

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Study

This curriculum evaluation study was carried out as part of the SFL Curriculum Renewal Project that started in the year 2002, following the strategic planning in 2001. The SFL Curriculum Renewal Project went through the *Needs Assessment*, *Curriculum Design*, *Instructional Design & Textbook Writing* and *Implementation* stages prior to this evaluation study.

The research team in this study is composed of four instructors – Serap Bilgiç Yücel (representative instructor from DBE), Özlem Sığınan (instructor at DML and member of the SFL Core Curriculum Committee and an active participant in the previous stages of the project), Duygu Güntek (instructor at the DML and currently teaching the ENG 101 course), and finally Yeşim Somuncuoğlu (former instructor at DML and a senior researcher).

This report presents the findings of the curriculum evaluation procedures conducted at the DML for the ENG 101 course. The purpose of the ENG 101 evaluation process was to find out the answers to the specific research questions below:

1. How do the rationale and objectives of the ENG 101 course relate to the DML curriculum rationale and objectives?
 - To what extent are the rationale and objectives of ENG 101 achieved?
 - Do the students improve/maintain their linguistic and educational skills by the implementation of the program?
2. Are the methods and materials used in ENG 101 effective in achieving the course rationale and objectives?
3. To what extent do the ENG 101 student evaluation procedures and tools measure the skills and knowledge targeted in the objectives of ENG 101?
4. Is the curriculum on paper perceived and implemented in the same way by all instructors?

2. METHOD

2.1 Data Collection Instruments

The instruments that were used in this research were two parallel questionnaires to evaluate the ENG 101 course. These questionnaires were given to 21 ENG 101 instructors and 255 students. In addition, there were interviews with 9 ENG 101 teachers and 1 administrator, and feedback from the end-of the term ENG 101 evaluation meeting.

2.1.1 Questionnaires

In order to get the teacher and student views on the effectiveness of the ENG 101 course, as well as the course-book, two questionnaires parallel in form and content (See Appendices for the questionnaires) were prepared and given to the aforementioned participants after the implementation of the program. There are only a few differences between these two surveys as explained below.

In the student questionnaire, there are four major parts in addition to the section on background personal information: objectives, methods and materials, evaluation procedures, and attitude, whereas in the questionnaire given to the instructors, the last part (students' general attitude towards ENG 101) has been eliminated. In the first part, both groups were to decide on the extent to which the course objectives were achieved. In the second part, the respondents were to evaluate the usefulness of the materials used such as the books, recordings and handouts (if any). In the third part, the usefulness of the tasks/activities was to be considered. In the last part, the quality of the assessment procedures was evaluated. The student questionnaire was piloted on a group of 25 students and the reliability of the tool was measured as above .90 (Cronbach Alpha).

The student and teacher questionnaires were parallel with some differences in the comments/suggestions parts, as well as the open ended questions. For instance, in the teachers' version, comments on the pace (timing) of the course, as well as on the class size, time-tabling and further improvements were sought, which were not included in the students' version since these are technical issues related to the teaching profession. However, further student comments were required under the title; "Any other comments".

The statistical procedures used in both student and instructor questionnaires are descriptive tests (means and percentages) and t-tests and ANOVA. In student questionnaires, t-tests were used to compare the mean scores of two groups – the students who studied at the DBE and those who were exempt from the DBE program. Besides, ANOVA was used to compare the mean scores of the students from the DBE according to their start level at the DBE (Beginner, Elementary, Pre-intermediate, Intermediate and Upper-intermediate). Finally, t-tests were used in analyzing instructor questionnaires, in the part related to current and desired teaching methods.

2.1.2 Interviews with ENG 101 Instructors

Nine randomly selected instructors giving the ENG 101 course and one administrator were invited to share their views about the course in an interview. These meetings were held during the teachers' office hours, and the data were used to find out whether the curriculum on paper was perceived and implemented in the same way by all instructors.

2.1.3 Feedback from the End of Course Meeting

At the end of the course, there was a general meeting among the ENG 101 instructors who evaluated the course and gave their suggestions for improvement. The outcomes of that meeting have been included in this report – in the Conclusions and Suggestions part – in order to provide further feedback from all the instructors to increase the reliability of the study.

2.2 Sampling

As mentioned above, data were collected from all the ENG 101 instructors, one administrator and the selected ENG 101 students, in Fall 2004. During the sample selection process two criteria were employed: representation of DBE and non-DBE students (approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of the student population at the DML are non-DBE – those exempt from the DBE program) and representation of different Faculties (and departments) at METU. Representative numbers of students from different departments at METU were selected as participants. The percentages of student population in each department were also taken into consideration.

3. RESULTS

Below are the results of the research in three sections: the results of the ENG 101 students' questionnaire, the results of the ENG 101 instructors' questionnaire, and the data gathered through the interviews with 9 instructors and one administrator. After the presentation of the results for each research questionnaire, a summary section is inserted to wrap up the relevant findings. Also in this summary section, specific reference is made to significant differences found in mean score comparisons through the t-tests and ANOVA.

3.1 The Results of the ENG 101 Students' Questionnaire

(* the 'p' values under .05 indicate statistically significant differences between the means)

To what extent has the ENG 101 course improved you in....

A- OBJECTIVES

PERCENTAGE

| | 1= not at all | 2=little | 3=mode rarely | 4=very much | Mean | N |
|--|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|------|-----|
| 5. using correct, appropriate language structures, vocabulary and transitionals/linking expressions in writing | 5.5 | 29.0 | 58.0 | 7.5 | 2.67 | 255 |

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|-----------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(252)=.504 P=.614 |
| 1 | 2.69 | 191 | |
| 2 | 2.63 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|--------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,182)=1.051 P=.371 |
| 1 | 2.80 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.64 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.57 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.78 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 6. learning and carrying out the stages in a process writing approach, while writing paragraphs and/or essays | 5.5 | 28.6 | 50.2 | 14.9 | 2.75 | 253 |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(250)=-1.033 P=.303 |
|---|------|-----|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 2.72 | 189 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 63 | |

one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,180)=.956 P=.415 |
|---|------|----|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 2.76 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.77 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.67 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.33 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 7. understanding the main ideas in a text | 4.7 | 18.4 | 60.0 | 16.1 | 2.88 | 253 |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(250)=.500 P=.618 |
|---|------|-----|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2.89 | 189 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 63 | |

one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,180)=.282 P=.838 |
|---|------|----|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 2.85 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.89 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.96 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.75 | 8 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 8. recognizing the relationship between ideas in a text | 2.7 | 24.7 | 56.9 | 15.7 | 2.85 | 255 |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(252)=1.113 P=.267 |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 2.89 | 191 | |
| 2 | 2.78 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,182)=.677 P=.567 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.91 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.95 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.78 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.78 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 9. recognizing the tone and purpose of the writer | 2.4 | 24.7 | 48.6 | 22.7 | 2.93 | 251 |
|---|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(248)=-1.154 P=.250 |
|---|------|-----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.90 | 188 | |
| 2 | 3.03 | 62 | |

