CURRICULUM RENEWAL PROJECT (CRP)

FIRST CYCLE

EVALUATION REPORT

PREPARED BY:

Directorate of School of Foreign Languages

July, 2005

I. INTRODUCTION

As teaching English is quite a dynamic task, all institutions engaged in this activity should follow the latest methods, approaches and trends when planning their curricula. In deed, this was the impetus for the administration of DBE in 2003-2004 academic year to undertake a radical overhaul of the curriculum and related procedures in an effort to raise the performance of DBE students. This descriptive curriculum evaluation study was carried out so as to reveal the effects of the great change by one of the five SFL Curriculum Renewal Project teams.

The research team comprises two representative instructors from DBE- Ilknur Kuntasal and Tansu Topcu and three instructors from DML- Bunyamin Mengi, Nuvit Tarhan and Sahika Tarhan.

The report describes and evaluates the implementation of the theme-based curriculum in the 2003-2004 Academic Year to meet the goals and objectives of DBE students. The aim of the study was to find out the answers to the specific research questions below:

1. To what extent were the intended goals and objectives of the CRP (Curriculum Renewal Project) achieved at the Department of Basic English?
   1a. What do the teachers think that the goals of the CRP are?
   1b. To what extent were each linguistic goal and non-linguistic goals of the CRP achieved?"
2. To what extent do the students cope with the linguistic and educational demands of their departmental courses?
   2a. To what extent do the students cope with the linguistic demands of their departmentalcourses?
   2b. To what extent do the students cope with the educational demands of their departmental courses?
3. To what extent were the materials used as a part of CPR effective/useful?
4. To what extent were the methods employed as part of CRP effective?
5. To what extent were assessment procedures of CPR effective?
6. How was the CRP perceived by students and teachers at DBE?

2. METHOD
2.1Participants
2.1.1 Student sample of the questionnaire

Out of 231 participants who completed the student questionnaire, 61.9% (N=143) were male and 38.1(N=88) were female. Thirty-five departments were represented in the survey questionnaire. The table below shows the distribution of the participants by major field of study.

Table 1: *The Distribution of the Participants by Major Field of Study*

	Department	f	%
1	Public Administration	5	2,2
2	Aerospace Engineering	2	,9
3	Architecture	5	2,2
4	Business Administration	12	5,2
5	Biology	3	1,3
6	Computer Engineering	11	4,8
7	Computer Education & Instructional Technology	8	3,5
8	Computer Engineering	8	3,5
9	Chemical Engineering	6	2,6
10	Chemistry Education	6	2,6
11	Civil Engineering	5	2,2
12	City and Regional Planning	7	3,0
13	Early Childhood Education	4	1,7
14	Economics	5	2,2
15	Electrical Engineering	14	6,1
16	Elementary Education	6	2,6
17	Environmental Engineering	9	3,9
18	Elementary Science Education	8	3,5
19	Food Engineering	5	2,2

20	Geological Engineering	4	1,7
21	History	4	1,7
22	Industrial Design	3	1,3
23	Industrial Engineering	6	2,6
24	International Relations	10	4,3
25	Mathematics	6	2,6
26	Mechanical Engineering	17	7,4
27	Metalurgical & Materials Engineering	8	3,5
28	Mining Engineering	9	3,9
29	Petroleum Engineering	4	1,7
30	Physics Education	5	2,2
31	Philosophy	3	1,3
32	Physics	7	3,0
33	Psychology	4	1,7
34	Sociology	7	3,0
35	Statistics	5	2,2
	Total	231	100

The majority of 231 students who took the interview are majoring in a technical area (f= 171, 74.9 %) whereas only one fourth of them (f= 58, 25.1 %) are studying social sciences.

The proficiency level of the students varied according to the semester. The following tables illustrate the distribution of sample in the first and second semester in terms of level of proficiency. As can be seen, half of the sample was intermediate by the end of the second semester.

Table 2: *Students' Proficiency Level of 1st term*

	F	%
Beginner (BEG)	51	22,1
Elementary (ELEM)	96	41,6
Intermediate (INT)	74	32,0
Upper-intermediate (UINT)	10	4,3
Total	231	100,0

Table 3: *Students' Proficiency Level of 2nd term*

	F	%
Pre-intermediate (PIN)	60	26,3
Intermediate (INT)	114	50,0
Upper-intermediate (UINT)	54	23,7
Total	228	100,0
Missing	3	
	231	

2.1.2 Student Participants of the Focus Group Interview

The focus group interviews were made by nineteen freshman students who studied at DBE in year 2003-2004. The sampling was made purposefully with the help of ENG101 (English for Academic Purposes I teachers. For the representativeness of the sample, the group of proficiency level of students (pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper-intermediate) and their departments (social sciences and engineering/positive sciences) were taken into account when selecting students for the interview. Instead of the initially intended 20 students (4 per interview), the interviews were made with 19 students in total since one student did not arrive on the day of the interview. In each group there were one student from the PIN,

two students from IN and one from the UP groups. Five of these are majoring in a "social sciences" students at the departments of International Relations, Public Administration, Elementary Education, Management and History, and 13 of them are currently enrolled in variety of technical fields, namely, Computer Engineering, Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Civil Engineering, Geological Engineering, Mathematics, Statistics and Chemistry.

2. 1. 3 Teacher Participants

2. 1.3. 1 Teacher Participants of the Questionnaire
The profile of the teachers is as follows:
Out of 60 DBE teachers who completed the questionnaire, the experience of 20 (%50) fall between 11 and 20 years. As can be seen from the table below, 10 of them have a teaching experience above 20 years. These figures show that the majority of the teacher participants are quite experienced. The other table reports on the proficiency level that teachers taught the second semester of the program. The figures show that half of them (f= 30, 50 %) were teaching the lower level of proficiency.

Table 4: *Level of Teacher's Experience*

Experience (in years)	*f*	*%*
1-5	7	12,1
6-10	12	20,7
11-20	29	50,0
20 and up	10	17,2
Total	58	100,0

Table 5: *Proficiency Level That Teachers were Teaching (by 2nd term)*

Proficiency Level	*f*	*%*
Pre-intermediate	30	50,0
Intermediate	23	38,3
Upper intermediate	7	11,7

2. 1. 3. 2 Participants of the Teacher Interviews (Individual)

Thirteen teachers were interviewed to collect in-depth data about the CRP in 2003-2004. Six of them were teaching a PIN group, 4 IN group and 3 an UP group. Although the PIN is the smallest group, number of PIN interviewees was highest. This was because two teachers share one PIN group as their contact hours was 6 per week, whereas the contact hours with IN and UP groups are 4 hours per week and they have only one teacher.

2. 1.4 Administrators

In addition to the interviews with teachers, two administrators were interview to reflect the perspective of the curriculum developers and implementers. One of the interviewees was not a part of the official administrative staff, but she worked as the curriculum developer and materials writer prior to the implementation of the new program. The other interviewee was one of the members of the curriculum committee and was actively worked as an official administrator throughout 2003-4 Academic Year. She no more holds an administrative position. The former interviewee taught a regular intermediate class throughout the second semester whereas the latter shared a class with three other administrators during the year.

2. 2 Data Analysis
Quantitative data gathered via the survey questionnaire were computed and analyzed on the SPSS. The statistics mainly used were of descriptive nature, including frequencies, means, and comparison of means

such as one-way ANOVA and paired samples t-test. The majority of qualitative data were obtained through focus group interviews with students and individual interviews with teachers. All of the interviews were transcribed and analyzed using content analysis. In addition to interviews, some data from the "comments" section of the questionnaire –open-ended items- were analyzed and were categorized according to the research question they fit into.

3. LIMITATIONS

This study has some limitations: First of all, The CRP was implemented in academic year 2003-2004 but the data was began to be collected six months later than the CRP ended. This time lapse might have made it hard for students and teachers to recollect details as to the previous years' practices and also, the period of data collection took place in 2004-5, which coincided with the subsequent academic year. To minimize the reverse effects, in both media of data collection, in the interviews and questionnaires participants were constantly reminded that they were supposed to provide their responses taking the previous years into consideration (see the instruments in Appendix 1).

Another limitation is concerned with the number of teachers who took the survey questionnaire. Although the researchers intended to reach the entire population (196 teachers) who took part in the implementation of the CRP, only 60 teachers returned the survey questionnaire meant for them. And, as can be seen from Table 5, the 50% of teachers were teaching a pre-intermediate group last year whereas pre-intermediate students constitute only 22.1% of the student sample who took the questionnaire (Table 3) , and as reported by DBE administration, this reflects the entire student population; only one fourth of DBE students were pre-intermediate by the end of second term last year. Although, a comparative presentation of quantitative results can be found in the "results" section, this may not be totally reliable. Besides, the low number of teacher sample did not it possible for researchers to make further analyses to investigate whether quantitative data obtained from teachers varied in accordance with the proficiency group they were teaching. For this reason, in this respect, qualitative data from the interviews remain as the sole source of data that we can rely on and hence data could not been properly triangulated.

A third limitation is that despite available data on the level of proficiency teachers were teaching, only the second term was taken as a basis, for it was assumed that teachers would have experienced the whole program only by the end of the second term. However, some teachers who were teaching a pre-intermediate group in the first term could have been teaching an upper-intermediate group the second term. So, some of them may have seen part of the program offered to their group.

4. RESULTS

In this report, the results for each research question are presented in the following sequence:

1. Quantitative data - students (obtained from student questionnaires)
2. Quantitative data – teachers (obtained from teacher questionnaires)
3. Qualitative data - students (obtained from focus group interviews and open-ended questions of the questionnaire)
4. Qualitative data – teachers (obtained from individual interviews and grouped as data from PIN (pre-intermediate) teachers, IN (intermediate) teachers and UIN (upper-intermediate) teachers. Since both preliminary quantitative results as well as qualitative data from pilot interviews showed that responses varied widely in accordance with the proficiency group, the entirety of qualitative data has been reported in three chunks. PIN (Pre-intermediate), IN (intermediate) and UIN (Upper-intermediate). In addition, data from open-ended items of the questionnaire were used.
5. Qualitative data –administrators (obtained from individual interviews)

4. 1 Research Question 1: "**To what extent were the intended goals and objectives of the CRP (Curriculum Renewal Project) achieved at the Department of English**"?

