby making it a requirement for those who wanted to remain up-to-date in the latest technological and scientific issues. This influence of

English, as Balteiro (2011) indicated, was reinforced by the role of the media in the late 20th century and placed English as a global language. Today, scholars closely correlate the improvement of globalization and the preponderance of English (Short et al., 2001).

Growing English competence "has speeded up globalization by facilitating political understanding, economic activities and cultural exchange; meanwhile globalization has been functioning as a driving force to strengthen the position of English as a global language" (Jenkins, 2000, p. 515). This spread of English as a global language has also "exerted pressure on governments for regulating their educational policies and practices. However, variations have been seen across countries depending upon the extent to which globalization has influenced and the function(s) of English within each country" (Jenkins, 2000, p. 516-517). In Turkey, the global influence of English was initially felt with the need to open up to the Western world and the increasing contact with the United States after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011). The strategic and geographical status of Turkey as a cultural and a physical bridge between Asia and Europe as well as its proximity to Middle East and Africa makes learning English as the international language particularly important at the crossroads of civilizations (Kırkgöz, 2007).

Belonging to "the "Expanding Circle" in Kachru's concentric circles, English has no recognized official status in Turkey. It does not function as an official or co14 official language as in India, which belongs to the "Outer Circle" (Doğançay- Aktuna, 1998, p. 30). Nevertheless, English is taught as a foreign language and has variety of functions in different domains in Turkey on account of its instrumental value as well as being an international language of communication. Doğançay-Aktuna (1998) listed these functions:

> The English language plays the leading role amongst other foreign languages in terms of the most widely preferred foreign languages, and it is subordinate to the Turkish language to popularity with respect to medium of education. English serves as a link between universal business and tourism as well as giving a kind of code, which is in the nature of a symbol for modernization and elitism to the schooled

middle class people and the people in the upper part of the socioeconomic environment (p. 37).

After a decade, this analysis of Doğançay-Aktuna (1998) does not seem to have changed drastically until today. In Turkey, English functions at both international and national level. At the international level, English helps to build economic and social relations with the rest of the world, to gain access to a great amount of knowledge and to keep up with the technological and scientific developments. However, in Turkey, domestic necessities and benefits determine the expansion of English language. English language has a useful function for an exceptional teaching and learning and a respectable job with reasonable interests in terms of national level. The perceived advantages of English enhanced its spread in Turkey through educational policy making (Demirel, 1988).

At the level of higher education, there have been also similar developments. Following the foundation of two English-medium universities, Middle East Technical University in 1956 and Boğaziçi University in 1971, an English-medium university model came into existence (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011). Since then, there have appeared many public and private universities that the medium of instruction is in English.

Additionally, these universities offer one-year intensive English language preparation to their incoming students if their proficiency is found below the level specified by the university in a preliminary language proficiency examination. In Turkish-medium universities, English is incorporated into the curriculum as an obligatory subject, usually given to the students for the first year. English is not only an obligatory school topic, but also a requirement for introduction and progress in professional life under Turkish conditions. To illustrate, Doğançay-Aktuna (1998) indicated that "about 68 % of job openings advertised in two Turkish papers, which were identified "prestigious and competitive" in terms of being higher level and better paid positions, required candidates to "know English" or "have a proficient command of English" (pp. 33).

This was a decade ago. Since then, the need for the applicants who have at least a working knowledge of English have increased in the today's competitive job market.

Besides, English knowledge is a source of financial incentives for government employees. Those who score at least 70 % on the Foreign Language Examination for Civil Servants (KPDS) are granted monthly bonuses. The test is administered in several languages. However, according to the recent statistics, 93 % of the test takers in May 2011 took the English language test, followed by 1.9 % Arabic and 1.5 % German (OSYM, 2011). Moreover, different levels of grading are considered to be a requirement to get an academic promotion. To illustrate, according to the Higher Education Law, 50% on KPDS or an equivalent score on a proficiency test such as TOEFL is the minimum criteria to apply for a postgraduate degree or a position as a research assistant.

Although "cultural and economic effects of globalization dominate the expansion of the English language in Turkey and the government promoted it, there have been also some acts against English language by the "medium of instruction" debate in educational context, "naming and branding" debate in business context, "degeneration and foreignization" debate in sociocultural context, and "anti-Americanism" in political context" (Selvi, 2011, pp. 193). What's more, the quality of English language teaching is not satisfying (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998). The people "who have graduated from public schools may only be classified as "false beginners" in spite of the fact that they have been given English language instruction for a long time. The general profile of Turkey can be more clearly seen on exploring cross-country differences (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998, p. 32).

In 2011, for instance, the English Proficiency Index (EPI) ranked Turkey in 43 among 44 countries, just before Kazakhstan at the bottom, and labeled as "very low proficiency" in English (oecd.org). While the top and mid-ranking countries often start English in the first grade, Turkey starts in the fourth grade. In the past, students graduating from Anatolian or Super High Schools would be granted with a higher level of English competence since they would be given an intensive English language instruction for one year.

However, in 2005, preparation class was cancelled entirely. Therefore, students no longer receive such intensive English instruction unless they go to a university, which offers such a preparatory program. Besides, the space between the optimum

formal policy and the real classroom practices arise from the issues related to teacher education and recruitment in Turkey. Teachers are regarded as crucial factors in employing macro policy decisions for practical purposes at the micro level according to Kırkgöz" (2009, p.678). However, research shows that beginning English language teachers "find it difficult to adhere to their beliefs of ideal teaching because they are more concerned with managing their classrooms, covering the curriculum on time, preparing students for exams and they are relatively influenced by their own language learning experience, proficiency of English, the range of opportunities and resources, etc." (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011, p.329).

Therefore, some courses such as university-based ones provide trainees with the best values without taking into account the limitations and difficulties, which are likely to come from the implementation of them in a serious manner. In rural areas of Turkey, the situation gets even worse because of the factors such as socioeconomic challenges, teacher sustainability and quality issues.

## 2.8. "Age" as an individual difference in foreign language learning

Each learner possesses different characteristics that will influence learning. There are individual differences between individuals. One of the individual difference is age. Age is a "significant variable in learning a foreign language because age can be dominant on determining the physical, cognitive, affective and linguistic characteristics of the learner" (Djigunovich, 1995, p.17). Age affects the learner's success in learning a foreign language whether it is acquired as a second language or it is learned in the classroom environment. Ekmekci (1991) verifies this idea by stating that the learner's age is a determining factor in identifying which method to use in the classroom. Briefly, the presentation techniques in teaching differ according to the learner.

Children learn a foreign language better than adults has been a subject for various researches. Some long-term researches reveal the common assumption that, especially high school students present a better performance than adults. On the contrary, short-term studies show that adults learn a foreign language faster than children. At the same time, Ur (2000) refers to Singleton's research published in l989. The findings of that research indicate that elder children's capacity for learning a second

language is better compared to that of high school students'. Littlewood (1994) refers to Fathman's research which points out that adolescents between the ages of eleven to fifteen learn grammar faster than high school students who are between the ages of six to ten. Another research Littlewood (1994) mention is OW Of Burstall et al. "in which they come up with the result that 'efficiency in second language learning increases with age, and that high school students are superior only in acquiring pronunciation skills" (p.66).