one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,179)=.558 P=.643 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 3.00 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.87 | 46 | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 10.reading more outside the class independently to cope with a variety of reading material | 24.7 | 40.4 | 28.2 | 5.5 | 2.15 | 252 |
|--|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(249)=134 P=.894 |
|---|------|-----|----------------------|
| 1 | 2.14 | 188 | |
| 2 | 2.13 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,179)=2.571 *P=0.56 |
|---|------|----|---------------------------|
| 1 | 2.26 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.20 | 76 | |
| 4 | 1.96 | 45 | |
| 5 | 1.50 | 8 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 11.reading fluently | 11.8 | 42.4 | 35.3 | 10.2 | 2.44 | 254 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(251)=1.029 P=.304 |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 2.47 | 190 | |
| 2 | 2.35 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,181)=1.728 P=.163 |
|---|------|----|--------------------------|
| 1 | 2.60 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.54 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.31 | 45 | |
| 5 | 2.11 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|---------------------------------|------|------|-----|
| 12.finding out the underlying meaning in sentences or parts of a text | 3.9 | 25.9 | 55.7 | 13.7 | 2.80 | 253 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | t(250)=1.106 P=.270 | | | |
| 1 | 2.83 | 190 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.71 | 62 | | | | |
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | F(3,181)=.140 P=.936 | | | |
| 1 | 2.85 | 55 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.80 | 75 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.87 | 46 | | | | |
| 5 | 2.89 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 13.evaluating and analysing information from (multiple) texts in reading | 3.1 | 27.8 | 56.1 | 12.9 | 2.79 | 255 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(252)=-.652 P=.518 |
| 1 | 2.77 | 191 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|---------------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,182)=.362 P=.781 |
| 1 | 2.85 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.75 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.72 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.78 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 14.synthesizing and using information from (multiple) texts in writing | 6.3 | 27.1 | 51.4 | 14.5 | 2.75 | 253 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|-------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(250)=.047 P=.962 |
| 1 | 2.75 | 190 | |
| 2 | 2.74 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|----------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,181)=1.007 P=.391 |
| 1 | 2.76 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.59 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.78 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------|---------------------------------|-----|------|-----|
| 15.identifying main idea(s) in spoken discourse | 6.7 | 34.9 | 48.2 | 9.4 | 2.61 | 253 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(250)=-.290 P=.772 | | | |
| 1 | 2.60 | 189 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.63 | 63 | | | | |
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,180)=.380 P=.768 | | | |
| 1 | 2.51 | 55 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.64 | 75 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.64 | 45 | | | | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 16.initiating and maintaining discussions | 7.8 | 40.4 | 42.0 | 8.6 | 2.52 | 252 |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(249)=.454 P=.650 |
| 1 | 2.53 | 188 | |
| 2 | 2.48 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,179)=.435 P=.728 |
| 1 | 2.42 | 53 | |
| 2 | 2.53 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.58 | 45 | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------|---------------------------------|-----|------|-----|
| 17.listening for a specific purpose to choose relevant information. | 14.5 | 38.4 | 38.8 | 7.5 | 2.40 | 253 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(250)=.132 P=.895 | | | |
| 1 | 2.40 | 189 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.38 | 63 | | | | |
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,180)=.818 P=.485 | | | |
| 1 | 2.35 | 54 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.44 | 75 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.46 | 46 | | | | |
| 5 | 2.00 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 18.developing my vocabulary building strategies (guessing, using dictionaries etc...) | 6.7 | 31.8 | 41.2 | 20.4 | 2.75 | 255 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | $t(252)=-.275$ $P=.783$ |
|---|------|-----|----------------------------|
| 1 | 2.76 | 191 | |
| 2 | 2.73 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | $F(3,182)=.335$ $P=.800$ |
|---|------|----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 2.75 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.75 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.70 | 46 | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | |

Please use the space below to put your further comments and suggestions related to the objectives of ENG101

45 students answered this question. The majority of these students gave favourable answers. 12 students stated that the course was both interesting and useful and three students said the course brought about effective improvement. Some students (seven) required more reading texts and more emphasis on writing. Two students stated more listening practice was needed. On the other hand, five students complained that the course was not interesting enough. Furthermore, five students said they experienced no significant development in the target skills. Finally, three students found the texts too difficult, whereas only one student stated that the level of difficulty of both the texts and the tasks was appropriate.

Summary

As regards the ENG 101 “**Objectives**” section of the questionnaire, all the student perceptions were close to ‘moderately’, which may lead to a conclusion that the students had favorable perceptions related to their achievement of the course objectives. Only in the following objectives; “extensive reading”, “reading fluently”, “initiating and maintaining discussions” and “listening for a specific purpose”, students were not satisfied enough with their improvement. Moreover, the significant difference across the DBE start level with respect to the “extensive reading” objective indicates that the Beginners had a comparatively higher perception.

B- METHODS AND MATERIALS

P E R C E N T A G E

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | N |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 19. The teaching styles are suitable for different learning styles. | 4.7 | 25.5 | 59.6 | 8.2 | 2.73 | 250 |