Sub-question 1 **What do the teachers think that the goals of the CRP are?**

To answer the first sub-question DBE teachers were asked several questions in the interview. No quantitative data is available in this dimension.

Qualitative Data from Teacher Interviews
PIN
As an answer to this question, most of the PIN teachers stated that the goals and objectives of the new program were not different than before, and the only difference was that it was the first time a written curriculum was drawn up. One of the PIN teachers said that the aim was to increase more awareness and quality. Another reported that a new program was launched because the English Proficiency Exam (EPE) has changed. Another teacher stated that the new program aimed at developing language skills in a contextual way.

IN
Among the teachers of intermediate group the most frequent answer to the question was to "integrate all skills in teaching language". Except for one respondent, all of the teachers think that one of the basic motives to prepare a new program was "to have a written curriculum document and to apply a more structured syllabus in the classroom". One of the respondents, however, indicated that although it was not directly mentioned by the administrators, the objective of the program was to prepare the students for both the proficiency exam and their academic studies. Another said that the new program aimed at helping students to develop language skills through given contexts.

UIN
All the teachers of upper-intermediate group indicated that the basic motive of the new program was "to integrate all skills in teaching language to increase the quality of education at Department of Basic English". One of the respondents also said that to have a written curriculum document for the first time was as important as to increase the quality of education. Another stated that the new program aimed at increasing the students' thinking abilities.

As can be seen from teachers' responses IN and UIN teachers think that the goal of the CPR was "to integrate all skills in teaching language to increase the quality of education at Department of Basic English" and to have a written and structured syllabus for DBE education. The answers of PIN teachers were not uniformed, yet they mentioned concerns such as improving the quality, contextualizing teaching and formation of a written curriculum.

Administrators

Both of the administrators indicated that the main goal of the new program was to integrate all skills in teaching language, instead of teaching them as discrete items. They claimed that such an approach is more meaningful than the previous ones since the students see and perceive language as a whole in real life, learning it in the same way would increase their success in the following years. Both said that by having the reading passages in the center, all other language skills were tried to be taught gradually. One of the administrators claimed that linguistic goals of the new program were to make students acquire skills necessary for their first year courses and help them to understand how the language should be used meaningfully. They also said that having a program in harmony with the curriculum document prepared by the contribution of DBE teachers was another important motive to change the program. One of the administrators mentioned that one of the most important features of the new program was to have some non-linguistic goals indicated in the curriculum document such as teaching strategies, increasing students' awareness of their needs and study accordingly, and increasing their thinking abilities.

Sub-question 2: **"To what extent were each linguistic goal and non-linguistic goals of the CRP achieved?"** The linguistic goals were writing, reading, listening and speaking and non-linguistic goals refer to critical thinking skills, autonomous learning and increased interest and motivation.

<u>Quantitative Data</u>

The questionnaire included items on four linguistic goals; under each linguistic goal, there are number of items that represent CRP objectives. On the students' form, the questionnaire item that explores to what extent the objectives were achieved was: "How competent do you feel in English as a result of the instruction you received in DBE last year in the following language skills/areas?". The first series of skills were related to the *writing goal*. For example, in Table 6 below, all the sub-skills each of which represent a writing objective add up the writing goal. For each language skill/goal an additional variable has been formed by computing all the scores given to each item and averaging them. The results as to the achievement of linguistic goals, gathered from students and teachers respectively are presented below The results under these headings are presented below:

Writing :

Table 6: *Students' Perception of their Competence in the Writing Skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
12	Writing simple sentences	3.68	.47	0.4	99.5
13	Writing compound sentences	3.00	.64	19.7	80.3
14	Using correct and appropriate vocabulary	2.79	.59	27.4	72.6
15	Using appropriate discourse patterns (cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentation)	2.68	.64	36.4	63.7
16	Writing academic paragraphs with appropriate topic, supporting and concluding sentences	2.80	.63	27	73
17	Recognizing & evaluating the elements of a well-written introductory paragraph in an essay	2.83	.64	27.7	72.3
18	Writing thesis statements appropriate to cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentative essays	2.91	.66	24.7	75.3
19	Writing the body and conclusion paragraphs for cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentative essays	2.84	.54	23	77
20	Achieving cohesion in writing via referencing, maintaining focus and looking out for old/new information	2.78	.55	27.8	72.3
21	Achieving unity in writing through the use of appropriate signal words	2.85	.61	25.9	74.1
22	Using appropriate register in writing (formal / informal language)	2.59	.67	47	53

Table 7: *Teachers' Perception of their Competence in the writing skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
9	Writing simple sentences	2.88	.78	23.7	76.2
10	Writing compound sentences	2.25	.73	67.8	32.2
11	Using correct and appropriate vocabulary	2.39	.62	57.2	42.9
12	Using appropriate discourse patterns (cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentation)	2.42	.83	56	44.1
13	Writing academic paragraphs with appropriate topic, supporting and concluding sentences	2.35	.82	62.7	37.3
14	Recognizing & evaluating the elements of a well-written introductory paragraph in an essay	2.54	.84	43.9	56.1
15	Writing thesis statements appropriate to cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentative essays	2.51	.92	46.5	53.5
16	Writing the body and conclusion paragraphs for cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentative essays	2.22	.78	72.9	27.1
17	Achieving cohesion in writing via referencing, maintaining focus and looking out for old/new information	2.03	.64	81	18.9
18	Achieving unity in writing through the use of appropriate signal words	2.35	.76	57.7	42.4
19	Using appropriate register in writing (formal / informal language)	2.34	.84	55.1	44.8

According to the students, all the writing objectives have been achieved except for the last one, which is "using appropriate registers in writing" (% 63.7). Another item that students rated next to average is "using appropriate discourse patterns" (%53). On the other hand, teachers rated their students' performance in writing much lower than students themselves. The two sub-skills that students and teachers provided closer ratings are: 1."making simple sentences" and "recognizing and evaluating the elements of a well-written introductory paragraph in an essay". Other than these items the values of teachers and students differ widely. For example, on the item "achieving cohesion in writing via referencing, maintaining focus and looking out for old/new information" 72.3 percent of the students perceive themselves competent and highly competent, whereas only 18.9 percent of teachers see their students competent and highly competent on this particular sub skill. Likewise, there is a wide gap on the items "Writing the body and conclusion paragraphs for cause-effect, compare-contrast, problem-solution, argumentative essays", "Writing academic paragraphs with appropriate topic, supporting and concluding sentences" and "writing compound sentences".

According to further analysis, a ONE-way ANOVA test, it was found that concerning the writing skills, students' perception vary significantly in accordance with the group of proficiency they belonged to, F (10.031, p= .000). Since the test of homogeneity of variance was non-significant, Tukey HSD was conducted as post hoc procedure. The results, as can be seen from the table below, there were significant differences among all groups. This means UINs were better than Ins and Ins were better than PINs.

Table: *Differences among Groups on Achievement of the Writing Goal*

Proficiency level	M	SD	IN	UIN
PIN	2,74	,36		*
IN	2,86	,36		*
UIN	3,04	,37	*	

Reading:

Table 8: *Students' Perception of their Competence in the Reading Skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
23	Understanding key ideas in a text using appropriate reading strategies	2.82	.61	29.3	70.8
24	Recognizing the relationship between ideas in a text	2.84	.57	25.2	74.8
25	Distinguishing between main idea and supporting details	2.94	.61	20.9	79
26	Distinguishing between facts and opinions	3.28	.62	8.3	91.7
27	Determining the writer's attitude and purpose by focusing on his/her choice of language structures, vocabulary and patterns of discourse organization	2.89	.65	24	76
28	Drawing conclusions based on the information from the text	2.83	.56	23.6	76.4
29	Making inferences based on implicitly stated ideas	2.51	.69	52.8	47.2
30	Understanding the function of author's structural and lexical choices within the given context	2.58	.59	43.5	56.6
31	Understanding referencing	2.98	.62	19.6	80.3
32	Guessing the meaning of unknown words using the contextual clues	2.67	.68	38.4	61.6

Table 9: Teachers' *Perception of Students' Competence in the Reading Skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
20	Understanding key ideas in a text using appropriate reading strategies	2.83	.59	27.1	72.9
21	Recognizing the relationship between ideas in a text	2.79	.55	27.1	72.9
22	Distinguishing between main idea and supporting details	2.93	.55	18.6	81.4
23	Distinguishing between facts and opinions	3.01	.54	13.8	86.2

24	Determining the writer's attitude and purpose by focusing on his/her choice of language structures, vocabulary and patterns of discourse organization	2.33	.68	64.4	35.6
25	Making inferences or drawing conclusions based on the implicitly stated ideas	2.27	.63	66.1	33.9
26	Understanding the function of author's structural and lexical choices within the given context	2.17	.66	75	25
27	Understanding referencing	2.87	.56	22.8	77.2
28	Guessing the meaning of unknown words using the contextual clues	2.65	.63	43.1	56.9

The results from the students' form suggest that the reading objectives of the DBE program were achieved to a great extent. However, it seems that more than half of the students (52.8%) perceive themselves as not competent in "making inferences based on implicitly stated ideas" and approximately half of the students (43.5%) don't think they are competent enough in "understanding the function of author's structural and lexical choices within the given context. The mean values on these items, which are very close to the threshold for the third interval 2.66 and up, validate these findings.

On the whole, it is evident that students rated themselves higher than their teachers on the reading-related items. In particular, students and teachers have contrastive perceptions as to the item "Determining the writer's attitude and purpose by focusing on his/her choice of language structures, vocabulary and patterns of discourse organization". While 76 % students believe they are competent in this sub skill, only 35 % of the teachers believe the students are competent in this area.

The figures indicate that teachers believe that most of DBE reading objectives have been achieved except for the item above, "making inferences or drawing conclusions and understanding the function of author's lexical choices within the given context" as they all fall below %50. It is important to note that all the three items are higher-order reading skills.

According to further analysis, a ONE-way ANOVA test, it was found that concerning the reading skills, students' perception vary significantly in accordance with the group of proficiency they belonged to, $\underline{F}$ 6,074 p= .003). Since the test of homogeneity of variance was non-significant, Tukey HSD was conducted as post hoc procedure. The results, as can be seen from the table below, there were significant differences between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups. This means UINs were better than PINs.