## 2.9. Problems in English Language Teaching in Turkey

A lot of studies, sources and articles are available so as to make an assessment related to the quality of English language teaching and learning (Demirel, 1999; Demirel, 1978; Eren, 2004; Gencel, 2005; Tarhan, 2003; Yeniyıldız, 2003). The Turkish Secondary Education system is controlled, managed, and assessed by the Ministry of National Education of Turkish Republic. The Ministry of National Education of Turkish Republic has been working to increase the quality of education and minimize the problems. The quality policies of the Ministry of National Education can be summarized as in the following:

- to apply an education and management approach that aims to increase the happiness of the learners, parents, teachers, employers, and the society in general
- to increase the culture and the awareness of democracy by allowing the peers of the education to contribute and take part in the decision – making process
- to develop all the citizens' knowledge and skills through education regardless of their language, religion, race, and sex by providing equal opportunities in education
- to focus on raising citizens with good characters
- to raise citizens that will be able to deal with and find solutions to the economic, cultural, and social problems that the humankind is facing
- to contribute to the peaceful environment that the humankind needs by evaluating the knowledge and cultural background of the humankind through a common way of wisdom and education
- to be able to reach for the excellence by focusing on the education and the processes of education

- to make an effective use of the sources dedicated to education, especially the source of human

- to raise individuals who are the participants of the contemporary civilization

- to contribute to the raising of good men, good citizens, and good professionals

- to contribute and respect for the existence of a habitable and sustainable environment

- to contribute to the society's intellectual and ethical purity

- to remove all the obstacles so that human can learn and realize themselves

- to contribute to the existence of qualified labor force required by the business world

- to observe the universal principles of education (MEB Toplam Kalite Ödülü ve Başvuru, p.2).

As Taş and Günel (2007) summarize the problem minimizing principles as in the following:

- to obtain information on the success level of the education

- to appoint the positive behaviors

- to stimulate the teachers to do their best

- to provide guidance and counseling to secure uniformity in education

- to improve the teaching methods and techniques applied in the institution

- to assist in the provision and usage of the teaching equipments

- to assist in the assessment and evaluation of the learners' success by using scientific methods

- to guide the teachers to solve and overcome the problems they encounter

- to improve and guide the precautions taken against the learners with the need for special treatment and education

- to appoint the educational leadership in the classroom and environment.

In many language-related programs, teaching materials are regarded to be main elements according to Richards (2001). Nunan (1988) shares the similar ideas by

stating, "materials act as curriculum models and provide. At their very best they fulfill a teacher development role by helping them follow in developing their own materials. A good language teacher should know these materials very well when s/he uses at least one of them (course book) in language classes; thus some knowledge on the use of materials can help a teacher a lot in his/her profession" (p.28).

High school students are full of action and they learn by doing and by being active. This means "the students attending a high school deal with experiences by means of enabling their current information and thinking to associate with what is studied. What high school students need is a learning atmosphere providing tangible experiences which are relevant, reasonable and deserving active participation. There should be rich resources, materials and stimuli for the child to engage" (Fisher, 1996, p.12).

High school students learn fast and they are ready to do all the activities. But while learning fast, they lose their interest easily, or forget things unless they are repeated. So, activities must be arranged considering their characteristics. Sometimes, stir them up activities and sometimes settle down activities should be used and the active involvement of learners should be enhanced in the classroom. "High school students learn by organizing their own learning experiences. Children do this by building schemas, reviewing or changing them. So while teachers make lesson plans they don't underestimate the children's schemata. They should supply or design activities that activate children's own learning. The activities, topics or subjects should be related to the interest of the child" (Fisher, 1996, p.12).

High school students learn by using language. So, the classroom discourse and the common knowledge shared by teacher and the students are important. With language use children "make sense of their experiences and internalize their actions. Students who have attended a high school are in need of some chances to debate, make statement, provide definition, narrate and speculate" (Fisher, 1996, p.13).

High school students learn by interacting with others as explained in Vygotsky's social context for learning and Bruner's scaffolding patterns. "In order for teachers to establish a conversation environment for children, they should provide arrangements for

course duration. Thus, the main objective of this conversation environment should be to reveal the available knowledge and consideration of a child, or to contribute the present ability of the child to think by means of asking or replying questions. Hence, such a conservation environment needs to be created through a plan and avoided happening accidentally" (Fisher, 1996, p.14).

It is understood that high school students should be approached with suitable language teaching and learning approaches and methods together with a curriculum and a syllabus, which reflect these approaches, and methods.

# CHAPTER III

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the methodological details of the study. First of all, the research design of the study is described. Then, information about the population and data collection tools are clarified. Finally, information about data analysis is presented.

### 3.2. Research Design

This aim of this study was to find out private and state high school English language teachers' perceptions on the quality of English language teaching in Turkey. It is a descriptive research, which aimed at describing teachers' natural teaching environment (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989). Accordingly, the survey research method was carried out in this study so as to gather and describe the views and opinions of English language teachers.

### 3.3. Participants

The participants who took part in the study were English language teachers working in state and private high schools in the Southeastern Anatolian region. Convenience sampling strategy was used in choosing the participants. Sixty high school English language teachers from 4 big cities participated in this study. Those cities included Diyarbakır, Mardin, Gaziantep and Şanlıurfa. Those cities were selected because of their convenience to the researcher. From each city 15 language teachers participated in the study and in each case 11 of them were from state high schools and the other 11 were from private high schools.

### 3.4. Data Collection Tools

Two data collection tools were used to gather data to find the answers to the research questions. The first data collection tool was a questionnaire (see Appendix 1), which was developed by Kabaharnup (2010). Kabaharnup (2010) stated the studies inspired him in constituting the questionnaire. Those studies were Arends's (1988), Barcelos and Kalaja's (2003), Hall and Hewings's (2003), Lamie's (2005), Roberts and

Weir's (1994) and Ruiz-Funes's (2002). The questionnaire used in this present study included two parts; the first part consisted of 10 questions, which elicited demographic data through open-ended and closed-ended questions. The second part of the questionnaire included 67 closed-ended questions based on a 5 point Likert-type rating scale where 5 indicates the respondent consider the item as highly effective within the context of their school. The questions in the second part were divided into 11 subgroups such as objectives, materials and technology, teacher's use of technology, teacher's use of materials, teacher's academic qualifications, methods, teacher-student relationship, motivation, assessment, physical conditions, family (of students) and some other issues under the category "other".

The second data-collection tool was follow-up interviews held with 6 English language teachers. The aim of the follow-up interview was to triangulate the data elicited through the questionnaire. There were about 4 main questions but depending on the responses elicited from the participants, some questions, which focused on the exemplifications, were also raised during the interviews.

## 3.5. Data Collection Procedure

Before the questionnaire was distributed to the teachers necessary permissions were taken from the Directorate of the National Education. After the permission was received, some teachers were given the questionnaire in Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa. Questionnaires were sent to the rest of the teachers living in Mardin and Gaziantep via media tools such as Facebook or e-mail. Answering the questionnaire took about 30 minutes for most of the teachers. Having collected the data through the questionnaire, follow-up interviews were conducted with 6 English language teachers, which equaled to the %10 of the total population. When determining whom to interview we used convenience-sampling method, as those 6 teachers were the easiest to reach. The interviews were held in teachers' own time. All of the teachers volunteered for interviews as they thought their answer might have an effect for the evaluation of the current English language-teaching program. Although there were only 4 questions in the interview, it took almost 15 minutes to complete each interview.