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(247)=-.684 P=.495 |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 2.71 | 186 | |
| 2 | 2.78 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,178)=.713 P=.546 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.82 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.70 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.64 | 45 | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 20. There is a variety of interactional patterns (communication in the form of <u>teacher to students</u> , <u>student to student</u> and <u>student to teacher</u>) during the sessions. | 2.0 | 14.5 | 65.9 | 15.7 | 2.97 | 250 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(247)=-2.548 *P=.011 |
|---|------|-----|--------------------------|
| 1 | 2.91 | 187 | |
| 2 | 3.15 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,179)=.750 P=.524 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.93 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.97 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.80 | 45 | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|--|------|------|-----|
| 21. The learners are actively involved in the lessons. | 2.7 | 23.5 | 58.8 | 12.9 | 2.84 | 250 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | t(247)=-2.421 *P=.016 | | | |
| 1 | 2.78 | 188 | | | | |
| 2 | 3.02 | 61 | | | | |
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | F(3,180)=1.117 P=.344 | | | |
| 1 | 2.78 | 55 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.95 | 74 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.72 | 46 | | | | |
| 5 | 2.44 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 22. The texts in the textbook are useful to carry out the speaking and writing tasks. | 9.0 | 31.8 | 50.2 | 7.8 | 2.58 | 252 |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(249)=-.304 P=.761 |
| 1 | 2.57 | 188 | |
| 2 | 2.60 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,180)=1.257 P=.291 |
| 1 | 2.67 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.61 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.43 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.33 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 23. The texts in the book are interesting and motivating. | 15.7 | 42.7 | 34.1 | 6.3 | 2.31 | 252 |
|---|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|-----------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(249)=.148 P=.883 |
| 1 | 2.32 | 188 | |
| 2 | 2.30 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,180)=.153 P=.928 |
| 1 | 2.35 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.28 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.38 | 45 | |
| 5 | 2.33 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 24. The learning experiences and tasks in the textbook are relevant to the needs of the students. | 9.4 | 35.3 | 50.2 | 3.9 | 2.49 | 252 |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(249)=-.377 P=.706 |
| 1 | 2.48 | 188 | |
| 2 | 2.52 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,180)=1.342 P=.262 |
| 1 | 2.58 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.51 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.35 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.22 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 25. The tasks in the textbook are challenging enough; they contribute to students' development or growth in different language skills . | 5.1 | 35.3 | 50.2 | 7.1 | 2.61 | 249 |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(246)=-.967 P=.335 |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 2.58 | 185 | |
| 2 | 2.68 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,177)=.919 P=.433 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.60 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.61 | 71 | |
| 4 | 2.63 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.22 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 26. The tasks in the textbook are interesting and motivating. | 17.3 | 40.4 | 38.0 | 2.7 | 2.27 | 251 |
|---|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(248)=-.072 P=.943 |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 2.27 | 188 | |
| 2 | 2.27 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,180)=.964 P=.411 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.22 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.37 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.13 | 45 | |
| 5 | 2.22 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------|------|-----|
| 27.The tasks in the textbook are repetitive and quite mechanical. | 5.5 | 35.7 | 45.1 | 10.6 | 2.63 | 247 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(244)=.791 P=.430 | | | |
| 1 | 2.65 | 184 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.56 | 62 | | | | |
| one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,176)=.634 P=.594 | | | |
| 1 | 2.55 | 55 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.71 | 72 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.73 | 44 | | | | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 28. Lessons are done using different equipment and tools, like the OHP, pictures, tape recorders, etc. | 7.1 | 29.8 | 49.4 | 12.2 | 2.68 | 251 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|--------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(248)=-1.902 *P=.058 |
| 1 | 2.63 | 187 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 63 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|-------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,179)=.406 P=.749 |
| 1 | 2.71 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.57 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.58 | 45 | |
| 5 | 2.67 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 29. The themes are meaningfully ordered. | 3.5 | 18.4 | 67.5 | 8.2 | 2.82 | 249 |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(246)=-.648 P=.518 |
| 1 | 2.81 | 186 | |
| 2 | 2.87 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|--------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,178)=1.697 P=.169 |
| 1 | 2.87 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.82 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.66 | 44 | |
| 5 | 3.11 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 30. Reading and studying on the same theme for a period of time was helpful. | 7.1 | 22.4 | 60.4 | 9.0 | 2.72 | 252 |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(249)=-.210 P=.834 |
| 1 | 2.72 | 189 | |
| 2 | 2.74 | 62 | |

one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,181)=.207 P=.892 |
| 1 | 2.75 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.72 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.70 | 46 | |
| 5 | 2.89 | 9 | |

31. Please explain your reasons for your answers to question 27.

49 students responded to this question. Half of the responses (24) were complaints about the two topics ‘Brain’ and ‘Intelligence’ in the first theme. The reason for this was that they were already dealt with in DBE, so these students found these topics boring and repetitive. Next, six students found the vocabulary task ‘guessing meaning from context’ repetitive and not much useful. Three students found the the number of comprehension questions too many and one student said the reading skills were too much emphasised. One student said speaking in the form of discussion activities was not emphasised enough. One student stressed there was too much paragraph writing. On the other hand, 16 students stated that the course included useful repetition (recycling) which was relevant and meaningful in the development of skills and which was good practice for exams.

32. Please write in the space provided below what subjects you would like to read about in ENG101.

94 students answered this question. In addition to the 24 students who complained about some of the topics of the first theme, three more students complained about the same topics here. Below is a list of the topics from the most popular to the least:

Popular Events/Culture (18) – Astrology/Business/Social Issues/Traveling

Science (21) – Biology/Medicine/Astronomy/Innovations/Robots/Technology

Art (15) - Music, Cinema, Fashion

Social Sciences (19) – Psychology/ International Relations/ World History/Politics/ Turkish Culture/Literature

Sports (8)

33. Please read the list of teaching methods below and indicate how much you like (or find useful) each for the ENG 101 course by putting a tick (✓) in the relevant box.

Use this scale:

1=not at all

2=little

3=moderately

4=very much/completely

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | <u>N</u> |
| a. Lecturing | 9.0 | 30.6 | 38.8 | 16.9 | 2.67 | 243 |

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(241)=.281 P=.779 |
| 1 | 2.68 | 182 | |
| 2 | 2.64 | 61 | |
| | | | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,174)=.368 P=.776 |
| 1 | 2.72 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.71 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.57 | 42 | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|---------------------------------|------|------|-----|
| b. Discussion | 3.5 | 23.9 | 41.2 | 28.2 | 2.97 | 247 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | t(245)=-1.198 P=.232 | | | |
| 1 | 2.94 | 185 | | | | |
| 2 | 3.08 | 62 | | | | |
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | F(3,176)=.850 P=.468 | | | |
| 1 | 2.94 | 54 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.81 | 75 | | | | |
| 4 | 3.05 | 42 | | | | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----|
| c. Individual or group work | 6.3 | 21.6 | 42.0 | 26.7 | 2.92 | 246 |
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(244)=-1.487 P=.138 | | | |
| 1 | 2.88 | 184 | | | | |
| 2 | 3.06 | 62 | | | | |
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | | | | |
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,175)=1.065 P=.365 | | | |
| 1 | 2.94 | 54 | | | | |
| 2 | 2.82 | 74 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.95 | 42 | | | | |
| 5 | 2.44 | 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| d. Conferencing (one-to-one feedback and guidance) | 6.7 | 28.2 | 42.4 | 17.6 | 2.75 | 242 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(240)=-.461 P=.646 |
| 1 | 2.73 | 180 | |
| 2 | 2.79 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,171)=.300 P=.826 |
| 1 | 2.81 | 52 | |
| 2 | 2.71 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.67 | 42 | |
| 5 | 2.63 | 8 | |

Please use the space below to put your further comments and relevant suggestions for the methods and materials in the ENG 101.

20 students responded to this item. The most frequent responses were related to the assignments and the writing tasks. These students complained that they had to do too much homework and there was too much emphasis on writing. One student suggested they needed

sample essays before starting to write. Another student emphasized organized/structured feedback sessions were needed. Four students suggested more speaking was needed. Three students suggested more listening practice (in the form of listening to lectures and note-taking) should be included. Some suggested translation tasks could be included in the program.