Table: *Differences among Groups on Achievement of the Reading Goal*

Proficiency level	M	SD	IN	UIN
PIN	2,70	,38		*
IN	2,82	,40		
UIN	2,92	,37	*	

Listening:

Table 10: *Students' Perception of their Competence in the Listening Skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
33	Identifying main idea(s) in spoken discourse	2.67	.66	37	63
34	Distinguishing main ideas from supporting detail	2.45	.65	53	47
35	Identifying discourse structure and organization	2.71	.65	32.2	67.8
36	Making use of signal words to follow the ideas in a lecture	2.55	.66	47.2	52.9
37	Recognizing the main points in a talk	2.69	.63	34.5	65.6
38	Specifying a purpose for listening to dialogues and conversations	2.56	.67	43	56.9
39	Understanding and carrying out oral instructions	2.77	.64	29.6	70.5
40	Listening to a lecture and taking notes simultaneously	2.26	.83	62	38

Table 11: *Teachers' Perception of Students' Competence in the Listening Skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)

				Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
29	Identifying main idea(s) in spoken discourse	2.59	.76	44.1	56
30	Distinguishing main ideas from supporting detail	2.35	.73	59.4	40.7
31	Identifying discourse structure and organization	2.32	.70	61	39
32	Making use of signal words to follow the ideas in a lecture	2.55	.72	47.5	52.6
33	Recognizing the main points in a talk	2.75	.67	31.6	68.3

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
29	Identifying main idea(s) in spoken discourse	2.59	.76	44.1	56
30	Distinguishing main ideas from supporting detail	2.35	.73	59.4	40.7
31	Identifying discourse structure and organization	2.32	.70	61	39
32	Making use of signal words to follow the ideas in a lecture	2.55	.72	47.5	52.6
33	Recognizing the main points in a talk	2.75	.67	31.6	68.3
34	Specifying a purpose for listening to dialogues and conversations	2.43	.70	58.6	41.4
35	Understanding and carrying out oral instructions	2.84	.79	29.3	70.7
36	Listening to a lecture and taking notes simultaneously	2.42	.77	55.7	42.4
34	Specifying a purpose for listening to dialogues and conversations	2.43	.70	58.6	41.4
35	Understanding and carrying out oral instructions	2.84	.79	29.3	70.7
36	Listening to a lecture and taking notes simultaneously	2.42	.77	55.7	42.4

The values on the listening skill show that students rated themselves as competent on most of the listening skills except for "distinguishing main ideas from supporting detail" (53%-not competent) and "listening to a lecture and taking notes simultaneously" (62%- not competent). On the other hand, teachers see their students as competent only in half of the sub skills. In addition to these two items teachers do not perceive students as competent in "Identifying discourse structure and organization" and "Specifying a purpose for listening to dialogues and conversations", either.

According to a one-way analysis of variance, no significant difference was found among groups on the listening goal, the cumulative variable under which all the listening objectives are listed.

Speaking:

Table 12: *Students' Perception of their Competence in the Speaking Skill at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not	Highly competent and

		M	SD	competent at all (%)	competent (%)
41	Initiating and maintaining a conversation appropriate to the context in an academic setting	2.06	.67	79.2	20.8
42	Speaking with reasonably accurate grammar	2.32	.68	64	35.9
43	Speaking with reasonably appropriate vocabulary	2.37	.65	56.7	43.3
44	Speaking with intelligible pronunciation	2.59	.74	40.7	59.3
45	Speaking with reasonable fluency	2.00	.72	80.1	20
46	Speaking with appropriate register (formal / informal language use)	2.22	.72	67.6	32.5
47	Speaking before an audience	2.21	.80	64.9	35.1

Table 13: *Teachers' Perception of DBE Students' Competence in the Speaking Skill*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
37	Initiating and maintaining a conversation appropriate to the context in an academic setting	1.96	.75	80	20
38	Speaking with reasonably accurate grammar	2.13	.74	71.6	28.3
39	Speaking with reasonably appropriate vocabulary	2.16	.71	71.7	28.3
40	Speaking with intelligible pronunciation	2.32	.75	54.3	45.8
41	Speaking with reasonable fluency	1.94	.73	75.9	24.1
42	Speaking with appropriate register (formal / informal language use)	1.88	.69	84.7	15.3
43	Speaking before an audience	1.94	.65	81.3	18.6

As for the speaking skill, both students and teachers gave lowest ratings of all. The only difference between students and teachers is that teachers consistently gave lower ratings than students did on each of the speaking-related items. The only sub skill that students rated themselves as competent was "speaking with intelligible pronunciation" (59.3%). In brief, the majority of neither the students nor the teachers think that speaking objectives are achieved at all.

According to further analysis, a ONE-way ANOVA test, it was found that concerning the speaking skills, students' perception vary significantly in accordance with the group of proficiency they belonged to, F (8,180, p= .000). Since the test of homogeneity of variance was non-significant, Tukey HSD was conducted as post hoc procedure. The results, as can be seen from the table below, there were significant differences among all groups. This means UINs were better than Ins and Ins were better than PINs.

Table: *Differences among Groups on Achievement of the Speaking Goal*

Proficiency level	M	SD	IN	UIN
PIN	2,05	,54		*

IN	2,27	,45		*
UIN	2,42	,54	*	

Other (non-linguistic goals):

Table 14: *Students' Perception as to the Extent of Achievement of Non-linguistic Goals at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
48	Using a variety of skills to accomplish a task	2.61	.59	38.5	61.4
49	Completing a task that requires multiple academic language skills (summarizing, note-taking, presentation, etc.)	2.44	.69	53.7	46.3
50	Becoming an autonomous learner	2.82	.67	28.3	71.7
51	Becoming a critical learner / Applying critical thinking skills	2.72	.69	35.8	64.2
52	Being a highly motivated and active learner	2.35	.77	59.3	40.5
53	Being aware of ethics and values in academic settings, and appreciating cultural diversity	3.08	.72	15.2	84.8
54	Using technology and language resources appropriately	2.72	.75	36	64
55	Gaining language awareness	2 .87	.71	24.2	75.7

Table 15: *Teachers' Perception as to the Extent of Achievement of Non-linguistic Goals at DBE*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not competent and not competent at all (%)	Highly competent and competent (%)
44	Using a variety of skills to accomplish a task	2.42	.62	57.9	42.1
45	Completing a task that requires multiple academic language skills (summarizing, note-taking, presentation, etc.)	2.31	.65	65	35
46	Becoming an autonomous learner	2.25	.62	75	25
47	Becoming a critical learner / Applying critical thinking skills	2.05	.61	82.4	17.6
48	Being a highly motivated and active learner	1.88	.74	81.4	18.6
49	Being aware of ethics and values in academic settings, and appreciating cultural diversity	2.20	.76	59.3	40.7
50	Using technology and language resources appropriately	2.45	.75	49.2	50.9
51	Gaining language awareness	2.35	.70	58.3	41.6

The values for the achievement of non-linguistic goals indicate that the teachers and the students mostly have different views. Whereas the teachers think that the students did not achieve non-linguistic goals at DBE on any of the items with the exception "Using technology and language resources appropriately" (50.9%), the students consistently gave higher ratings on each of the items related to non-linguistic items. The only items the students rated themselves as not competent were "Completing a task that requires multiple academic language skills (summarizing, note-taking, presentation, etc.)" (46.3%) and "Being a highly motivated and active learner" (40.7%). Unlike the teachers, the students rated themselves as competent in all the other items.

Summary: As can be seen from the results reported above, the percentage of students who think that the DBE goals have been achieved is higher (?) than the teachers who think that these goals have been achieved because they rated their performance higher than the teachers did as they perceive themselves more competent in the related areas than their teachers do. According to the one-way ANOVA results run for the students on none of the each of the linguistic goals and non-linguistic goals indicated above, significant difference was found among the groups belonging to three different proficiency levels, namely, pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate.

Additional Analysis: According to the respondents, non-linguistic goals such as *critical thinking* and *autonomous learning,* developed well. One of them claimed that the aim was to teach students strategy skills and therefore, different strategies were presented to make students notice different strategies and choose the ones suitable for themselves. She indicated that on paper the aim was achieved. However, they both mentioned that developing such skills was closely related to teachers' classroom practices, and therefore, it is impossible to know exactly whether the aim was fulfilled or not.

Concerning this research question, one significant finding of the study concerns the mismatch between the extent to which linguistic goals is achieved and the extent to which each linguistic skill is emphasized in the program. As can be seen from the student questionnaire (Appendix 1), after the background questions, participants were asked to indicate how often each skill was emphasized throughout the program. The table below shows the mean values and percentages each skill received.

Table 15: *Students' Perception of the Extent Each Skill is Achieved in the Program*

Item no	Item	M	SD
6	writing	2,39	,86
7	reading	2,83	,40
8	listening	2,58	,47
9	speaking	2,25	,51

Table 16: *Students' Perception of the Extent Each Skill is Emphasized in the Program*

Item no	Item	M	SD
6	writing	3,31	,70
7	reading	3,56	,71
8	listening	3,08	,67
9	speaking	2,39	,86

Although sub-scales varied slightly (with the first question the scale was on a competent- non-competent continuum whereas the second scale referred to the frequency that each skill received in the program) , it is evident that the mean scores on the first three skills vary considerably. Table 17 reports the results of the paired-samples t test run to investigate whether the mean differences are statistically significant from one another. In the table "writing" refers to students' perceptions pertaining to the extent writing is emphasized in the program, and "compwrit" stands for perceptions as to the extent the writing goal is achieved and so on. The figures suggest that the all these language skills might have been emphasized in the classroom by teachers but students did not feel that they were as competent as expected in any of these areas. Therefore, it would not be wrong to say linguistic goals have not been achieved in proportion with the instruction and effort offered in the classroom.