## 3.6. Data Analysis

The data gathered from the questionnaire was analyzed by using SPSS 17.0 statistical package. First of all, demographical characteristics of the participants were gathered by using frequency and percentage statistics. Later, the comparison of the participants' views from different kinds of schools was investigated by using Chi Square statistics for each item. The data gathered from the interviews was subjected to content analysis.

**CHAPTER IV**

**4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

**4.1. Introduction**

This chapter presents the findings of the study that have been collected through a Questionnaire (see Appendix 1) and follow-up semi- structured interviews. The aim of the study was to identify how English language teachers perceive the quality of English language education in high schools. The findings of the study are presented in two main sections. In the first section, findings elicited through the questionnaire are discussed. In the second section the results elicited through follow-up semi- structured interviews are presented.

**4.2. Findings from the Questionnaire**

Findings from the questionnaire are presented in two main sections. The first section (4.2.1.) presents the findings from the first section of the questionnaire, which consisted of, 10 open-ended questions to collect data about the demographic qualities of the participants. The second section (4.2.2.) presents the findings from the second part of the questionnaire. The second part of the questionnaire included 67 closed-ended questions based on a 5 point Likert-type rating scale where 5 indicates the respondent consider the item as highly effective within the context of their school.

**4.2.1. Demographical Characteristics of Participants**

In this section, the data gathered from the first part of the questionnaire are presented. Table 1 presents the demographical characteristics of the participants:

**Table 1. Demographical Characteristics of the Participants**

|  |  | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 30 | 50 |
|  | Female | 30 | 50 |
| School Type | State | 30 | 50 |
|  | Private | 30 | 50 |
| Undergraduate area of study | BA-Linguistics | 8 | 13,3 |
|  | BA-Eng. Lit. | 18 | 30 |
|  | BA-ELT | 26 | 43,3 |
|  | BA-American Cult. | 8 | 13,3 |
| Age | 20-29 | 21 | 35 |
|  | 30-39 | 28 | 46,7 |
|  | 40-49 | 9 | 15 |
|  | 50 + | 2 | 3,3 |

According to Table 1, 30 (%50) of the participants were male while another 30 (%50) were female. The similar distribution was also valid for the type of schools that the participants work at. As for undergraduate area of study, 8 (%13.3) of the participants were graduated from Linguistics programs, 18 (%30) of them were graduated from English language and literature programs, 26 (%43.3) of them were ELT graduates and finally, 8 (%13.3) of them were graduates of American Culture programs. The distribution of the participants based on the age intervals are as follows; 21 of them (%35.5) were 29-29 age interval, 28 of them (%46.7) of them were at 30-39 age interval, 9 of them (%15) were 40-49 age interval and finally 2 of them (%3.3) were more than 49 years old.

**4.2.2. Findings Related to the Comparison of State and Private School Teachers Views**

In this part, the data gathered from the second part of the questionnaire are presented. In the second part the questionnaire, the teachers were asked to rate the probable factors that may affect their teaching in some specific sub dimensions with regards to how effective the given factor on their teaching was.

### 4.2.2.1. Comparisons Based on Objectives

The Chi-Square results related to objective sub-dimension are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State and Private School for Objectives**

|   |  | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $\chi^2$ | df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 4,8 | 1 | ,028* |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 |  |  |  |
| **2** | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 11,915 | 1 | ,001* |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 |  |  |  |
| **3** | State | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 6 | 11,998 | 3 | ,007* |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 19 |  |  |  |
| **4** | State | 0 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 1 | 19,641 | 3 | ,000* |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 12 |  |  |  |

*Not: 1: Objectives of the curriculum, 2: Objectives of the lesson, 3: Knowledge about the objectives, 4:The need for new methods*

The relation between the type of school and views related to objectives of the curriculum [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 4.8, *p* <.05], objectives of the lesson [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 11.91, *p* <.01], knowledge about the objectives [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 11.99, *p* <.01] and the need for new methods [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 19.64, *p* <.01] was found statistically significant. According to results it can be said that private high school teachers find each item as highly effective in ELT while state high school teachers find items 2-3 as effective items. Half of the state high school teachers are neutral for item four. Most of the teachers both in state and private high schools think item four as an effective item in ELT

### 4.2.2.2. Comparisons Based on Materials and Technology

The Chi-Square results related to Materials and Technology sub-dimension are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State and Private School for Materials and Technology**

|  |  | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $x^2$ | Df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 | 0,373 | 1 | 0,542 |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 |  |  |  |
| **2** | State | 0 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 4,463 | 3 | 0,216 |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 6 |  |  |  |
| **3** | State | 0 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 2,723 | 3 | 0,436 |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 8 |  |  |  |
| **4** | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 7 | 8,049 | 3 | 0,045* |
|  | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 |  |  |  |
| **5** | State | 0 | 9 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 17,60 | 3 | 0,001* |
|  | Private | 0 | 1 | 12 | 15 | 2 |  |  |  |

*Note: 1:Course books, 2:Audio materials (cassettes, CDs), 3:Visual materials (Flashcards, pictures), 4:Audio-visual materials (films, videos), 5:CALL (computer assisted language learning) labs.*

The relationship between the school type and the items in materials and technology sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views related to course books [$x^2$ (1, N = 60) = 0.373, $p$ <.05], audio materials [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 4.463, $p$ <.01], visual materials [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 2.723, $p$ <.01], audio visual materials [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 8.049, $p$ <.01] was found statistically insignificant but computer assisted language learning [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 17.60, $p$ <.01] was found statistically significant. The results showed that, most of the teacher views in the state schools are as effective for audiovisual materials and CALL while in the private schools are as highly effective.

### 4.2.2.3. Comparisons Based on Teachers' Use OF Materials

The Chi-Square results related to teachers' use of materials sub-dimension are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State and Private School for Teacher's Use of Materials**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $x^2$ | Df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | State | 0 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 16,028 | 3 | ,001* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | | | |
| **2** | State | 0 | 2 | 17 | 9 | 2 | 5,291 | 3 | 0,152 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 6 | | | |
| **3** | State | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 9,490 | 3 | ,023* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 13 | | | |

*Note: 1:Blackboard use, Use of technology, 2:Using other course content, 3:Use of audio-visual aids.*

The relationship between the school type and the items in teachers' use of materials sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views related to blackboard [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 16.028, *p* <.01], use of audio materials [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 9.490, *p* <.05] were found statistically significant. The results showed that, most of the teacher views in the state schools for those items are as effective while in the private schools are as highly effective.

### 4.2.2.4. Comparisons Based on Teachers' Academic Qualifications

The Chi-Square results related to teachers' academic qualifications sub-dimension are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State and Private School for Teachers' Academic Qualifications**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $\chi^2$ | Df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 1,071 | 1 | 0,301 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | | | |
| **2** | State | 1 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 16,71 | 4 | 0,002 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 20 | | | |
| **3** | State | 0 | 3 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 9,253 | 3 | 0,026 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 6 | | | |

*Note: 1:Proficiency in target language, 2:Experience abroad, 3:Awareness of language-culture relationship.*

The relationship between the school type and the items in teachers' academic qualifications sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views related to experience abroad [$\chi^2$ (4, N = 60) = 16.71, $p$ <.01] and awareness of language-culture relationship [$\chi^2$ (3, N = 60) = 9.253, $p$ <.05] were found statistically significant. The results indicated that, most of the teacher views in the state schools for those items are as effective while in the private schools are as highly effective.