Summary

With respect to the “**Methods and Materials**” section of the questionnaire, all the student perceptions were close to ‘moderately’, which may lead to a conclusion that the students had favorable perceptions related to the teaching methods and materials used in the course. Student views concerning “the interest value of the texts and tasks in the book” and “the relevance of learning tasks and experiences” seemed to be below moderately. The students didn’t find the texts, tasks and learning experiences relevant and interesting enough in general. It was noteworthy to find that the students who were exempt from the DBE had higher mean scores than those who did study at the DBE in general. The mean differences between these two groups were significant especially in items related to the “classroom interactional processes” and “student involvement in the lessons”. More specifically, the non-DBE students were more active in and content with these processes.

C- EVALUATION PROCEDURES

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | N |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 34. The classwork assessment procedures (paragraph writing, swap-shop, etc.) are relevant to each other. | 2.0 | 10.6 | 69.4 | 16.5 | 3.02 | 251 |

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | Mean | N | t(248)=-1.861 P=.064 |
|---|------|-----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2.98 | 188 | |
| 2 | 3.15 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | Mean | N | F(3,179)=.853 P=.467 |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| 1 | 3.09 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.92 | 76 | |
| 4 | 2.95 | 43 | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 35. The classwork assessment procedures effectively assess our development process. | 3.5 | 25.5 | 61.2 | 7.5 | 2.74 | 249 |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|--------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(246)=-2.755 *P=.006 |
| 1 | 2.68 | 186 | |
| 2 | 2.94 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|-------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,177)=.687 P=.561 |
| 1 | 2.75 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.70 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.56 | 43 | |
| 5 | 2.67 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|----|-----|------|-----|
| 36. Assessment is based on rigid standards, which limits creative writing and expression of individual perceptions. | 4.7 | 34.5 | 51 | 6.3 | 2.61 | 246 |
|---|-----|------|----|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(243)=3.277 *P=.001 |
| 1 | 2.69 | 183 | |
| 2 | 2.37 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,174)=.632 P=.595 |
| 1 | 2.70 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.63 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.76 | 42 | |
| 5 | 2.89 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 37. The assessment criteria are relevant and meaningful. | 3.9 | 22.7 | 63.1 | 8.2 | 2.77 | 250 |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(247)=-.212 P=.832 |
| 1 | 2.77 | 187 | |
| 2 | 2.79 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|-------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,178)=.718 P=.542 |
| 1 | 2.80 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.76 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.67 | 43 | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 38. The students are provided with information about the assessment criteria. | 2.0 | 19.2 | 66.7 | 9.0 | 2.85 | 247 |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|--------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(244)=-2.258 *P=.025 |
| 1 | 2.80 | 184 | |
| 2 | 3.00 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,175)=.136 P=.939 |
| 1 | 2.81 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.81 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.76 | 42 | |
| 5 | 2.89 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 39. There is a meaningful link between the assessments and the course content. | 3.9 | 19.2 | 62.7 | 12.2 | 2.85 | 250 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|-----------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(247)=.170 P=.865 |
| 1 | 2.86 | 187 | |
| 2 | 2.84 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,178)=.392 P=.759 |
| 1 | 2.93 | 55 | |
| 2 | 2.85 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.81 | 43 | |
| 5 | 3.00 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 40. The grade I received after the assessment was realistic. | 5.5 | 19.2 | 60.0 | 11.0 | 2.80 | 244 |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(241)=-.607 P=.544 |
| 1 | 2.78 | 184 | |
| 2 | 2.85 | 59 | |

one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|--------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,175)=2.024 P=.112 |
| 1 | 2.76 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.71 | 73 | |
| 4 | 3.00 | 43 | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------|--|------|------|-----|--|-------------|----------|--|--|--|--|---|------|-----|--|--|--|--|---|------|----|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|------|----|--|--|--|--|---|------|----|--|--|--|--|---|------|----|--|--|--|--|---|------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 41. The students' <u>development</u> in process writing (reflective essay & reaction-response essay) is effectively assessed | 4.7 | 21.6 | 56.9 | 12.5 | 2.81 | 244 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>Mean</td><td>N</td><td colspan="4">t(241)=-2.176 *P=.031</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2.75</td><td>184</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>2.98</td><td>59</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr> </table> <p>one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>Mean</td><td>N</td><td colspan="4">F(3,175)=.912 P=.436</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2.79</td><td>53</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>2.81</td><td>74</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>2.63</td><td>43</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>2.56</td><td>9</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr> </table> | | | | | | | | Mean | N | t(241)=-2.176 *P=.031 | | | | 1 | 2.75 | 184 | | | | | 2 | 2.98 | 59 | | | | | | Mean | N | F(3,175)=.912 P=.436 | | | | 1 | 2.79 | 53 | | | | | 2 | 2.81 | 74 | | | | | 4 | 2.63 | 43 | | | | | 5 | 2.56 | 9 | | | | |
| | Mean | N | t(241)=-2.176 *P=.031 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2.75 | 184 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.98 | 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mean | N | F(3,175)=.912 P=.436 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2.79 | 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.81 | 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 2.63 | 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Please use the space below to put your further comments and suggestions for the evaluation procedures in ENG 101 (You can also refer to the assignments, the reflection sheets and the Midterm examinations).

24 students answered this question. The most frequent response (10) was related to the Reflection Sheets. The complaints were that they were too many in number and that they were not useful enough (repetitive). Furthermore, the students suggested that the Reflection Sheets should have less weight within the overall course grade and they should include more personalisation than the reorganisation of previously written paragraphs. More specifically, the students propose that the Reflection Sheets should require more creativity and extension of ideas.

42. Do you believe time devoted to this course (4 hours a week) is OK? If not, how many hours should it be?

105 students responded to the question. 81 students are happy with four hours a week. 15 students suggested it should be 3 hours a week. 14 students said 2 hours a week would be satisfying. Two students wanted 6 hours a week. Another two students wanted 8 hours a week.

Summary

In the “**Evaluation Procedures**” section of the questionnaire, again the student perceptions in general, except for a few items were favourable. Similar to the case in “**Methods and Materials**” section, the students who were exempt from the DBE had higher mean scores than those who did study at the DBE in general. Specifically, related to the items “the effectiveness of the classwork assessment procedures”, “limitation of creativity and individuality in writing”, “being informed about the assessment criteria” and “assessment of the development in process writing” students who were exempt from the DBE had significantly higher mean scores than those who did study at the DBE; therefore, these students had comparatively more positive perceptions regarding the evaluation procedures of the course.