Table 17: *Paired samples T-test*

	Paired Differences			
	M	SD	t	significance
WRITING - COMPWRIT	0,42	0,68	9,32	0,000
READING - COMPREAD	0,72	0,75	14,13	0,000
LISTENIN - COMPLIST	0,50	0,73	10,36	0,000
SPEAKING - COMPSPKG	0,14	0,85	2,44	0,015

<u>Qualitative Data</u>

<u>Students</u>

When the **interview**ees were asked whether they had reached the desired level of English expected by their departments- the major goal of the DBE program, *students predominantly stated that they had*. In PIN level, all students, except for one who partially agreed, said that they had reached the desired level. The case was also exactly the same for UP students. Similarly, in IN level, most of the students (7 out of 11) stated that their English is adequate for their departments. However, two IN students claimed that the program did not help them gain the necessary skills for their departments and the other two were content with the program only to a certain extent. At the end of the interviews, students were asked if they had any extra comments. What students from *all different levels* emphasized was the fact that *speaking was the most problematic skill* as students were not fluent enough and as they did not get the chance to produce anything by speaking. Moreover, students agreed that all levels could not reach the same desired level of proficiency and added that EPE was a big source of anxiety especially for beginner and PIN students.

According to **open-ended items**, in terms of the comments received concerning 'listening', it is quite obvious that the students predominantly ask for more listening input (24). Some other students demand more variety in listening texts. Moreover, a student mentions that listening to Turkish speakers speaking English is more advantageous than listening to native speakers. Of the four students who think that the time allocated to reading is not adequate, two assert that it is too much while the other two claim it to be too little. However, most of the students find the 'reading' successful. When speaking is considered, almost all comments are negative. Majority of the students want to be supplied with more speaking activities. In terms of writing, most of the students (7) claim that writing exercises are not enough in number and there must be more emphasis on writing whereas three students ask for just the opposite. Moreover, some students (4) think that writing exercises should start in the first semester. In terms of grammar, the majority of the students (17) express their negative opinions about 'grammar'. Most of the students (12) state that the time allocated to grammar is inadequate and that it should be increased. Some other students claim that teaching of grammar by using Theme-based Instruction is not efficient.

<u>Teachers</u>
<u>PIN</u>

Reading: The reading objectives were not achieved because of the level that was way above their level of proficiency.

Listening: Listening was, on the whole, proved to be "disastrous" . It was
neglected the first term and because of the pressure of the approaching EPE, it began to be addressed in the second term, but it was too late.

Writing: Writing, similarly, was neglected in the program in the first term and began to be addressed in the second term starting from the sentence level, again due to the upcoming EPE, but it was too late for this skill as well.

Speaking: All the teachers mentioned that there was no time allocated to the speaking skill to do the suggested tasks.

As for the non-linguistic goals, *motivation and interest* of students were poor, or zero, and *critical thinking* developed to a certain (or limited?) extent. One of the teachers explained that critical thinking did not develop because students have not been able to develop lower-order skills to be able to apply critical thinking strategies. Another stated that critical thinking questions in the materials were above students' level, so they did not serve their purpose. Quite sarcastically, about *autonomous learning*, one teacher stated that it developed "a lot" since students were left to their own devices, especially in face of EPE and took care of themselves.

<u>IN</u>

Reading: All of the respondents who taught intermediate groups indicated that the new program achieved the intended goals in reading. Two of the respondents mentioned that, especially in the second term, the

program was successful in fulfilling its goals in reading. One of them said that the amount of vocabulary learned by the students increased tremendously with the application of the new program.

Listening: Except for one of the respondents, they all reported that listening was one of the weakest components of the program. Among the reasons for this, quality and amount of the listening materials and time allocated to this skill were the most common ones. One of the respondents, however, told that listening was better treated in this program when compared to the ones applied in previous years. She also mentioned that it could have been revised and developed if they had had the chance of applying the same program again.

Writing: Almost all the teachers said they felt that writing was the second best component of the program. Yet, they all indicated that in the first term writing was not emphasized enough in the classroom; therefore, in the second term there was a rush to develop the necessary skills for both the EPE and for first-year courses in students' departments.

Speaking: All of the respondents indicated that this component was the weakest in the program. However, they indicated that it was not much different from that of the previous years. One of them mentioned that she was not sure whether this skill should be integrated into the program or not, since she believed that within the given time period it was impossible to develop all the four skills in a foreign language properly. Another one said that development of the speaking skill was directly related to the students' personality and there was not much to do to develop such a high-level skill in such a short period of time.

According to the intermediate group teachers, non-linguistic goals such as *critical thinking* and *autonomous learning* developed very well. One of them said "Though I believe that these skills somewhat developed through the new program, I am not sure if they should be among the goals and objectives of a preparatory school program". Regarding motivation and interest, three of the teachers mentioned that students' motivation was higher when compared to that of the previous years. Yet, one of them claimed that students' motivation was very low because the selected themes were too long and not interesting enough for students. One of the teachers said she felt that the main motive of the new program was good, and, if the program had a chance of being implemented again, within two or three years, it would have been totally successful in developing students' non-linguistic skills as well as linguistic ones.

UIN

Reading: All of the teachers who taught the upper-intermediate group mentioned that the new program totally achieved its goals in reading. One of them said that students' ability in reading developed "better" through this program compared to previous years, when their level of achievement is taken into account.

Listening: Except for one respondent, all the upper-intermediate teachers claimed that listening was "one of the weakest" components of the program although it was better than it used to be. They also said that listening is always considered like "a step child" at the departmental programs. One of the teachers, however, claimed that listening objectives were fully achieved in her classes. She said that all of her students were successful in the listening part of the proficiency exam and this was an indicative of the fulfillment of the goals of the new program.

Writing: Almost all the respondents indicated that writing was "the second best" component of the program. Yet, one of them claimed that it was a failure since they tried to teach essay writing throughout the year, and because of the types of writing questions in the proficiency exam ahead , they started to teach proper paragraph organization in the second half of the second term, which was very confusing and annoying for her students.

Speaking: Except for one, all the teachers claimed that this component was the weakest in the program. Yet, they indicated that speaking was not much different from what it was before.

According to the teachers of the upper-intermediate group, two of the non-linguistic goals, *critical thinking* and *autonomous learning,* developed very well. One of them claimed that developing such skills was closely related to the students' personality, and therefore, any program intending to develop such skills had the risk of failure. Therefore, she said, students in her class made a progress in this respect because of their own

potential, not because of the new program. Two of the respondents claimed that student motivation was higher in this program when compared to the previous years'.

<u>Administrators</u>

Reading: Both of the administrators indicated that that reading was the primary tool to teach various skills and therefore it was at the center of everything. As a result, reading objectives were achieved to a great extent. They both claimed that in addition to skills taught in previous years, students were able to talk about writer's attitude, his/her use of language depending upon the intended audience, and deep meaning in a text. Moreover, teaching grammar through reading passages, in their opinion, helped students to understand the meaning of them rather than concentrating only the form of grammar points. One of them mentioned that the results of the proficiency exam indicated that the students' performance in reading was higher when compared to the previous years' scores.

Listening: Both of the respondents claimed that listening was one of the weakest components of the program. However, they said that while-listening and note-taking tasks were emphasized enough, and most of the students were successful in these skills. They also indicated that listening was much more systematically handled when compared to the previous years' programs. However, they claimed that it would be better to have more time to devote to listening. One of them mentioned that materials were not sufficient to cater for the needs of the students.

Writing: Both of them indicated that there was sufficient amount of writing activities in the program. They claimed that the objectives were not different from the previous years', but the approach was different and students were asked to write something within the theme taught.

Speaking: One of the respondents said that it was possible to encourage students to discuss about the subjects they read within the given themes. Since they have more information about the discussion topics, they were willing to speak. Yet, both indicated that this component was the most neglected one in the program.

According to the **open-ended** items, teachers' (6 teachers) comments on 'writing' are mainly negative. They consider that writing was not user-friendly and was chaotic. They also noted that writing done during the year was not 'enough' for the EPE and more time should have been spent on writing. Most of the teachers (9) who made comments on 'speaking' are not satisfied with either the quantity or the quality of speaking practices. Four teachers think that time allotted to speaking activities is not enough, one also saying that time to teach speaking explicitly is necessary. Teachers' (6) opinions on 'listening' are negative, too. 4 teachers think that listening handouts and activities were not enough, one adding that the 30% of the EPE is listening and listening practices during the year started too late. Two (2) teachers state what they think about 'grammar'. One says that it was very inconvenient to teach grammar without contextually rich material and that grammar and reading must not be separated. Regarding the achievement of non-linguistic goals, for the motivation of students negative comments (3) are made. All teachers claimed that students were demotivated, explaining that the long-themes caused this lack of motivation. One teacher commented on 'autonomy and critical thinking' stating that there should be projects for both. Out of the eight teachers who comment on the curriculum, some state positive ideas, one saying that this major change has been useful and the other claiming that though demanding, the program was useful for teachers and students. However, some teachers say that some grammar points were overemphasized unexpectedly and many things were told passively which satisfied neither the teachers nor the students

4. 2 Research Question 2: **To what extent do the students cope with the linguistic and educational demands of their departmental courses?**

Sub question 1: **To what extent do the students cope with the linguistic demands of their departmental courses?**

<u>Quantitative Data</u>

To answer this question, first descriptive statistics were run for 5 questionnaire items under section 3, "Considering the requirements of your departmental courses in the first year, how do you evaluate yourself in terms of the following language tasks in English? As can be seen from the tabulated data below, more

than half of the students think that they are competent enough in the following academic tasks that involve English with respect to writing, reading and note-taking in lectures (65,5%, 56,4% and 58,5% respectively). However, a lower portion of students see themselves competent in areas that require speaking tasks as indicated in item 57 and 60 (31,5% and 38.3% respectively). Teachers' predictions on how students cope with the linguistic demands do not match at all with what the students report themselves, except for item 56, which is "Reading authentic and field-specific material with relative ease at a fair rate of comprehension and reacting to it". Other than reading tasks, much lower percentage of teachers than students think that students are competent on all other areas. However, as can be seen from the tables, as in the DBE goals-related questions reported above, students have a higher opinion of their performance in English in their departmental courses.