**4.2.2.5. Comparisons Based on Methods**

The Chi-Square results related to methods sub-dimension are presented in

Table 6.

**Table 6. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State and Private School for Methods**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $x^2$ | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 19 | 0,300 | 1 | 0,584 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 21 | | | |
| 2 | State | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 7 | 25,173 | 3 | 0,001 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | | | |
| 3 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 0,739 | 1 | 0,390 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | | | |
| 4 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 6,648 | 1 | 0,010 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | | | |
| 5 | State | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 15 | 3,333 | 2 | 0,189 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | | | |
| 6 | State | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4 | 15,85 | 2 | 0,001 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | | | |
| 7 | State | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 8,533 | 2 | 0,014 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 14 | | | |

*Note: 1: Connection between theory and practice, 2:Use of grammar-based approach, 3: Teaching vocabulary in a meaningful context, 4:Teaching grammar in a meaningful context, 5: Teachers' awareness of language teaching methods: 6: Use of communicative activities, 7:Use of authentic materials*

The relationship between the school type and the items in methods sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views related to use of grammar based approach [$x^2$ (3, N = 60) = 25.173, $p$ <.01], teaching grammar in a meaningful context [$x^2$ (1, N = 60) = 6.648, $p$ <.01], use of communicative activities [$x^2$ (2, N = 60) = 15.850, $p$ <.01] and use of authentic materials [$x^2$ (2, N = 60) = 8.533, $p$ <.05] were found statistically significant. The results showed that, most of the teacher views in the state schools for those items are as effective while in the private schools are as highly effective.

### 4.2.2.6. Comparisons Based on Teacher-Student Relationships

The Chi-Square results related to teachers-student sub-dimension were presented in Table 7.

**Table 7. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State and Private School for teacher-student relationship**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $X^2$ | Df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 2,7 | 1 | 0,100 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | | | |
| 2 | State | 0 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 1,343 | 3 | 0,719 |
| | Private | 0 | 7 | 15 | 5 | 3 | | | |
| 3 | State | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 6 | 3,96 | 2 | 0,138 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 13 | | | |
| 4 | State | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 8 | 1,968 | 2 | 0,374 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 13 | | | |
| 5 | State | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 2 | 9,124 | 2 | ,010* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 10 | | | |
| 6 | State | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 3,789 | 2 | 0,150 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | | | |
| 7 | State | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 3,725 | 2 | 0,155 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 12 | | | |
| 8 | State | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 5 | 6,456 | 2 | ,040* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 13 | | | |
| 9 | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 19 | 1,209 | 2 | 0,546 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | | | |
| 10 | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 17 | 1,221 | 2 | 0,543 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 21 | | | |
| 11 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 0,739 | 1 | 0,390 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | | | |
| 12 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 0,271 | 1 | 0,602 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | | | |
| 13 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 8,531 | 1 | ,003* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | | | |
| 14 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 8,076 | 1 | ,004* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 21 | | | |

*Note: 1: Student behavior, 2:Punishment, 3:Rewards, 4:Knowing students' socio-economic background, 5:Addressing students by their names, 6:Students' previous Foreign Language experiences, 7:Student-centred classes, 8:Teacher-centred classes, 9:Learners' anxiety, 10:A positive classroom atmosphere, 11:A negative classroom atmosphere, 12:Teachers' attitude toward students, 13:Learners' prejudices towards Foreign language, 14:Language*

The relationship between the school type and the items in teachers-students relationships sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views related to addressing students by their names [$\chi^2$ (2, N = 60) = 9.124, $p$ <.01], teacher-centered classes [$\chi^2$ (2, N = 60) = 6.456, $p$ <.05], learners' prejudices towards Foreign [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 8.531, $p$ <.01] and language [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 8.076, $p$ <.01] were found statistically significant. The results indicated that, most of the teacher views in the state schools for those items are as effective while in the private schools are as highly effective.

### 4.2.2.7. Comparisons Based on Motivation

The Chi-Square results related to motivation sub-dimension are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State And Private School for Motivation**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $\chi^2$ | Df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 4,593 | 1 | ,032* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | | | |
| 2 | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 1,091 | 2 | 0,580 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | | | |
| 3 | State | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 5 | 7,917 | 2 | ,019* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | | | |
| 4 | State | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 11 | 3,216 | 2 | 0,200 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | | | |
| 5 | State | 0 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 10,552 | 3 | ,014* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 20 | | | |
| 6 | State | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 7 | 7,451 | 2 | ,024* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 | | | |
| 7 | State | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 7 | 2,448 | 2 | 0,294 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 11 | | | |

*Note: 1:Motivation of the students, 2:Motivation of the teachers, 3: Salaries of Foreign Language teachers, 4:Working conditions, 5:Administrative support, Regulations put by the government, 6:Regulations put by the administration, 7:Awards*

The relationship between the school type and the items in motivation sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views related to motivation of students [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 4.593, $p$ <.05], salaries of foreign language teachers [$\chi^2$ (2, N = 60) = 7.917, $p$ <.05], administrative support, regulations put by the government [$\chi^2$ (3, N = 60) = 10.552, $p$ <.05] and regulations put by administrators [$\chi^2$ (2, N = 60) = 7.451, $p$ <.05] were found statistically significant. The results showed that, most of the teacher views in the state schools for those items are as effective while in the private schools are as highly effective.

**4.2.2.8. Comparisons Based on Assessment**

The Chi-Square results related to assessment sub-dimension are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9. Chi Square Results for Comparison between State And Private School for Assessment**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $x^2$ | Df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 5,455 | 1 | ,020* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | | | |
| **2** | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 3 | 3,606 | 2 | 0,165 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 8 | | | |
| **3** | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 8 | 0,083 | 2 | 0,959 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 9 | | | |
| **4** | State | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 3 | 1,948 | 2 | 0,378 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 7 | | | |

*Note: 1:SBS / YDS, 2:Assessment instruments, 3:Feedback from teacher, 4:Error correction techniques*

The relationship between the school type and the items in motivation sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views on SBS/YDS [$x^2$ (1, N = 60) = 5.455, $p <.05$] was found statistically significant. In private schools, views on this item are as highly effective by all the instructors but in state schools, some of the instructors regard this item as just effective.

**4.2.2.9. Comparisons Based on Physical Conditions**

The Chi-Square results related to physical conditions sub-dimension are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10. Chi Square Results for the Relationship Between State And Private School for Physical Conditions**

|   |  | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $\chi^2$ | Df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 3 | 4,532 | 2 | 0,104 |
|   | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 9 |  |  |  |
| **2** | State | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 1 | 11,058 | 3 | 0,011* |
|   | Private | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 11 |  |  |  |
| **3** | State | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 3,59 | 1 | 0,058 |
|   | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 |  |  |  |

*Note: 1:Classroom's physical atmosphere, 2: Furniture, 3: Sitting plan*

The relationship between the school type and the items in physical conditions sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views on Furniture [$\chi^2$ (1, N = 60) = 5.455, $p$ <.05] was found statistically significant. In private schools, views on this item are as highly effective by almost all the instructors but in state schools, most of the instructors regard this item as just effective.