D- ATTITUDE

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | N |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| 43. What I learn in this course will be very useful for me later. | 11.8 | 22.0 | 51.8 | 12.2 | 2.66 | 249 |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|----------|---------------------------------|
| a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE) | | | |
| | Mean | N | t(246)=-1.212 P=.227 |
| 1 | 2.62 | 186 | |
| 2 | 2.77 | 62 | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|---------------------------------|
| b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.) | | | |
| | Mean | N | F(3,177)=.042 P=.988 |
| 1 | 2.65 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.61 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.60 | 43 | |
| 5 | 2.56 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 44. Success in this course is dependent on hard work; If one works hard, s/he will be successful. | 16.1 | 36.9 | 33.3 | 11.4 | 2.41 | 249 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(246)=2.682 *P=.008 |
| 1 | 2.49 | 186 | |
| 2 | 2.15 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----------|--|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,177)=1.502 P=.216 |
| 1 | 2.61 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.47 | 75 | |
| 4 | 2.40 | 43 | |
| 5 | 2.00 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 45. What we learn and do in this course is enjoyable. | 13.7 | 40.8 | 37.6 | 5.1 | 2.35 | 248 |
|---|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|--------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(245)=-1.715 *P=.088 |
| 1 | 2.30 | 185 | |
| 2 | 2.50 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|-------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,176)=.104 P=.957 |
| 1 | 2.28 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.34 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.28 | 43 | |
| 5 | 2.22 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 46. This course has motivated me to develop my language skills in English. | 9.4 | 33.3 | 50.6 | 3.9 | 2.50 | 248 |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|------|-----|---------------------------------|
| | Mean | N | t(245)=-1.596 P=.112 |
| 1 | 2.46 | 185 | |
| 2 | 2.63 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|------|----|----------------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,176)=1.506 P=.215 |
| 1 | 2.46 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.55 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.25 | 44 | |
| 5 | 2.44 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 47. The process approach in this course has relieved my anxiety in writing essays. | 9.8 | 31.0 | 49.0 | 6.3 | 2.54 | 245 |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | t(242)=-.881 P=.379 |
| 1 | 2.52 | 184 | |
| 2 | 2.62 | 60 | |

one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | Mean | <u>N</u> | F(3,175)=1.379 P=.266 |
| 1 | 2.59 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.58 | 73 | |
| 4 | 2.33 | 43 | |
| 5 | 2.33 | 9 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 48. The speaking tasks and activities in this course have provided me with more self-confidence in speaking. | 11.4 | 31.4 | 46.7 | 8.2 | 2.53 | 249 |
|--|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|

a) t-test for question 2 (1=studied at DBE; 2=did not study at DBE)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|--|
| | Mean | N | t(246)=-2.424 *P=.016 |
| 1 | 2.46 | 186 | |
| 2 | 2.74 | 62 | |

b) one-way-ANOVA for question 3 (1=beginner; 2=elementary; 3=pre-intermediate; 4=intermediate; 5=upper-int.)

| | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| | Mean | N | F(3,177)=.123 P=.947 |
| 1 | 2.50 | 54 | |
| 2 | 2.45 | 74 | |
| 4 | 2.48 | 44 | |
| 5 | 2.33 | 9 | |

Please use the space below to put your further comments about how you feel in this course and suggest any solutions to overcome the difficulties.

11 students responded to the question but only four of them proposed solutions. These students thought that the amount of homework should be less. The other responses to this question were typically: “I don’t like English”, “I don’t feel good in this course” or “I like the course”.

Summary

In the “**Evaluation Procedures**” section of the questionnaire, similar to the findings in the other sections, the non-DBE students had a more favourable attitude in general. For the item “expectation of success in relation to hard work/effort”, however, the students from the DBE had a higher mean score than the other group; they believed success was dependent on hard work to a higher extent. However, the general understanding among all the students was that there is almost no correlation between hard work and success. Similarly, the general perception among the students was that the course was not enjoyable enough. Finally, the non-DBE students were significantly more positive about the contribution of the course to their self-confidence in speaking.

3.2 The Results of the Instructors' Questionnaire

(* the 'p' values under .05 indicate statistically significant differences between the means)

To what extent has ENG101 course been effective in helping students....

A- OBJECTIVES

PERCENTAGE

| | 1=not at all | 2=little | 3=moder. | 4=comp. | Mean | N |
|---|-----------------|----------|----------|---------|------|----|
| 1. use correct, appropriate language structures, vocabulary and discourse markers in writing | 4.8 | 33.3 | 61.9 | - | 2.57 | 21 |
| 2. internalize and carry out the stages in a process writing approach, while writing paragraphs and/or essays | - | 42.9 | 42.9 | 14.3 | 2.71 | 21 |
| 3. understand the key/main ideas in a text | 4.8 | 14.3 | 52.4 | 28.6 | 3.05 | 21 |
| 4. recognize the relationship between ideas in a text | - | 9.5 | 76.2 | 14.3 | 3.05 | 21 |
| 5. recognize the tone and purpose of the writer | - | 9.5 | 28.6 | 61.9 | 3.52 | 21 |
| 6. read extensively | 9.5 | 38.1 | 42.9 | 9.5 | 2.52 | 21 |
| 7. read with reasonable fluency | - | 23.8 | 66.7 | 9.5 | 2.86 | 21 |
| 8. deduce the underlying meaning in sentences or parts of a text | - | 38.1 | 57.1 | 4.8 | 2.66 | 21 |
| 9. evaluate analyze information in (multiple) reading texts | - | 15 | 70 | 15 | 3.00 | 20 |
| 10. synthesize and use information in (multiple) texts in writing | - | 23.8 | 57.1 | 19 | 2.95 | 21 |
| 11. listen for a specific purpose to choose relevant information | - | 38.1 | 47.6 | 14.3 | 2.76 | 21 |
| 12. initiate and maintain discussions | 4.8 | 42.9 | 38.1 | 14.3 | 2.62 | 21 |
| 13. identify main idea(s) in spoken discourse | - | 50 | 45 | 5 | 2.55 | 20 |
| 14. develop students' vocabulary building strategies | - | 33.3 | 57.1 | 9.5 | 2.76 | 21 |

Please use the space below to put your further comments and suggestions related to the objectives of ENG101.

In terms of objectives, of the four instructors, three instructors stated that there was too much writing. One said that the excessive number of students was an obstacle to reach the goals and objectives. One suggested using some extensive reading activities such as reading books at home and evaluating performance according to an honor system.