Table 17: *How Students Cope with the Linguistic Demands of their Departments*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not well enough and poorly (%)	Well and very well (%)
56	Answering the questions using grammatically and stylistically appropriate discourse patterns in <u>oral</u> form	2.72	.66	34.5	65.5
57	Answering the questions using grammatically and stylistically appropriate discourse patterns in <u>oral</u> form	2.23	.65	68.5	31.5
58	Reading authentic and field-specific material with relative ease at a fair rate of comprehension and reacting to it	2.56	.70	43.6	56.4
59	Note-taking while following a lecture	2.57	.73	41.4	58.5
60	Asking questions during lectures. participating in debates and expressing opinions	2.27	.79	61.7	38.3

Table 18: *Teachers' Perception on How Students Cope with the Linguistic Demands of their Departments*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not well enough and poorly (%)	Well and very well (%)
56	Answering the questions using grammatically and stylistically appropriate discourse patterns in <u>written</u> form	2.32	.71	67.8	32.1
57	Answering the questions using grammatically and stylistically appropriate discourse patterns in <u>oral</u> form	1.89	.76	82.7	17.2
58	Reading authentic and field-specific material with relative ease at a fair rate of comprehension and reacting to it	2.49	.73	47.4	52.7
59	Note-taking while following a lecture	2.35	.61	57.9	42.1
60	Asking questions during lectures. participating in debates and expressing opinions	1.98	.71	79.3	20.7

Qualitative Data

Concerning whether they could follow their departmental courses with ease, most of the students stated that they had "no problems", especially in listening and reading comprehension. PIN students mentioned that they had difficulty in listening especially in note-taking. The students reported that they have no difficulty in following the lectures because 1) figures and symbols were used most of the time, 2) instructors switch to Turkish when necessary, or teaches in Turkish, 3) their instructors simplify the language when needed. One student commented: "the listening tasks at DBE were much more challenging". Five students drew attention to the fact that field terminology was not taught at all in DBE. And thus this, they claimed, might cause problems, both for technical field and social sciences students. One student stated that he had to learn it for himself. As for the writing skills, students stated that DBE writing instruction has been useful in ENG101 tasks. Some had difficulty in essay writing in 101. Concerning the areas they have difficulty in speaking is at the top. More than half of the students reported, regardless of their proficiency level, that they cannot speak. To put briefly, students reported that have difficulty in their departments when they have to use English productively.

Teacher and administrators were not asked questions in the interviews as to this dimension.

Sub question 2: **To what extent do the students cope with the educational demands of their departmental courses as a result of the DBE instruction?**

Since the student records of 2003 EPE results and CGPA (of the first term of 2004-5) were available at Students Affairs Office, it was possible to make a correlational analysis between two variables using the whole population: 1. level of proficiency as measured by EPE and 2. academic achievement as represented by CGPA. The correlation coefficient between the EPE grades of all the test-takers in 2004 and their first term GPAs was computed to be r: 0.385 (significant at 0. 01 level). Correlation coefficients are not interpreted as percentages but when squared, they may be considered as percentages. In this case, r: 0.385 indicates a relationship of about 15% between the EPE grades and academic term averages obtained in all the coursework in the freshman year.

Research Question 3: **To what extent were the materials used as a part of CPR effective/useful?**

This questionnaire question that corresponds to materials was "Considering the last years' curriculum, to what extent were the materials useful?" The mean values and percentages to eight items under this question are reported in the tables below.

Table 19: *Students Opinions about the Usefulness of Materials*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not very useful and not very useful at all (%)	Useful and very useful (%)
57	Reading Book(s)	2,84	,80	30,4	69,5
58	Listening Book(s)	2,46	,83	50,5	49,5
59	Writing Book(s)	2,32	,94	53,1	46,9

60	Reading Handouts	3,09	,74	16,2	83,9
61	Listening Handouts	2,76	,89	34,7	65,4
62	Writing Handouts	3,10	,78	17,9	82
63	Audiotapes	2,62	,83	40,8	59,2
64	Others	2,75	,95	38,3	61,7

Table 20: *Teachers' Opinions about the Usefulness of Materials*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Not very useful and not very useful at all (%)	Useful and very useful (%)
57	Reading Book(s)	3,05	,69	21,1	78,9
58	Listening Book(s)	2,57	,77	45,6	54,4
59	Writing Book(s)	1,68	,84	84,4	15,5
60	Reading Handouts	2,87	,82	29,9	70,2
61	Listening Handouts	2,77	,84	35,1	64,9
62	Writing Handouts	2,61	,91	38,9	61,1
63	Audiotapes	2,65	,92	38,5	61,5

According to these results, students' assessment of materials was one of positive. Students found reading and writing handouts most useful of all (82.9% and 83%).Of all the responses related to handouts, the lowest ratings were given to the listening handouts, although students apparently found listening handouts more useful than listening books (65,4%) . In fact, half of the students were satisfied with the listening book(s) (49.5) whereas the other half did not find them useful enough. The percentages are more or less similar for the writing book(s), i.e. half of them were happy with the writing books while the other half were not. Therefore, apart from reading, writing books and audiotapes, students were satisfied with the materials used as a part of the new program.

Teachers, on the other hand, do not quite agree with students. As can be seen clearly from the tables above, a vast majority of teachers gave higher ratings on all types of material except for the writing book, which was rated strikingly lower than all (15.5%). However, more than half of students found this/ these books useful (53.1%). Similarly, concerning the handouts, teachers are apparently less positive than students. Their assessment of listening handouts is very close to one another (for students and teachers, 65.6% and 64.9 respectively); yet, they hold a lower opinion of the reading and writing handouts than students.

Qualitative Data

When **students** were asked whether the materials had met their needs or not, they mainly expressed their positive opinions in the **interview**. They were satisfied with reading books and pacing of the materials. However, they added that the books were a little bit boring- especially PAW and the handouts were very difficult. Students from all groups stated that they had problems with listening material. Moreover, students told that the materials were informative and attractive. Nevertheless, they stated that the materials might have included more pictures. Some upper students mentioned that long themes with a lot of terminology were very boring. As for the quantity of the material, students said that they were enough in number. Some students even stated that they were sometimes more than needed. About the level of the material,

interviewees seemed to have few problems. Although they had no problems with the level of the books, they claimed that handouts' language level was difficult. Finally, about the appropriateness of the tasks, students told that some exercises were quite unnecessary and easy. The most problematic area was listening. Intermediate and upper students stated that videos were very difficult and poor in quality. Moreover, they added that *Contemporary Topics* was very fast and challenging. The **open-ended items** suggest that the main attitude of the students towards the materials is negative. Some students (5) believe that materials used, especially in speaking and writing, are inadequate and confusing. There are also some comments about Self-access Center (SAC). Students think that it is very beneficial to use those materials. They suggest its being used more often and they complain about not having enough time to go and study there. The additional written reactions to the books are also negative. The predominantly pointed out problem is the writing book, PAW (7). Majority of the students (9) express their dissatisfaction about reading books as they find them boring. Concerning the handouts, students seem to be satisfied (6), especially about the writing and grammar handouts.

PIN (Pre-intermediate)

Regarding the materials, teachers supplied extensive data referring to both quantity and quality. First of all, all the teachers complained that there were too many handouts, which is why both the teacher and students were lost. One teacher also called this practice as "waste of paper". With regard to timely arrival of handouts all the teachers said that they were late. Another stated that handouts were redundant in the presence of books and were full of mistakes. One teacher stated that even corrections to correction had to be provided. The modules were prepared in haste, and not in a painstaking manner. All the teachers claimed that they used supplementary material although they said there was not enough time concerning the quality, one said that the handouts caused grammar teaching to remain at recognition level and did not lend themselves for productive grammar. Most of the teachers said that the materials were not in congruence with the goals and objectives of the program. One said that she could imagine that a lot of effort was put into material preparation but, in effect, they were far from matching the classroom reality.

The most striking point that all the teachers made was that they could not see the entirety of the program, which was, as they put it, very frustrating and annoying. In addition to handouts, books were another source of complaint. Reading books, especially *Off-line 2*, was way above the level of students. Often the passages went uncomprehended. One said "Luckily, the admin did not dare to give up on *Language in Use*." Another commented that *PAW* was a very good as a reference book but was not suitable as a course book. Another comment by two teachers was that books were not appropriate for the theme-based approach and that they had to try to make adaptations and make them more classroom-compatible.

All the interviewees stated that they had a low opinion of *Teacher's Manual* (TM), which was specifically designed by materials writers and included objectives and suggestions and instructions to the teacher. Three of the teachers referred to them as "lesson plans" and all of them stated they were too detailed. One stated that because it was new, it was hard to follow and TM was not user-friendly. The teachers were not oriented or trained in using them. Two of the teachers indicated that TMs were too restrictive and restrained teacher's initiative. One claimed that the preferred method depends very much on the dynamics of the class, saying "lesson plans should be the job of the teacher, what works in one lesson m ay not work in another".   Again, the same comment was made as handouts: you can tell they have been prepared in haste and not meticulously enough. Three fourth of the PIN teachers said they found such guidance useful for the novice teacher but unnecessary for the experienced. . One of the PIN teachers said that she benefited from the specific objectives written in TM. Some stated that they found it insulting and restricting that each and every step was dictated. This destroyed teacher's freedom completely and prevented teacher flexibility.

About the *integratedness* of the materials, most of the teachers have a negative opinion. Two stated that the materials contextually were integrated. One of them also stated that anchoring of tasks was not as smooth as it should have been.

INT

About the materials, there were various viewpoints among the respondents. They all indicated that they used the entirety of materials given by the administration in their classes. They also mentioned that they used

supplementary materials, especially the one focusing on the grammar component, thinking that this was one of the least emphasized components along the way.

Regarding the quality of materials, they argued that the target grammar in the existing materials were not of much of a use since the materials were too difficult for students to understand to begin with, let alone the grammatical structures. In other words, they all felt that some of the materials were above the level of students to some extent and some others were way above their level. They all agreed that one of the books, *Off- Line II*, was very difficult for the level of intermediate students. As far as the handouts are concerned, most of them indicated that the amount of them was excessive, and there were unnecessary repetitions. Just like a PIN teacher, one of IN teachers called the situation as "waste of paper". However, another indicated that she and her students were happy about the number of handouts supplied by the administration because they helped students to revise whatever they learned and understand the subject matter better. Almost all the teachers said that from time to time, handouts arrived much too late, and they did not have enough time to integrate them into their lesson plans properly. The number of such occasions was one third of all time. They also mentioned that handouts sometimes contained some spelling and grammar errors.