### 4.2.2.10. Comparisons Based on Family of Students

The Chi-Square results related to family of students sub-dimension are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11. Chi Square Results for the Relationship between State and Private School for Family of Students**

| | | Highly Ineffective | Ineffective | Neutral | Effective | Highly Effective | $\chi^2$ | df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | State | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 17 | 1,182 | 2 | ,554 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 17 | | | |
| 2 | State | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 14 | 6,444 | 2 | ,040* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 10 | | | |
| 3 | State | 0 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 7,008 | 3 | 0,072 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 14 | | | |
| 4 | State | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 3 | 7,477 | 2 | ,024* |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 12 | | | |
| 5 | State | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 8 | 5,219 | 2 | 0,074 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 13 | | | |
| 6 | State | 0 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 11 | 2,229 | 3 | 0,526 |
| | Private | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 9 | | | |

*Note: 1: Violence in family, 2: Economical situation, 3: Number of family members (crowded families), 4: Divorced families, 5: Education level of families, 6: Disinterested families*

The relationship between the school type and the items in physical conditions sub-dimension were investigated by chi square statistics. The relation between the type of school and views on Economical situation [$\chi^2$ (2, N = 60) = 6.444, $p$ <.05] and Divorced Families [$\chi^2$ (2, N = 60) = 7.477, $p$ <.05] were found statistically significant. In private schools, views on those items are as highly effective by almost all the instructors but in state schools, some of the instructors regard this item as just effective.

### 4.3. Findings from the Interviews

In this section, the interview data collected from 6 (10%) of the participant teachers are presented. During the interviews, the teachers were asked 4 questions so as to investigate the topic in depth.

The main aim of the first question was to learn whether the teachers think English is taught successfully in our schools or not. On analyzing the responses given to the first question, we observed that 5 out of 6 teachers believe that English is not taught successfully. When expressing their own points of views, they came up with similar ideas. The following quotation, stated by Teacher A, represents those 5 teachers' opinions:

> Extract 1: *when I was in university I thought that we are good at in teaching English ,but today nobody can make me believe this sentence.*

Only 1 private high school teacher stated that he believes that out country is successful in English teaching. He cleared up his idea as in the following extract:

> Extract 2: *I can say that Turkey is better than most of the developed countries. I worked in South Korea as a volunteer teacher. Our teachers are really active and friendly when I compare Turkey with South Korea.*

Second interview question was related to the first one. That is, with the second question, we aimed to elicit the teachers' opinions on possible factors that affect the quality of English language teaching. The teacher responses show that teachers believe there are different factors that affect the quality of English language teaching in our country. Four out of 6 teachers stated that the main factor that affects the quality of English language teaching negatively is the curriculum while 1 of them pointed out the insufficient lesson hours as a main factor affecting teaching. Only 1 teacher indicated that traditional methods are the main factor affecting English teaching. Drawing on the responses we elicited from the teachers, we might assume most of the teachers are not happy with the present quality of English language teaching because of curriculum in use. This assumption is reflected in one of the teachers' responses as in the following:

> Extract 3: *When I look at curriculum, I think that I need a guidance to understand it because of its density and complexity.*

In the third questions teachers were asked whether they think there is a gap between theory and practice. Four of the teachers out of 6 accepted that there is a gap between theory and practice. Only one of them did not accept such a gap. One of the teachers working in a private high school explained the situation as in the following excerpt:

> Extract 4: *when I was in university I was not aware of the gap in theory and practice. Real world is really different from books.*

The last question aimed to find out the teachers' suggestions as to how they think they can improve or change current situation. Four of the teachers out of 6 said that curriculum must be improved according to both teachers' and students' needs. Teacher D working in state school expressed his ideas as in the following:

> Extract 5: *fulfilling this curriculum is sometimes torture for teacher because students are generally bored with some activities.*

Teacher B working in private high school agreed with teacher D. Teacher B gives importance on practice but she emphasizes meaningful practice. She cleared up her ideas as in the following sentence:

> Extract 6: *practice is in the heart of English teaching if it is meaningful otherwise it will be nonsense activity for children.*

One of them believes that teachers should give up using old-fashioned methods. The other one thinks that lesson hours are insufficient. He stated his ideas with these sentences:

> Extract 7: *I have only 2 hours with tenth graders in a week. What do they expect from me? We are not robots, we need more time for practicing.*

It is seen that teachers' responses are different from one another, but most of them want a change in the present curriculum. They have different suggestions but all of the suggestions are logical when they explain their teaching contexts. The most important of all, all of the language teachers are hopeful about future teaching practices.

**CHAPTER V**

**5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

**5.1. Discussion**

The results of this descriptive study revealed important themes pertaining to the issues in concern. There are three major conclusions made.

The first interesting result of the present study is related to the views on physical conditions of the schools. The studies investigating the effects of physical learning environment and physical resources show that safety, temperature, and air quality, which can be regarded as the basic needs for human beings, together with the building, materials, classrooms and other physical aspects seem to have certain effect on the learning environment; and the lack or the inefficiencies of these cause problems in educational activities (Berry, 2002). But, in the current study, both state and private school teachers view the physical conditions as effective except the views on furniture. Views related to furniture are more positive for private teachers then the state teachers. This result could be related to economic condition differences of the schools. On the other hand, there was no difference on the views related to seating plans, which is not dependent on economic conditions.

Additionally, the views related to teacher-student relationships were found showing no difference by school type. Only, four items have significant chi-square results. A good teacher should understand his/her students in that being emphatic (seeing things from the point of view of his/her students), authentic (being herself/himself all the time) and respectful (understanding his/her students' ideas). Being aware of learner's level, interest areas and needs are important. So choosing appropriate activities and materials are very critical for learning environment, which is similar to the study conducted by Cameron (2002). The results of this study indicated that, there is no difference by the school type, but such similarity is caused by the high level of positive views of teachers in both groups.

In the present research it became clear that both teacher groups view using of materials in their schools is as highly effective except the items that require economic power (CALL, Audio visual materials). On the other hand, views of the materials that

are independent of monetary power (course books, audio materials, visual materials) did not show difference by the school type. It is a known fact that people remember more when they see, listen and read at the same time. In teaching and learning process audio and visual aids have an influence on permanent learning. In a world like this in which people expose to visual and auditory stimuli a lot, a teacher can select many materials to be used in the classroom. But, the point is to be clear about how to choose materials and to connect it to real life to make learning memorable and powerful. Good materials should simplify the course by providing economy in time and speech, make the course vivid and clear, increase students' interest and motivation, and create desire for learning. Besides, they should make abstract concepts concrete, help to express complex explanation easily and enrich the course by providing the chance for practicing subjects.

The economic condition of the families is also concern in state-private school difference. Families in private schools have more economic powers as reported by English teachers while divorced family is significantly different in private schools as well. On the other hand, according to English teachers family violence is equally problem both in private and state schools.