Please use the scale below to indicate your perceptions/opinions related to the teaching methods and materials used in ENG101 course. Put a tick (✓) in the response which best illustrates your opinion.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4= Strongly Agree

B- Methods and Materials

| | 1=SD | 2=D | 3=A | 4=SA | Mean | <u>N</u> |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|----------|
| 15. The syllabus and specific guidelines bear sufficient information about suggested teaching methods and strategies. | - | 9.5 | 57.1 | 33.3 | 3.24 | 21 |
| 16. The teaching methods suggested in the syllabus effectively address different learning styles. | 5 | 15 | 65 | 15 | 2.90 | 20 |
| 17. Teacher's discretion related to teaching methods and strategies is supported in the present curriculum. | - | 30 | 50 | 20 | 2.90 | 20 |
| 18. The present curriculum is too rigid to implement a variety of teaching methods and strategies. | 19 | 66.7 | 14.3 | - | 1.95 | 21 |
| 19. The present curriculum supports the prevalence of a variety of interactional patterns in the teaching-learning process. | - | 4.8 | 81 | 14.3 | 3.10 | 21 |
| 20. The curriculum mainly fosters learner-centered instruction. | | 10 | 75 | 15 | 3.05 | 20 |
| 21. Theme-based approach was effective in providing a meaningful context for learning and production. | 4.8 | 9.5 | 52.4 | 33.3 | 3.14 | 21 |
| 22. The tasks in the textbook are challenging enough to bring about desired personal and intellectual growth. | - | 14.3 | 81 | 4.8 | 2.90 | 21 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|-----|------|----|
| 23. The learning experiences and the tasks in the textbook are relevant to the needs of the students. | - | 30 | 60 | 10 | 2.80 | 20 |
| 24. The tasks in the textbook are interesting and motivating. | - | 23.8 | 66.7 | 9.5 | 2.86 | 21 |
| 25. The texts and tasks in the textbook are of desired quality (authentic, meaningful, and well-graded). | - | 19 | 61.9 | 19 | 3.00 | 21 |
| 26. The tasks in the textbook are repetitive and quite mechanical. | 36.8 | 52.6 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 1.78 | 19 |
| 27. The support skills (reading, listening, and speaking) are effectively integrated into the writing component (horizontal organization) to bring about holistic and meaningful learning. | - | 38.1 | 52.4 | 9.5 | 2.71 | 21 |

Please use the space below to put your further comments and suggestions related to the methods and materials used in the ENG 101.

In terms of methods and materials, of the five instructors, one said that there were too many Reflection Sheets; and reflective essays should require more creativity. One stated that the language in the first two texts was easier than that of the rest of the book. It should be more difficult right from the beginning. One said that integration of skills added variety but couldn't be dealt with at length so as to help students.

28. Please read the list of teaching methods below and indicate their desired and current implementation in the ENG 101 course by putting a tick (✓) in the relevant box. Use this scale:

1=not at all 2=little 3=somewhat 4=very much/completely

| | 1- CURRENT Mean | 2- DESIRED Mean |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| a. Lecturing | 2.55 | 2.25 |
| b. Discussion | 2.71 | 3.70 |
| c. Individual or group projects | 2.76 | 3.40 |
| d. Conferencing | 1.80 | 2.72 |

Paired-t-test for question 28:

- a) $t(19)=2.042$ * $p=.055$
- b) $t(19)=-5.146$ * $p=.000$
- c) $t(19)=-4.333$ * $p=.000$
- d) $t(17)=-5.575$ * $p=.000$

*** the 'p' values under .05 indicate statistically significant differences between the means**

29. Comment on the length, level and quality of the following:

- Reading texts
- Listening material (texts and recordings)

As regards the reading texts, of the 26 instructors who answered the questions, six stated that they were successful; three thought they were of appropriate level; three believed that the third theme was interesting; seven stated that some texts were too long. Two thought that the length was fine but one believed that balance in terms of length was needed. Three said that some texts were boring and one stated that there should be a wider variety. As for the listening texts, of the 19, six stated that they were not authentic or natural. One said that they were integrated and meaningful. Six found them successful. However, two believed that they were too long; one believed that the book needed better listening texts. Another one found the quality poor. Two thought listening practice was not enough.

C. Evaluation Procedures

| | 1= SD | 2=D | 3=A | 4=SA | Mean | <u>N</u> |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 30. The class-work assessment procedures are meaningfully ordered. | 10.5 | 21.1 | 57.9 | 10.5 | 2.68 | 19 |
| 31. The students' development in process writing is effectively assessed. | 5 | 50 | 45 | - | 2.40 | 20 |
| 32. Assessment is based on rigid standards which impede creative writing and expression of individual perceptions. | 5 | 50 | 40 | 5 | 2.45 | 20 |
| 33. The assessment criteria are relevant and meaningful. | - | 23.8 | 71.4 | 4.8 | 2.81 | 21 |
| 34. There is a meaningful link between the assessments and the rationale of the course. | 4.8 | 23.8 | 66.7 | 4.8 | 2.71 | 21 |

Please use the space below to put your further comments and suggestions related to the evaluation procedures in the ENG 101.

Regarding the evaluation procedures, of the 12 instructors, four stated that there were too many Reflection Sheets and paragraphs. Four instructors thought that grading everything was not good. Two said that there was too much writing. One believed that more grades should be allotted for swap-shops. Another one said that grade allocation needed re-adjustment.

39. Please comment on the effectiveness of the procedures suggested to prevent plagiarism in this course.

As for plagiarism, of the 16, seven thought using reflection sheets was a good method because they include personalization. Five believed that plagiarism was successfully prevented. Two stated that because of overload, there was plagiarism. One thought it was difficult to prevent this problem since students could find texts on the net. One stated that they were not effective.

40. Does the time allocated for the tasks and activities in the syllabus match with the actual classroom implementation?

Considering the time match, of the 18, six instructors said it was fine. Six said that more time was needed especially for tasks, group work and discussions. Four believed that the pace was too fast for students to follow. One thought due to the course being overloaded and demanding, time was not enough.

Summary

In terms of the **Objectives** and **Methods/Materials** of the course, the instructors believe that the ENG 101 course was effective in helping students improve their language skills. They think that the teaching methods and materials used were suitable and effective, overall. Besides, the t-test results related to the difference between the current and desired implementation of the teaching methods reveal that the instructors desire significantly more discussion, individual or group projects and conferencing, but less lecturing.

With respect to the **Evaluation Procedures** used in the course, the only item that the instructors were not positive about was the effective assessment of students' development in process writing. The instructors did not agree that this aim was achieved satisfactorily. On the other hand, the students had more favorable perceptions for the same item. Finally, in general the instructors agreed on the effectiveness of all the evaluation procedures in the course.

3.3 The Results of the Interviews with the Instructors

Q.1 What do you think the rationale of the new curriculum is?

The responses to this question can be summarized as:

It provides a flow between the two departments and thus bridges the gap between the DBE and the MLD programs.

Q.2 How do you feel about the match between the ENG 101 course in implementation and the rationale of the new curriculum? Why? You may refer to the:

- * goals and objectives**
- * the tasks in the textbook**
- * the evaluation tools**

[The rationale of the new MLD curriculum includes focus on “process approach”, “integrated skills”, “autonomous learning”, and “theme-based approach”]

The responses can be categorized as:

Process approach:

Of the eight instructors interviewed, one said the process approach worked well, whereas the others said it did not. The reasons stated for this were lack of time for the essays and too much paragraph writing.