All of the respondents reported that Teachers' Manual (TM), which was referred to as lesson plans by one of the teachers, were very detailed. Two of them found them very useful in the sense that they helped them integrate the material and prepare for classes. They also indicated that availability of goals and objectives was very useful in planning their classroom practices properly. One of the respondents mentioned that such a detailed manual was helpful especially for junior instructors, and as a senior teacher she was able to adapt it depending upon the needs of her students. The rest of the respondents indicated that they found such a detailed material too restricting, and felt as if they were insulted. As a result, they started to apply their own lesson plans rather than using the suggested ones. They also mentioned that the program was far from catering for the needs of teachers, reducing the role of them to that of robots simply carrying out the given orders. As a result of such an approach, they said, the teachers lost their motivation, which, in effect, resulted in the failure of the program.

UPP

All of the upper- intermediate teachers indicated that the *amount* of materials supplied by the administration was sufficient and they used the entirety of materials in their classes. Moreover, they all mentioned that they used supplementary materials especially for the grammar component since this was the least emphasized components in the materials.

As far as the *handouts* are concerned, all teachers indicated that the amount of them was sufficient, but from time to time, the arrival of the handouts posed a problem since they were delivered late, leaving them insufficient time for preparation. They all indicated that one third of the handouts were delivered late, and therefore, they did not have enough time to check them for spelling and grammar errors. (Erroneous materials was a problem mentioned by both PIN and IN teachers). All of UIN teachers agreed that some of the materials used in the classroom were too difficult even for the upper-intermediate students. The amount of such materials was reported to be ten percent of all.

For the *books*, except for one of the respondents no problem was mentioned. She indicated that the books seemed OK considering that that was the first year of the program, but they needed to be revised and reorganized according to the needs and levels of the students.

All of the teachers said that Teachers' Manuals, were very detailed and well prepared, which helped them in the integration of the materials. They also indicated that availability of goals and objectives was very useful to plan their classroom practices properly.
Both of the administrators indicated that the amount of materials was sufficient and they used the entirety of materials in their classes. Moreover, they mentioned that they did not use supplementary materials for any components. They both indicated that the materials were not the finalized products. They were in the process of piloting and would be improved at any rate (i.e. at the beginning of the new term). One of them said that the most important problem the teachers encountered was that they were not able to see the entirety of the materials since the administration did not have enough time to produce all the materials before the term started. Moreover, there was an opposition to the administration, which in turn, reduced the success of the piloted materials'. They both indicated that it is perfectly normal to face problems of this kind whenever a

new program and materials were put to use. However, according to them, some of the teachers perceived the new program and materials as finalized, and this triggered the opposition; as a result, most of the teachers started to consider only the negative sides without considering the positive ones. They both said that there were problems about the delivery of the materials from time to time. Moreover, they stated that sometimes there were some errors in the materials since they tried to produce materials during the process to catch up. Yet, they claimed that the materials could be revised and reconsidered at the end of the process. Both of them indicated that teachers' manuals were very detailed and were meant to help teachers with the integration of the materials. They also believed that availability of goals and objectives was useful for teachers to plan their classroom practices properly. However, they both claimed that most of the teachers were not aware of what was going on. Therefore, they tried to do everything written in the Teachers' Manual rather than modifying it, depending upon the needs of their students. Moreover, they said that some of the materials produced for the beginner and elementary levels were above their level, which reduced the level of satisfaction both for teachers and the students, and that was a mistake.

Teachers' comments on materials in the **open-ended item** section of the questionnaire can be analyzed in two groups as 'handouts' and 'books'. Some teachers find handouts too demanding and difficult especially for the PIN group students. Teachers (11) made comments on different books and on books as a whole. Comments on teachers' manuals (4) are negative in general. The others say manuals were confusing, too detailed and catastrophic.

Research Question 4: **To what extent were the methods used as part of CPR effective?**

Sub-question 1: **To what extent were the teacher-based and student-based activities used in the classroom?**

According to the results, it seems the **students** and **teachers** have similar opinions concerning the frequency of **student-based activities** like pair-work, group-work, and students' asking questions. They think that such activities are *sometimes* or *usually* used. In addition, the focus-group interviews with students revealed that PIN group students did more group work than the others. However, the general belief among the interviewees was that pair and group works were not very effective. In fact, the intermediate level students stated that group-works meant time for chatting. Role-plays, on the other hand, were the least employed student-based activity with a high variation in its implementation in classes. It seems that although role-plays were used to a certain degree in some classes, they were not used at all in some other classes. As for the **teacher-based activities** in the classrooms, the **teachers** perceive their methodology more teacher-based than the **students** do. The facts that the role-plays are the least frequently employed student-based activity and that the lessons are mostly teacher-based may be accounted for by the qualitative data at hand. Nearly all teachers in all groups (PIN, IN, UP) invariably stated that there were too much teacher talk in the lessons due to the excess of the material to be covered, the limited time available to cover the material, and the pressure of the upcoming EPE. Due to these reasons, the teachers may have chosen to lead most of the sessions themselves rather than resorting to more time-consuming student-based activities. The same finding is also evident in the student focus interviews. The students stated that the teachers were more active than themselves especially in grammar lessons. As the students' proficiency level increased, however, the methodology gradually became less and less teacher-centered. Therefore, it seems that as the role of grammar decreased in lessons, the amount of teacher-based lessons and teacher-talk also decreased.

Sub-question 2: **To what extent was the CRP implemented in the classroom?**

In light of the quantitative data at hand, it can be concluded that **theme-based approach** -the suggested methodology of CRP- was implemented to a great extent. However, it is also evident from the data at hand that the extent to which the CRP was implemented changed from one class to the other. That is, while some activities of CRP were frequently used in some classes, some others were rarely or never used in some other classes. Especially those activities requiring more production on part of the students were less commonly employed in classrooms. This may have been due to the pressure of time the teachers felt and the amount of the material to be covered. Overall, however, it seems there was inconsistency among classrooms in the implementation of CRP. PIN teachers especially highlighted the inappropriacy of the materials for theme-based approach. Some teachers stated that they started to use their own materials as time passed, disregarding both the material given to them by the administration and the teachers' manual along with its suggested activities. As the proficieny level increased, however, the problems related to the materials seem to have decreased. Although most IN teachers taught everything within the given themes, only a few

mentioned using their own materials especially while teaching grammar. All UP teachers stated that everthing was taught within the given themes, but they suggested that the variety of the themes be increased. Similarly, the students in the focus group interviews at all levels indicated that themes were long and boring.

Research Question 5: **To what extent were the assessment procedures of CRP effective?**

Overall, the students and the teachers seem to have a positive opinion of the assessment procedures (MTs, PQs, PGs). Both the students and the teachers believe that these assessment tools had content validity. That is, the midterms and the pop-quizzes reflected what was covered in themes in the class. However, more than half of both students and teachers find these assessment tools inadequate to evaluate the students' success. In addition, especially PIN teachers believe that the midterms and the pop-quizzes were too difficult for their students. PIN teachers perceive this difficulty level as one of the main reasons why their students lost confidence in themselves and performed poorly in subsequent exams. The same difficulty concern was shared by INT teachers as well, especially in the first semester. The data from the focus-group student interviews also highlight the unbalance between the two academic semesters. For the students as well the first semester was easier and slower in pace while the second semester the exams and the materials were more difficult. UP teachers, however, indicated that the difficulty level of the midterms and the pop-quizzes was appropriate for their students. It seems that as the proficiency level increases, the concern for the difficulty level of the assessment tools decreases. Another assessment tool that draws attention is the PGs. It seems the teachers have a higher opinion of the PGs than the students. However, most teachers and students complained about the differing practices in grading the students in-class performance, stating that the teachers are subjective in grading the students in-class performance.

Research Questions 5: **To what extent were the methods used as a part of CPR effective?**

Sub-question 1: To **what extent were the teacher-based and student based activities used in the classroom?**

<u>Quantitative Data</u>

The questionnaire section that corresponds to pedagogical methods and the degree to which the CRP was implemented in the classroom was "How often were the following methods employed in the classroom last year?" The first nine of these items are concerned with the general interactional patterns in classroom inherent in language pedagogy. Throughout this study, these methods have been classified as student-based and teacher-based. The remaining five items are specific to theme-based approach (with its module system), which is the guiding methodology that shaped the CRP of 2003-2004 at DBE.

As can be seen from the table above, according to **students**, activities where students were more active occurred within a frequency range falling between "sometimes" and "usually" since 1. The percentages on these items cluster around these adverbs, and 2. The mean values for "pair-work, group work, and students' asking questions" are 3. 65 (SD=.78), 3.45 (SD=.82) and 3.83 (SD=.72) respectively. However, "role-play" seems to have been employed least often, or seldom (M= 2.14, SD=1.03). Since the SD value is the highest of these four types of activities, we can say that frequency of role-play activities changed from class to class. Further statistics, one-way ANOVA, was run to identify whether different proficiency groups account for the variation. Since the F value (0.041)was not statistically significant, it would not be right to say that the role-plays are more frequently employed in one group of proficiency than they were in another group of proficiency. One possible explanation is that some teachers may have chosen this activity type more than the others. The figures show that this choice is not connected to the proficiency level of the group teachers were teaching.

According to **teachers**, activities where students are more active occurred –despite slightly lower mean scores- sometimes or usually, and always, as can be seen from the table because 1. The percentages again cluster around these adverbs, and 2. The mean values for pair-work, group work, and students' asking questions are 3. 44 (SD=.99), 3.03 (SD=.93) and 3.44 (SD=1.17) respectively. The high standard deviation value on the last item (student asking questions) indicate high variation, i,.e. teachers do not agree with one another as to the frequency of students asking questions in the classroom. As with the case of

students, teachers think that "role-play" was the least employed (seldom) type, of all the student-based activities (M= 1.94, SD: .90).

The results suggest that students and teachers do not differ widely in their perceptions regarding the frequency of student-based activities. They are sometimes or usually used in the classroom except for role-play, which was seldom or sometimes employed depending on the class and/or teacher.

In **students'** view, activities where teachers were more active occurred quite frequently and teacher-based methods were used more frequently than student-based ones since 1. percentages cluster around usually and always, and 2. The mean values for students' answering questions, teacher giving explanations on grammar points, and teacher-based instruction are 3.50, (SD=.89) 3.79 (SD=1.09), and 3,96 (SD= .74) respectively.