One another similarity on the views is related to assessment dimension. The results indicated that in all the dimensions except the formal exams made by the state (SBS/YDS) rest of the items related to assessment is regarded with similar positive way. As to the motivation sub dimension, students' motivation, salary, administrative support, the teachers view regulations put by the government and regulations put by the administration differently. The reported views are more positive for the private school teachers in all of the items given above.

When asked how to improve the current situation, most of them stated similar suggestions for improving the current situation. They generally stated that curriculum is dense for this reason they believe it should be purified. Some of them believe that lesson hours should be increased. Few of them support adopting new methods while giving up the old ones.

In Conclusion, Turkey has started to actively follow the developments in foreign language teaching, especially English, at the end of 1960s, due to the country's desire to take place in the global world. Since then, foreign language teaching policies have changed a number of times, affecting actual classroom practices through changes in the curriculum, syllabus, course material and methods. Developments in the field were reflected onto practices and procedures, thereby making the whole practice of teaching English increasingly complex. At the primary level, particularly, there were shifting perspectives. Following an eight-year-compulsory education law in 1997, English was integrated into the primary school education system and young learners encountered English when they reached the 4th grade. Those steps could be considered to develop the quality of English teaching in Turkey and one of the best ways of improving the quality of education is improving the quality of education. Turkey has the power and enthusiasm to reach the quality standards of the Modern world in the field of education. With a good and systematic plan, and hard work, I believe that Turkey will also be able to catch up the quality level of the high standards.

## 5.2. Recommendations

- In the present study teachers with different experience levels are included, a further study comprising a specific level of their career development teachers can be conducted as well to get a specific picture about their views especially at their career periods of study especially when teachers need more assistance from outside and administrative bodies.

- A further study can be conducted to describe the satisfaction and the problems related to the each dimension. Each dimension can be taken separately to provide more detailed results on the English language teaching.

- The present study evaluated the situation in a descriptive way. A further study can be conducted to see how these three dimensions correlate with the students' academic achievements.

- In the future studies the perspectives of the graduates of the non-ELT teaching departments can also be included to analyze their viewpoints from different perspective, as they could judge the situation from a broader perspective.

- The present study included only 4 cities, a nation-wide study could be conducted to obtain a broader view on physical environment and resources, motivation of teachers and the program, so a strategy could be formulated for enriching teachers' experiences.

- One another study could be replicated in the following years to confirm the results obtained; and besides questionnaire, the participants could be interviewed. It can be carried over a broader sample representing the whole country.

- The social and academic backgrounds of the teachers could be researched, as these factors could affect their perspectives towards their schools' physical, social, and academic environment.

- Another study can be conducted to compare the results of study in relation to the other dimensions with the demographic characteristics of the teachers to see if there are significant differences based on them, genders, universities and the variables of the study.

- There could be a study that considers a multiple set of variables helping research to determine factors that predict the effects of learning environment on students' learning.

# 6. REFERENCES

Akkerman, S.F. & Meijer, P.C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. *27*, 308-319.

Alptekin, C. & Tatar, S. (2011). Research on foreign language teaching and learning in Turkey. *Language Teaching*, *44*(3), 328-353.

Armstrong, T. (2000). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. (2$^{nd}$ ed.) Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Asher, J. (1986). Learning another language through actions: The complete teachers guidebook. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions. paradigm for content-oriented materials and instruction. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 191-217). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Aslan, O. (2008) Eğitim Fakülteleri Kapsamında İlköğretime Yönelik Farklı Yabancı Dil Öğretmeni Modelleri, Ç.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 35.

Ausubel David P., (1964). Adults versus Children in Second-Language Learning: Psychological Considerations. The Modern Language Journal *48*( 7), 420-424

Balteiro, I. (2011). Some reflections on the impact of niversities in the teaching and learning of English in socalled "expanding circle" countries. *Porta Linguarum*, *16*, 75-88.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F.I.M., Green, D.W. & Gollan, T.H. (2009). Bilingual minds. Bilingual minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *10*(3), 89-129.

Brewster, J., Ellis, G. & Girard, D. 1992. *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. London: Penguin. Pp16-26. Brown, J. D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), The second language curriculum (pp. 222-241). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J. D. (1995a). Language program evaluation: Decisions, problems and solutions. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, *15*, 227-248. Watanabe, Y., & Pang, A. 2007 TESOL Convention 4

Brown, J. D. (1995b). The elements of language curriculum. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Bryk, A. S. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(7), 23–30.

Bush, M. & Terry, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Technology-enhanced language learning*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Calabrese, R. & Dawes, B. (2008). Early language learning and teacher training: A foreign language syllabus for primary school teachers. *Studi di Glottodidattica*, *1*, 32-53.

Campbell, L. and Campbell, B. (1999). *Multiple intelligences and students achievement: Success stories from six schools*. USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Campbell, L., B. Campbell, & D. Dickinson. (1996). *Teaching and learning through multiple intelligences*. (2$^{nd}$ ed.) USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Carrier, M. (2006). Technology in the future language classroom: possibilities and probabilities. *Modern English Teacher*, *15*(4), 5-11.

Chang, J. (2006). Globalization and English in Chinese higher education. *World Englishes*, *25*(3/4), 513-525.

Chastain, K. (1976). *Developing second language skills* (2$^{nd}$ ed.), Chapter 5. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language:* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Curran, C. (1982). A linguistic model for learning and living in the new age o f the person. In R. W. Blair (Ed.), *Innovative approaches to language teaching* (pp. 136-146). Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Curran, C. A. (1976). *Counselling-learning in second languages*. Apple River, Illinois: Apple River Press.

Demircan, Ö. (2005). *Yabancı-Dil Öğretim Yöntemleri*, Der yayınları, İstanbul.

Demircan, Ömer. (1988) Dünden Bugüne Türkiye'de Yabancı Dil. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Demirel, Ö. (1978). *Yabancı dil ögretimi ve tam ögrenme*. Egitim ve Bilim, *14*,46.

Demirel, Ö. (1999). *lkögretim okullarında yabancı dil ögretimi*. Ankara: MEB, Ögretmen Kitapları Dizisi.

Djigunovich M. J. (1995). Attitudes of young foreign language learners: a follow-up study. In: M. Vilke. & Y. Vrhovac. (Eds.). *Children and foreign languages*. University of Zagreb: Faculty of Philosophy, 16-33.

Doff, A. (1990). *Teach English: A training course for teachers*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Doğançay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *19*(1), 24-39.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams *(Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doye, P. & Hurrell, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Foreign language education in primary schools* (ages 5/6 to 10/11). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Press.

Dunkel, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Computer-assisted language learning and testing: Research issues and practice*. New York: Newbury House.

Ekiz, D. (2004). "Teacher professionalism and curriculum change: primary school teachers' views of the new science curriculum." *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 12*/2: 339-350.

Ekmekci, F.Ö. (1991). *Resarch Writing: A Guide for Writing Theses, Dissertations, and Articles*. Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları, No: 2

Erdoğan, İ., (2003). *Avrupa Birliği'ne Giriş Sürecinde Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Yabancı Dil Eğitimi ve Kalite Arayışları Sempozyomu*. İstanbul: Özel Okullar Birliği Neta Matbaacılık.

Eren, Z. (2004). The use of short story in teaching English to the students of public high schools. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 26*, 41-47.