Integrated skills:

[The responses to this question proved to be contradictory, and the researchers had difficulty in coding and interpreting the responses.]

Three teachers said integration of skills worked well through the process. Two instructors said there should be more emphasis on reading and writing as reading is done as a transition to writing. It is thought that writing was more emphasized than speaking, in terms of production skills and that the book did not encourage speaking. Teachers think that this skill should be practiced in a more organized way.

Almost all the instructors said that there was variety in the book in terms of the texts and tasks. There was good transition across the themes and units. They also believe that listening added variety to the course. However, teachers stated that there should be better transition between the paragraph and essay input. They think that there are too many reading materials. In addition, they don't believe that there was process writing or speaking throughout the course.

Theme based approach:

Half of the informants stated that the theme based approach was effective.

Evaluation:

Teachers said that in the exams there was no vocabulary section, no dictionary use and no listening component although these were dealt with in the course. Moreover, they stated that exam questions needed to be in accordance with the question types in the book.

Two instructors found the exams effective. Some said the midterms should be more “product-oriented” and that they should have more essay type/open-ended questions. Two instructors stated that thesis statement writing was not taught, but required in the exam.

The majority of the informants stated that the “Going Beyond the Text” section in the book was redundant in terms of writing.

3. Do you believe the students improved their linguistic skills by this new program?

Which ones? To what extent? Why? Why not?

Vocabulary:

Two teachers complained that there was no vocabulary “teaching”, but just “guessing.” Some items for guessing were not well chosen. In some cases there were not enough clues for guessing, and in some others high-frequency words were not chosen. But in general vocabulary improvement was satisfactory.

Language use:

The general idea was that there should be more grammar emphasis - not in the form of explicit teaching/input but awareness-wise. In general, we can’t speak about language improvement because the skills and knowledge that students bring with themselves are very low and there is no room for development anyway because there is not enough time. One instructor said 1/4 hours should be allotted to explicit language teaching, but others emphasized we shouldn’t be doing grammar work; that was not our focus anyway. More paraphrasing activities were needed.

Reading:

More strategies for reading; e.g., finding main ideas, were needed. The texts put in the appendices for students to practice extensive reading did not really serve their purpose because they did not involve students in research. One instructor said finding relationships between ideas; e.g., main and supporting ideas, worked well. Yet, thorough strategy training in class was needed, especially for fluency.

Writing:

Time limitations and the skills and knowledge that students bring with themselves were the major problems in dealing with this skill. Summarizing was not structured effectively; again paraphrasing was not effectively dealt with. Essays and reflection sheets (paragraph writing) were too loaded.

Overall, it could be said that effective improvement in four language skills was observed.

4. Which non-linguistic skills do you believe have been improved by the course?

How? (*Learner Autonomy, Critical Thinking, Motivation & Team-Work*)

Critical thinking:

There were enough discussion questions, but the effectiveness of these was very much dependent on students. This skill was difficult to improve in one semester anyway; but there was good emphasis with the types of questions and tasks, in the form of debates and discussion, in the textbook. However, overall, Theme 1 did not foster critical thinking. The emphasis on this skill should start right from the beginning. Critical thinking was emphasized through essays, paragraphs, debates, discussions and workshops.

Team-work:

The improvement of this skill depends on individual teachers. However, the syllabus lends itself to the improvement of team-work among students with its tasks and requirements. There was good emphasis on team-work.

Motivation:

The instructors said this non-linguistic skill was student-dependent. Again the first Theme posed some problems. Circling round the same topics, in this theme, might cause lack of motivation on both students' and instructors' part.

Overall, comparatively student motivation was higher this year.

Learner autonomy:

Overall, the syllabus lends itself to learner autonomy.

Finally, all the informants emphasized that improvement in non-linguistic skills was very much dependent on instructor abilities and attitudes. There was significant variety among the instructors in this.

5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the text-book? Specifically refer to:

- a) The variety (themes/topics, skills, tasks, assignments)***
- b) The transition/link within the themes and across the themes***
- c) Contribution to students' thinking process***
- d) Integration of language skills***
- e) Interest value for both the students and teachers***

f) Other

*** Did you use the textbook as it is? Or did you have to omit, supplement or revise certain parts like *texts, input, skills or tasks* in it? Which ones? Why?**

a) Some instructors said that Eng 101 has become an Eng 102 course. One instructor said the textbook needs more variety, especially in the first theme. One solution could be combining Theme 1 and Theme 2 into one. There is repetition of the same topics as the DBE reading materials also focused on the same topics. Students complained about this. We should reduce its load, and extend the last theme. The topic “brain” was not interesting, anyway. Furthermore, reference questions and vocabulary were a bit loaded.

Most of the informants commented that it was a good approach not to give structures (in essay input)/formulas/mechanical expressions. In this way, there was room for original work, interesting texts and effective personalization in tasks.

Variety in tasks and assignments was satisfactory except for the writing assignments. One teacher said comprehension questions were above the students’ level. Paragraph input was necessary; there was a quick jump to essay writing. Students needed more practice on how to write thesis statements and an introduction. Texts were loaded with reference and vocabulary tasks. There was not much balance between questions. The tasks were enjoyable but a bit mechanical.

The reflection sheets were problematic – too loaded, too repetitive. More research tasks should be integrated instead of such activities.

b) The informants stated there were no problems in terms of transition; there was good transition across the themes, units and tasks. There should be more emphasis on argumentation and “reaction” throughout.

c) As regards contribution to the thinking process, Theme 1 was not effective, but Themes 2 and 3 were. The integration of skills and tasks helped this.

d) The interest value of the course was a teacher and student dependent issue. Again, Theme 1 was not considered to be interesting enough; Themes 2 and 3 were. The layout of the textbook was attractive.

e) As for using the book as it is, some informants said that they designed and used their own comprehension questions and warm-up activities. They added their own input sessions. (Some others used vocabulary and references as homework.) Some omitted some of the “Going Beyond the Text” activities and “Reflection Sheets” and added input on Reaction and Response essay structure, as well as summarizing, writing the thesis statement, argumentation and grammar work. One instructor said she included some research questions.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The conclusions below were drawn in the light of the results obtained by all the research tools used. They are organised according to the related research questions:

Conclusions

1. How do the rationale and objectives of the ENG 101 course relate to the DML curriculum rationale and objectives?

-To what extent are the rationale and objectives of ENG 101 achieved?

-Do the students improve/maintain their linguistic and educational skills by the implementation of the program?