In teacher's view, activities where teachers are more active occurred quite frequently: the mean values for students' answering questions, teacher giving explanations on grammar points, and teacher-based instruction are 3.93, 4.43, and 4,20 respectively. These are higher values than those of the students.

The results suggest that teachers see that the methods they used are more teacher-based than students think that they are.

Table 21: **Students' Perception of the Frequency of Teaching Methods Used in the Classroom**

Item no	Item	M	SD	never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always
69	Pair work	3,65	,78	1,3	6,1	27,3	56,3	9,1
70	Group work	3,45	,82	,4	12,6	36,4	42,9	7,8
71	Students' asking questions	3,83	,72		3,9	24,3	56,1	15,7
72	Students' answering questions	3,50	,89	1,7	10,9	33,5	43,0	10,9
73	Role-play	2,14	1,03	33,6	30,6	24,9	9,6	1,3
74	Teacher giving explanations on grammar points	3,79	1,09	1,7	12,6	23,4	29,0	33,3
76	Teacher-based instruction	3,96	,74		3,5	18,7	55,2	22,6
75	Student presentations at the end of a module	2,61	1,06	19,0	24,2	34,2	20,8	1,7
77	Written projects- as culminating activity at the end of a module	2,43	1,09	24,1	28,5	30,7	13,2	3,5
78	Written exercises on discourse patterns within the context of a given text	3,39	,93	4,8	10,0	33,8	44,2	7,4
79	Teaching grammatical structures within the given theme (i.e. money)	3,78	,95	1,7	8,3	23,0	43,9	23,0
80	Doing grammar exercises within the given theme (i.e. money)	3,47	,96	2,2	13,9	31,6	39,0	13,4
81	Doing vocabulary exercises within the given theme (i.e. money)	3,89	,85	,9	4,8	22,8	46,9	24,6
82	Analyzing a text within the given theme to understand how the writer conveys meaning using certain grammar structures & words	3,50	,95	3,0	11,7	29,6	43,5	12,2

Table 22: **Teachers' Perception of the Frequency of Teaching Methods Used in the Classroom**

Item no	Item	M	SD	never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always
65	Pair work	3,44	,99	1,7	17,2	29,3	37,9	13,8
66	Group work	3,03	,93	6,9	15,5	50,0	22,4	5,2
67	Students' asking questions	3,44	1,17	3,4	24,1	17,2	34,5	20,7
68	Students' answering questions	3,93	,98	3,4	6,9	10,3	51,7	27,6
69	Role-play	1,94	,90	37,5	35,7	21,4	5,4	
70	Teacher giving explanations on grammar points	4,43	,79		1,7	13,8	24,1	60,3
71	Teacher-based instruction	4,20	,81	1,7	1,7	8,6	50,0	37,9
72	Student presentations at the end of a module	2,60	1,27	24,5	24,5	26,4	15,1	9,4
73	Written projects- as culminating activity at the end of a module	2,46	1,11	19,2	38,5	25,0	11,5	5,8
74	Written exercises on discourse patterns within the context of a given text	3,08	1,04	7,1	19,6	39,3	25,0	8,9
75	Teaching grammatical structures within the given theme (i.e. money)	3,80	,98	1,8	7,0	28,1	35,1	28,1
76	Doing grammar exercises within the given theme (i.e. money)	3,47	1,15	3,5	21,1	21,1	33,3	21,1
77	Doing vocabulary exercises within the given theme (i.e. money)	4,03	,85		5,2	19,0	43,1	32,8
78	Analyzing a text within the given theme to understand how the writer conveys meaning using certain grammar structures & words	3,68	,99	1,7	12,1	22,4	43,1	20,7

<u>Qualitative Data</u>

<u>Students</u>

Concerning the methodology used in class, the interviewees mainly stated that teachers were more active than the students. Especially, in grammar lessons, teachers were said to be very dominant. As a result, in upper groups, methodology was not so teacher-centered. As for pair/group work, the students stated that

they were used occasionally. Pin students did more group work than the other levels. However, the general belief was that pair/group works were not very effective. Intermediate students told that group works meant time for chatting. Only few students found them beneficial. Finally, about the themes, the interviewees confirmed that themes were used during the lessons. However, students from all groups used the same adjectives to describe theme-based lessons: long and boring.

<u>Teachers</u>

<u>PIN</u>

All the teachers in this group stated that *teacher talk* had never been this much. One of the teachers said that they had to do "lecturing" Another comment was that they wanted to integrate group and pair work into the classroom practices as indicated in the teacher's manual, but because of the time limit and the excess of materials, and as one put, and due to the pressurizing effect of the EPE, it was practically impossible for them to do that, and gradually pair-work and group work were diminished".

One said "we could not use technology; we tried to use the OHP but we could not figure out how to render classes interactive. As a result, as all the other teachers reported, students were bored. "One month for one module was too long". Teachers also indicated that the program passivized the students and one stated that students had lost track by the end of April, and eventually, their grades fell.

<u>IN</u>

All the intermediate group teachers pointed out that there was *too much teacher talk* in the classroom because of the fact that the amount of materials to be covered was too much. They all indicated that although they wanted to do so, they were not able to integrate group and pair work into their classroom practices as indicated in the TM because of the time limit and the excess of materials.

<u>UP</u>

Except for one, all the respondents pointed out that there was *too much teacher talk* in the classroom due to the amount of materials to be covered. They indicated that it was very difficult for them to integrate group and pair work into their classroom practices as indicated in the TM, because of the time limit and the upcoming proficiency exam. They said that 70% of their lessons depended on teacher talk. One of the respondents, however, claimed the opposite and said that she used group and pair work activities to teach almost everything and teacher talk in her classes was at minimum level.

The **open-ended items** included a few comments about methodology most of which are negative. Two of the other four think that teaching grammar within themes is not successful and that teachers moved away from using this method and taught students structures out of context.

<u>Administrators</u>

Both the administrators pointed out that methodology was directly related to the teacher's understanding of methodology. There were some suggestions in the teachers' manual, but these were just suggestions for the teachers. Therefore, except for their classes it is impossible to talk about methodology applied in the classrooms. One of them indicated that they were not able to supply teachers with training sessions. The first reason for this was the teacher trainers' apathy for applying such a training program for senior teachers. The other one was not to have enough time for such a program. Therefore, they decided to supply them with very detailed teachers' manual, but the teachers perceived it as lesson plans, and most of them did not like the idea of having imposed lesson plans from the administration. That was a misunderstanding.

Sub-question 2. To what extent was the CRP implemented in the classroom?

Activities related to the module system and theme-based instruction correspond to the last seven items on the tables above (starting from item 75 in students' form and item 72 in teachers' form. The percentages and mean values show that the most frequent activities of the new program was "doing vocabulary exercises within the given theme" and "teaching grammatical structures within the given theme" with mean values 3.89 (SD=..95) and 3.78 (SD=.85) respectively for **students** and 4.03 and 3.80 for **teachers**. According to both students and teachers, these are the most frequently used methods of all items in this section, apart from "teacher-based instruction".

The results on the remaining items of teachers' version, suggest negative attitudes. As can be seen from the percentages all of which are below 50%, teachers did not like the teachers' manual very much or did not

find it practical and useful despite the fact that nearly half of them (47.4%) found (M=2.55, SD:.78) some beneficial teaching ideas in it (see Table 25 ahead).

From the scores given by **students,** it can be inferred that student tasks such as "written projects at the end of a module" were done sometimes and seldom (30.7% and 28.5% respectively with a mean value of 2.43, SD=1.09). "Student presentations at the end of a module were more frequent; the percentages cluster around seldom (24.2%) , sometimes (34,2%) and usually (20.8%) and the mean value is 2.61 (SD=.1.06). The high standard deviation suggests that the frequency of these activities changed from class to class. T**eachers,** on the other hand, think that "written projects at the end of a module" was never (19.2%), seldom (38.5%) and sometimes (25%), despite the higher mean value of 2.46, SD=1.11). On the frequency of "written projects at the end of a module", teachers' responses agree with those of students, as can be seen from similar distribution of percentages and mean values. However, teachers think that student presentations were done less often; 47.7% of teachers reported that presentations were never or seldom done (19.2 %, never, 38.5, seldom).

The reported low frequency these above-mentioned two tasks may be due to the fact that half of the teachers' sample was teaching the beginner level, and such student-centered tasks of relatively demanding nature may have been less frequently assigned to students of the lower proficiency level.

The similar percentage distribution and approximate mean values on the other 3 items indicate that both **students and teachers** have reported the same thing: "written exercises on discourse patterns within the context of a given text", "doing grammar exercises within the given theme" and "analyzing a text within the given theme to understand how the writer conveys meaning using certain grammar structures & words" were applied sometimes and/or usually.

Summary: With the quantitative data at hand, it can be concluded that the suggested methodology of the theme-based approach of the CRP was implemented in the classroom to a great extent. However, longer activities that call for more production on the part of students were less commonly employed depending on individual classes at DBE last year.

Qualitative Data

PIN

With respect to the extent to which theme-based approach was implemented, PIN teachers gave a dark picture. One said that it was difficult to teach grammar within the modules. She went on to explain that teaching "grammar" after you stimulate them using the text and the content turned out to be artificial. Another teacher said that although grammar instruction was there, it remained too abstract. Likewise, she stated that grammatical structures there was not a graded sequencing of as the book was meant to be the reading skills book, but it was the reading texts that determined the sequence;: "you teach relative clauses but only part of that bit and then you move onto "participles and only a bit of that too". This, she found, confusing for students. The grammar examples were selected from the same topic; if the theme is, say, computers, the examples to present grammar had to be related to computers. Since they were text and topic-driven, not all the examples lent themselves to present that grammar. In the end, students began to resist and protest. Besides, the former teacher stated that some of the criticisms directed to the previous DBE curriculum were that it was too structure-based and the CRP was supposed to be an attempt to reverse this. However, it all backfired. She found that, conversely, "vocabulary "was acquired naturally as they were exposed to many texts.