Erozan, F. (2005). "*Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergraduate ELT curriculum at eastern niversities university: a case study.*" Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Fisher, J. (1996). *Starting From the Child*?, Buckingham-Philadelphia, Open University Press.

Galloway, V. (1998). Constructing cultural realities: "Facts" and frameworks of association. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 129- 140). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gardner, Howard. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gencel, U. (2005). Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğrenme ve yabancı dil yogun eğitimlerin ekonomik ve sosyal maliyetleri. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitisü Dergisi, 2*, 50-72.

Genessee, F. (1998). Content-based instruction. In Met. M. (Ed.), *Critical issues in early second language learning* (pp. 103-105). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley.

Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching: Surveys and studies*, *40*(2), 97-118.

Girard D (1997). *Early Modern Language Learning: Conditions of Success*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Hancock, C. R. (1981). Modest proposals for teacher education in the 1980's. In J. Phillips (Ed.), *Action for the 80's: A political, professional, and public program in foreign language education*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. (3rd ed.) England: Pearson Education Limited.

Hein, George E. (1991). Constructivist Learning Theory [On Line] Available: http://www.exploratorium.edu/IFI/resources/constructivistlearning.html.

Hengirmen, Mehmet (1997) Yabancı Dil Öğretim Yöntemleri ve Tömer Yöntemi, Ankara: Engin Yayınları.

Heyworth, F. (2003). *Challenges and Opportunities in Language Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Hommel, B., Colzato, L.S., Fischer, R. & Christoffels, I. (2011). Bilingualism and creativity: Benefits in convergent thinking come with loses in divergent thinking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*, 1-5.

Huang, B.H. & Jun, S.A. (2011). The effect of age on the acquisition of second language prosody. *Language and Speech*, *54*(3), 387-414.

Hudelson, Sarah. (1991). EFL *Teaching and Children: A Topic-Based Approach* (The English Teaching Forum). Arizona State University, USA.

Hutchinson, T. And A. Waters (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning Centred Approach*. Cambrıdge: Cambridge University Press.

James, P. (2001). *Teachers in action: Tasks for in-service language teacher education and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2000) The Phonology of English as an International Language, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kabaharnup, Ç. (2010). *The Evaluation of Foreign Language Teaching In Turkey: English Language Teachers' Point of View*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Çukurova University Institute Of Social Sciences. Adana.

Kahraman, M. K. (2001). *Effectiveness of a teaching programme aiming at niversitie of communication competencies for teacher candidates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara.

Kim, K.H.S., Relkin, N.R., Lee, K.M. & Hirsh, J. (1997). Distinct cortical areas associated with native and second languages. *Nature*, *388*, 171-174.

King, K., & Mackey, A. (2007). *The bilingual edge: Why, when, and how to teach your child a second language*. New York: Collins.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *Regional Language Center Journal*, *38*(2), 216-228.

Kramsch, C. (1993b). *Foreign language study as border study: Report on a cross-cultural teacher training seminar. Culture and content: Perspectives on the Acquisition of cultural competence in the foreign language classroom, Monograph Series #4*. Tempe, AZ: Southwest Conference on Language Teaching.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman

Krashen, S.D. (1975). The critical period for language acquisition and its possible bases. *Developmental Psycholinguistics and Communication Disorders*, *263*, 211-224.

Küçük, Ö. (2008). *An Evaluation of English Language Teaching Program ay Key Stage I and opinions of Teachers Regarding the Program*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Çanakkale 18 Mart University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching*. New York: McGraw.

Lafford, P. A. & Lafford, B. A. (1997). Learning language and culture with internet technologies. In M. D. Bush & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Technology-enhanced language learning* (pp. 215-262). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lange, D. L. (1999). Planning for and using the new national culture standards. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices* (pp. 57-135). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1992). *An introduction to second language acquisition Research*. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. 2$^{nd}$ ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lazear, David. (2000). *The intelligent curriculum: Using multiple intelligences to develop your students' full potential*. USA: Zephyr Press.

Leaver, B. L. & Stryker, S. B. (1989). Content-based instruction for foreign language classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, *22*, 269-275.

Lee, J. F. & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw Hill.Liskin

Liddicoat, A.J. (2008). Pedagogical practice for integrating the intercultural in language teaching and learning. *Japanese Studies*, *28*(3), 277-290.757.

Littlewood, W. (1994). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and outlines of Suggestopedia*. New York: Gordon & Breach.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1995) 'How Does Anxiety Affect Foreign Language Learning: A Reply to Sparks and Ganschow', The Modern Language Journal, Vol. *79*(1), pp. 90-99

MEB (1997) *İlköğretim Kurumları İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı*. İstanbul : Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

MEB (1999). *Tebliğler Dergisi*, 2504, 573. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

MEB (2006*). English Language Curriculum For Primary Education* (Grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8). Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

MEB Toplam Kalite Ödülü ve Başvuru Şekli. Retrieved from: http://www.yesd.com.tr /dosyalar /makale_072.pdf

Mechelli, A., Crinion, J.T., Noppeney, U., O'Doherty, J., Ashburner, J. Frachowiak, R.S. & Price, J.C. (2004). Structural plasticity in the bilingual brain. *Nature*, 431,

Merino, B. J., Trueba, H. T., & Samaniego, F. A. (Eds.) (1993). *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish*. London: Falmer.

Mirici, I. H. (2000). "European Language Portfolio: A tool for a common language education policy in Europe". *Journal of Interdisciplinary Education*, *6*(1): 161-166.

Moore, Z. T. (1994). *The portfolio and testing culture. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 163- 182). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Nunan, D. (2000) *Language Teaching Methodology*. Oxford: Phoenix.

Official Gazette (1997). (18.07.1997), 4306.

Özoğlu, M. 2010.Türkiye'de öğ retmen yetiştirme sisteminin sorunları. Ankara: Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Toplum Araştırmaları Vakfı.

Peçenek, D. (2010). A longitudinal study of two boys' experiences of acquiring Italian as a second language: The influence of age. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 268-290.

Pennington, M. C. (1996). *The power o f CALL*. Houston, TX: Athelstan.

Richard, J.C. and Rogers, T.S., (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (2003). *Curriculum Development In Language Teaching, the United States of America*, Cambridge University Press.

Şahin, İ. (2007). "Assessment of new Turkish curriculum for grade 1 to 5." *Elementary Education Online*, 6, 2: 284-304.

Sammons, P, Hillman, J & Mortimer, P 1995, Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: A Review of School Effectiveness Research, Office for Standard in Education and Institute of Education, London.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and practice*. Reading, MA: Addison.

Seliger, H. W. and Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Selvi, A.F. (2011). World Englishes in the Turkish sociolinguistic context. *World Englishes*, *30*(2), 182-199.

Short, J.R., Boniche, A., Kim, Y. & Li, P.L. (2001). Cultural globalization, global English, and geography journals. *Professional Geographer*, *53*(1), 1-11.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. New York: Appleton.

Spichtinger, D. (2003). *The spread of English and its appropriation*. Retrieved from http://spichtinger.net/Uni/sp-dipl3.pdf.

Stansfield, C. W. (1994). Developments in foreign language testing and instruction: A national perspective. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 43-67). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Taneri, P.O. & Engin-Demir, C. (2011). Quality of education in rural schools: A needs assessment study. (Ankara-Kalecik sample). *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 91-112.