Considering the achievement of the objectives in the student questionnaire, most of the students agreed that the ENG 101 course improved them moderately in most aspects except for item number 10 “reading more outside the class independently to cope with a variety of reading material”, item number 11 “reading fluently” and item 17 “listening for a specific purpose to choose specific information”. These students believed that there was little improvement in those objectives. As regards the results of the t-test and ANOVA, there were no significant differences between the answers of the students who studied at DBE and who did not as well as the students who studied at different levels at DBE. The comments the students made regarding the goals and objectives of the course were in line with these findings. The students emphasized that there should be more reading texts and more listening practice. In terms of the students’ attitude towards the course, it was discovered that in general students found the course useful, motivating and effective in developing their language skills and improving their self-confidence in production skills. However, they disagreed with item 44 ‘Success in this course is dependent on hard work; if one works hard s/he will be

successful'. Moreover, almost half of them did not find the course enjoyable. As regards the t-test results for item 44 there was a significant difference between the two groups. The students who studied at DBE were significantly more positive in that the success in ENG 101 depended on effortful behaviour. For item 48, 'The speaking tasks and activities in this course have provided me with more self-confidence in speaking', the students who studied at DBE were less positive than the others.

With respect to the instructors' perceptions of the goals and objectives of the course, it was found that most of the instructors believed that the ENG 101 course was moderately effective in achieving the objectives stated in the curriculum.

Considering the interview results of the instructors, it was found that student improvement in vocabulary was not as effective as expected. Target vocabulary items were not well chosen. The instructors highlighted that students' improvement in language was again not effective as required and there should be more language emphasis and input awarenesswise. In terms of reading, similar to the findings stated above, the extensive reading objective was not achieved properly. The interview results considering the achievement of the non-linguistic goals revealed positive results.

2. Are the methods and materials used in ENG 101 effective in achieving the course rationale and objectives?

As regards the methods and materials used in the course, the findings from both the student and instructor questionnaires showed that the students perceived these aspects of the course effective in general except for the interest and motivation value of some texts (you may refer to Item 23 in the student questionnaire, in the results section). Furthermore, the results of the T-test and ANOVA indicated that no significant differences were created in perceptions according to (a) whether the students studied at DBE or not or (b) their level at DBE.

As regards the responses to the open-ended questions, the students commented that Theme 1 and Theme 2 were redundant both topic-wise and task-wise. In addition, Theme 1 (Brain) covered the same topics already dealt with at DBE. In terms of skills, students' responses turned out to be contradictory as some ask for more speaking and find reading too much, some others find such a recycling process useful.

On the other hand, the instructors' comments mainly focused on the problems related to (a) the reflection sheets and 'going beyond the text' sections, and (b) the difficulty level

across the texts in the book. More explicitly, the instructors complained that there were too many reflection sheets to deal with and these tasks did not lend themselves to student creativity. Furthermore, both the texts and the tasks should be more difficult right from the beginning. Critical thinking and reading strategies practice should start from the beginning. Next, the results of the T-test on the instructors' perceptions of the desired and current methods used revealed that there was a significant difference between the current and desired methods. More specifically, the instructors wanted less lecturing but more discussion, conferencing and individual or group projects.

The findings from the interviews with the instructors elaborated more on the strengths and the weaknesses of the textbook. The weaknesses mainly focused on insufficient variety in Theme 1 and 2 in terms of both topics and tasks; in other words, especially the first theme didn't have much interest value for the students, in line with the findings above.

3. To what extent do the ENG 101 student evaluation procedures and tools measure the skills and knowledge targeted in the objectives of ENG101?

Most of the students and the instructors agreed that the evaluation procedures and tools used in the ENG 101 course were successfully designed and used to measure the skills and knowledge targeted in the objectives. However, half of the students and also the instructors agreed with the statement that "Assessment is based on rigid standards, which limits creative writing and expression of individual perceptions." This particular result was strengthened by the complaints of the students regarding the 'Reflection Sheets' mentioned in the further comments and the suggestions section of this part. These students believed that the number of the Reflection Sheets was too many and they were repetitive, which was in line with the results related to the other aspects of the course. On the other hand, half of the instructors did not agree that "Students' development in process writing was effectively assessed."

Moreover, significant differences were observed between the responses of students who studied and who did not study at the DBE. For item 36, "Assessment is based on rigid standards, which limits creative writing and expression of individual perceptions" the students who studied at DBE had a significantly higher mean score than those who did not study at DBE. For item 38, "The students were provided with information about the assessment criteria" the students who studied at DBE had a significantly lower mean score than those who did not study at DBE. For item 41, "The students' development in process writing is

effectively assessed”, the students who studied at DBE had significantly lower mean scores than those who did not study at DBE. According to the results from the Instructor Interviews, some of the instructors believed that there was a mismatch between the content of the course and the content of the exams. A minority of them thought that exams were effective.

4. Is the curriculum on paper perceived and implemented in the same way by all instructors?

The interviews with the instructors revealed that the instructors were not sufficiently aware of the rationale of the course and the contents of the curriculum document. When asked about the new curriculum, their interpretation was that it aimed at bridging the gap between DML and DBE. That is why their answers were mainly related with the textbook. As far as the implementation was concerned, instructors used most of the book as it was, despite their complaints. However, they made some minor changes according to the needs of their students. These changes included modifying, eliminating and replacing some of the comprehension questions and warm-up activities as well as dealing with Reflection Sheets and Going Beyond the Text activities in different ways.

4.2 Suggestions:

- a) Theme 1 and Theme 2 could be compiled into one, leaving out the repetitive topics and tasks.
- b) The purposes, number and grading of the ‘Reflection Sheets’ and ‘Going Beyond the Text’ tasks could be revised for improvement. More creativity and personalization should be incorporated into these.
- c) Midterms should reflect more the content of the course, and should be more ‘product-oriented’ and essay type questions should be asked in the exams.
- d) The practice in non-linguistic skills was very much teacher dependent. So teachers can be guided and/or trained to enable students to achieve such objectives. Teacher training should also focus on vocabulary teaching skills and methods, as well as materials design for this purpose.
- e) More focus on argumentation and reaction is needed all throughout the course. Critical thinking skills should also be highlighted throughout the process, right from the beginning.

- f) Students could be assigned some outside reading tasks as homework and they could find those materials themselves in order to gain the habit of independent reading.
- g) To train students in fluent reading , teachers could time the reading activities in class and stick to the time limit.
- h) Teachers, depending on the need, could provide students with some extra language input and/or practice materials to compensate for the areas where students are weak or they could exploit the reading texts focusing on the language aspect.
- i) Teachers could spend some of the class time on vocabulary teaching and revising, as well as strategy training.
- j) For both summarizing and essay writing, more structured input and feedback should be integrated into the program.
- k) More listening practice should be included and the recording quality should be improved.
- l) More time should be allocated for speaking/discussion tasks.