Tarcan,Ahmet,Yabancı Dil Öğretim Teknikleri,Nobel,Ankara,2004

Tarhan, S. (2003). *Perceptions of students, teachers and parents regarding Englishmedium instruction at secondary education*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Tarhan, S. (2003). *Perceptions of students, teachers and parents regarding English medium instruction at secondary education*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Taş, A. and Günel, C., (2007). İngiltere ve Türkiye'deki Okulların Denetimi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, Vol. 173, pp. 139-156.

Teyfur, E., M. Teyfur and O. Çınar. (2006). "İlköğretim okulu öğretmen ve yöneticilerinin yapılandırmacı eğitim yaklaşımı ve programı hakkındaki görüşleri." *Education Faculty Journal*, 7, 11: 47-64.

Tochon, F.V. (2009). The key to global understanding: World languages education-Why schools need to adapt. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*(2), 650-681.

Tough, J. (1991). High scool students learning languages. In Brumfit C, Moon J and Tongue R (eds.) 1991. *Teaching English to Children - From Practice to Principle*. London: HarperCollins Publishers pp213-227.

Ültanır, G (2003). *Eğitimde Planlama ve Değerlendirmede Kuram ve Teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel

Ur, P. (2000). *A Course in Language Teaching. Practice and Theory. Beijing.* Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Cambridge University Press.

Valdes, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 299-328.

VanPatten, B. (1992). Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching: Part 2. *ADFL Bulletin, 25*(3), 23-37.

Varış, F. (1996). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme*. Ankara: Alkım Kitabevi.

Wiggins, G. (1993). *Assessment: Authenticity, context, and validity*. Phi Delta Kappan, *75*(3), 200-214.

Wiggins, G. (1994). Toward more authentic assessment of language performances. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 69-85). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Wolff, J. S. (2003). Design features of the physical learning environment for collaborative, project-based learning at the community college level. National Research Center for Career and Technical Education University of Minnesota. In Whitmore K. F. & Goodman Y. M. (1996). *Whole language voices in teacher education. National Council of Teachers of English*. York, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Wood, P. (1999). "Who is using the National Foreign Language Standards?" *Foreign Language Annals*, *32*, 435-440.

Yılmaz, C. (2003). *A Needs analysis of teacher trainees in the English departments of Turkish niversities within the framework of communicative language teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

**7. APPENDICES**

**7.1. APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire**

THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING FROM THE

LANGUAGE TEACHERS' POINT OF VIEW

Dear Colleagues,

I am currently enrolled in the MA (Master of Arts) ELT program at Çağ University. I

am conducting a study on teachers' views about the factors affecting foreign language

teaching in Turkey. The purpose of the study is to find out:

*factors affecting success in teaching English as a foreign language

*how the language teachers from all levels view language teaching

*the views on ways to improve language teaching and possible suggestions to the

problems

Your responses will be kept **confidential** and used only for research purposes. So, your

responses are very precious in the evaluation of the foreign language

Teaching and will contribute to the improvement of the foreign language education in

Turkey via this study.

**(PERSONAL INFORMATION)**

**Please circle the appropriate answer for you.**

1. **Age:**          20-29      30-39      40-49          50….

2. **Gender:**       Male      Female

3. **I have been teaching English for:**

 1-5 years    6-10 years   11-15 years   16-20 years

4. **Which type of school are you teaching?**

   A state high school           a private high school

5. **Academic degree**

BA in linguistics  BA in English literature   BA in ELT   BA in American Culture

6. **Have you ever attended any training course, workshop or a seminar on foreign language?**

   If yes specify it (name- duration)...............................................................

7. **Have you ever been to abroad?** If your answer is yes please state the reason the place and the time……………………………………………………………

*Below are some probable factors that may affect your teaching. While answering this part, please consider How effective is the given factor on your teaching? Considering the scale, circle the most appropriate choice.*

| Highly Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Highly Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**OBJECTIVES**

1. Objectives of the curriculum    5   4   3   2   1

2. Objectives of the lesson    5   4   3   2   1

3. Knowledge about the objectives    5   4   3   2   1

4. The need for new methods    5   4   3   2   1

5. Other(please specify): _____

**MATERIALS&TECHNOLOGY**

6. Course books    5   4   3   2   1

7. Audio materials(cassettes, CDs)    5   4   3   2   1

8. Visual materials(Flashcards, pictures)   5   4   3   2   1

9. Audio-visual materials (films,videos)   5   4   3   2   1

10. CALL* labs    5   4   3   2   1

(*computer assisted language learning)

11. Other(please specify): _____

**TEACHERS' USE OF MATERIALS**

12. Blackboard use    5   4   3   2   1

13. Use of technology    5   4   3   2   1

14. Using other course content    5   4   3   2   1

15. Use of audio-visual aids    5   4   3   2   1

**16.** Other(please specify): _____

## TEACHER'S ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **17.** Proficiency in target language | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **18.** Experience abroad | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **19.** Awareness of language-culture relationship | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**20.** Other(please specify): _____

## METHODS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **21.** Connection between theory and practice | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **22.** Use of grammar-based approach | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **23.** Teaching vocabulary in a meaningful context | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **24.** Teaching grammar in a meaningful context | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **25.** Teachers' awareness of language teaching methods | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **26.** Use of communicative activities | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **27.** Use of authentic materials | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**28.** Other(please specify): _____

## TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **29.** Student behaviour | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **30.** Punishment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **31.** Rewards | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **32.** Knowing students' socio-economic background | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **33.** Addressing students by their names | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**34.** Students' previous Foreign Language

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| experiences | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 35. Student-centred classes | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 36. Teacher-centred classes | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 37. Learners' anxiety | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 38. A positive classroom atmosphere | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 39. A negative classroom atmosphere | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 40. Teachers' attitude toward students | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 41. Learners' prejudices towards Foreign | | | | | |
| 42. Language | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 43. Other(please specify): _____ | | | | | |

## MOTIVATION

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44. Motivation of the students | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 45. Motivation of the teachers | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 46. Salaries of Foreign Language teachers | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 47. Working conditions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 48. Administrative support | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Regulations put by the government | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 49. Regulations put by the administration | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 50. Awards | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 51. Other(please specify): _____ | | | | | |

## ASSESSMENT

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52. SBS / YDS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 53. Assessment instruments | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 54. Feedback from teacher | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 55. Error correction techniques | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**55.** Error correction techniques      5      4      3      2      1

**56.** Other(please specify): _____

## PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

**57.** Classroom's physical atmosphere      5      4      3      2      1

**58.** Furniture      5      4      3      2      1

**59.** Sitting plan      5      4      3      2      1

**60.** Other(please specify): _____

## FAMILY (OF STUDENTS)

**61.** Violence in family      5      4      3      2      1

**62.** Economical situation      5      4      3      2      1

**63.** Number of family members (crowded failies) 5   4      3      2      1

**64.** Divorced families      5      4      3      2      1

**65.** Education level of families      5      4      3      2      1

**66.** Disinterested families      5      4      3      2      1

**67.** Other(please specify): _____

### 7.2. APPENDIX 2 : Interview

1. Do you think  English is taught succesfully in our country?

2. If not, what are the main possible factor ?

3. Is there a gap between theory and practice?

4. What is your sugesstion for success or solution for problems