Some teachers stated that they tried to implement the program in its original form at the start because they thought that there as a point to all this and they did not know what was coming next, but in time they had to resort to their own means such as using own examples and materials they chose themselves.
In connection with this, all the PIN teachers invariably stated that there was no "flexibility" in the curriculum; everything was dictated by the Teacher's Manual (TM). Two of the teachers indicated that they did whatever necessary for the success of their students and began to apply their own methodology disregarding the activities suggested in the TM thanks to their sheer teaching experience.

All IN teachers stated that everything was taught within the given themes, but two of the respondents mentioned that the supplementary materials they themselves prepared, especially for the grammar component, were not related to the themes.

UP

All of the upper-intermediate teachers indicated that everything was thought within the given theme, but they also suggested that the variety of themes be increased.

Administrators

Both of the respondents said that they applied what was suggested to the word, but they remarked that they had the advantage of having prepared part of the materials themselves, thus they were very much familiar with the material and suggested methodology and hence had no difficulty.

Research Question : To what extent were the assessment procedures of CRP effective?

The questionnaire section that corresponds to the appropriateness of assessment procedures was "State your opinions as to the appropriateness of assessment procedures was "How often were the following methods employed in the classroom last year?"

Table 23: *Students' Opinions about the Assessment Procedures*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)	Agree and strongly agree (%)
	The contents of MTs and PQs were parallel with the lessons' contents.	3,25	,60	8,7	91,3
	The question types used in the MTs and PQs were similar to the ones used in the lessons.	2,96	,63	18,6	81,4
	The difficulty level of the MTs and PQs **gradually** increased as required by the curriculum	2,63	,70	44,6	55,4
	The MTs and PQs given throughout the year helped my students to learn better.	2,78	,75	30,3	69,7
	The assessment tools evaluated the students' success adequately.	2,36	,77	54,6	45,5
	PG was a good tool to assess students' performance in class.	2,53	,89	46,5	53,5
	The number of MTs and PQs were enough.	2,99	,69	18,7	81,3

Table 24: *Teachers' Opinions about the Assessment Procedures*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)	Agree and strongly agree (%)
79	The contents of MTs and PQs were parallel with the lessons' contents.	2,94	,72	22	77,9
80	The question types used in the MTs and PQs were similar to the ones used in the lessons.	2,68	,70	41,4	58,7
81	The difficulty level of the MTs and PQs **gradually** increased as required by the curriculum.	2,71	,76	37,3	62,8
82	The MTs and PQs given throughout the year helped my students to learn better.	2,54	,70	47,5	52,6
83	The assessment tools evaluated the students' success adequately.	2,48	,75	56,9	43,1
84	PG was a good tool to assess students' performance in class.	2,66	,95	40,7	59,3
85	The number of MTs and PQs were enough.	2,72	,83	37,9	62

As can be seen from the tables above, regarding the assessment procedures, on the whole, both students and teachers have a favorable opinion except for the adequacy of these procedures; only 45.5% of students and 43.1% of teachers agreed with the statement "The assessment tools evaluated the students' success adequately." From the scores given on the first item on the scale, which are the highest for both students and teachers (agree & strongly agree, 91.3% and 77.9 %, respectively), it is seen that students and teachers gave feel that midterm exams and pop quizzes had content validity, for it reflected what was covered in class. Also, according to students, question types of midterms and quizzes are similar (81.4%) although teachers are not equally positive about this aspect (58.7%). On the beneficial backwash effect of testing, students are more positive: 69.7 % of them agree that the MTs and PQs given throughout the year helped them to learn better.

On another aspect of assessment tools, the number of midterms and pop quizzes and, students are more satisfied than teachers are as the percentages are considerably higher in favor of students (81.3% vs. 62%.) However, teachers have a higher opinion of performance grades (PG). In addition, teachers are more satisfied with the gradual increase in the difficulty level than students are.

Qualitative Data

Students

In the focus group **interviews** provided more in depth data on issues of assessment. Concerning whether the exams (PQs, MTs etc.) reflect what has been done in class, the validity of assessment tools, the responses are quite positive. Students were satisfied with the content and difficulty level of the PQs and MTs. They stated that by studying regularly and listening to the teacher regularly, they could be successful in exams. Only few students thought that the exams did not match with what was done in class.

Nevertheless, there were two problematic issues mentioned by the interviewees, namely, the unbalance between two academic semesters and PGs. First of all, students claimed that the first semester was easier and slower in pace. However, second semester, everything changed and became much more difficult in terms of both materials and exams. The other chaotic area was the different criteria used by DBE instructors for giving PGs. Students asserted that there was no consistency among the instructors about the PGs. Some instructors gave 100 to every student while some others gave ranging between 30 and 70. Some students claimed the more silent they kept in class, the better grades they got from PG.

Regarding the teacher feedback, it was quite obvious that students were commonly given "class feedback" as a whole. Especially, after MTs, the teachers talked about the strong and weak points of the students or in exam papers, they wrote the correct answers. However, there were also some teachers who gave individual feedback and some other teachers who did not give any feedback at all. Therefore, it could be concluded that just like the criteria in PG, feedback was also dependent on the teacher.

During the interview, students always wanted to talk about EPE and in order not to lose focus, interviewers kept telling them that there would be a part at the end of the interview when they could express their thoughts and suggestions about EPE. Although EPE falls beyond the scope of this study, - assessment tools in research question 2 refers to mainly achievement tests- some of the comments about EPE are presented below. Students started by emphasizing the inequality between June and September EPEs. They all claimed that September EPEs are much easier than the June EPE and complained about the fact that students who failed the June EPE got exemption(s) from the September EPE. Moreover, they thought that the exemption system was unfair as, in actuality, there was no difference between 59,5 and 74,5.

Furthermore, students mentioned that the DBE curriculum should be adjusted according to EPE. They asked for more grammar sessions and specific sessions targeting EPE. The interviewees agreed that EPE had become a better exam after the addition of listening and writing part; however, they complained about the fact that they could not find sufficient material to prepare for the exam. Due to this problem, students considered the listening part of the exam as the worst part. The final suggestion was about the grading system. Students told that their yearly average should be included in the calculation of their EPE scores. They claimed that their absenteeism would decrease and their motivation would reach the peak.

On the evaluation process, students' comments on **open-ended items** mainly focus on PQs (15). Majority of the students (8) want to have 'informed' PQs. When the Proficiency Exam is considered, students think that it is an unfair way of evaluating their success. Moreover, they claim that the question formats of the MTs and EPE are quite different and EPE is much more difficult than the MTs. To overcome this problem, students suggest that points from their yearly performance should be added to their proficiency scores. Finally, some students assert that student evaluation, especially PGs, is subjective and it depends on the teacher.

Teachers

PIN

All the teachers stated that the exams were congruent with the theme-based approach; grammar was assessed within a reading text. While half of the teachers stated that the midterms and pop quizzes reflected what was covered in class, two of them felt just the opposite saying that at DBE, exam topics have always been similar to the ones done in class. She said "they fell short of measuring the sub-skills". However, all of them felt that for-pre-intermediate students they were too or unnecessarily difficult, way above students' level of proficiency although the quality was good as always. One stated that they were too technical and too academic and students' grades were low and realizing that they were failing, they "took care of themselves" for EPE. Another teacher also stated that students struggled with exams above their level and most of the good PIN students could pass EPE only in September. One said " We shook their self-confidence and that was sad. The ultimate goal was "utopic".

One teacher stated that other tools of assessment such as PG could have had more weight or other alternative methods of assessment could have been incorporated. She also argued for more pop quizzes and midterms, saying that METU students are quite-exam oriented and this is what works with them.

IN

Like PIN teachers, all IN teachers pointed out that exams were closely related to the *themes* taught in the classroom, and hence, reflected the theme-based approach. Yet, three of them indicated that they were, especially in the first term, too difficult and above the students' level. Other two instructors mentioned that the types of exams were *exactly the same as the ones given in the previous years* and were far from reflecting such a change in the program. These two claimed that some *alternative assessment methods* such as

portfolio and presentations should have been integrated into the existing ones and in the following years they should replace formal modes of assessment (i.e. midterms). All of the respondents claimed that assessment techniques used to evaluate students' classroom performance should be standardized since there were tremendous differences among the teachers in the way they assess the classroom performance, and therefore, some of their students felt that this non-standard practice was not fair. Most of them indicated that the existing exams were far from preparing the students for the proficiency exam, and therefore, they demanded that some modifications in achievement exams should be made. One of the instructors, however, pointed out that the aim of the exams given at the preparatory school and the proficiency exam were totally different from each other and there was no need to modify the existing exams to make them parallel to the proficiency exam. Some of the teachers who mentioned pop quizzes said that they did not pose any problems.

UP

All the teachers in this group pointed out that the exams were within the boundaries of the *themes* taught in the classroom and their level matched the level of their students. They all mentioned that the types of exams were *exactly the same as the ones given in the previous years*. One of the instructors said that a change in a program required a parallel change in the testing and assessment methods, yet this was not done in the new program. She claimed that some *alternative assessment methods* including portfolio and presentations should have replaced the existing ones. They all agreed that classroom performance grade was extremely important especially for upper-intermediate level since all their students were required to prepare presentations, role-play activities, and projects. However, they doubted whether this component was taken into consideration in other levels in such a serious manner.

According to **open-ended items**, teachers'(11) comments on evaluation includes opinions on the quality and quantity of PQs and MTs. Most (8) of the teachers think that more pop-quizes were needed. Two teachers among the group claim that the number MTs were enough.

Administrators

While one of the participants mentioned out that the exams were within the themes and their level were appropriate for the level of their students, the other said that having grammar component in the exam was against the principles of integrated skills assessment. Yet, the latter indicated that all the exams were within the themes and the testers were dedicatedly worked to produce exams appropriate for the students. She also claimed that in the long-run the aim was to reduce the number of exams and to prepare assessment tools to evaluate students' products. They both mentioned that classroom performance grade was extremely important especially for upper-intermediate level since the students were required to prepare presentations, role-play activities, and projects. However, they both said that they were not sure if these tools were taken as seriously as it should be in each and every classroom.

Research Question 6: How was the CRP perceived by students and teachers at DBE?

The last section of the questionnaire forms were devoted to the *attitude* of students and teachers to the new-program, whose approach was supposed to be different than before in the sense that the curriculum was designed according to theme-based approach. Therefore, items on these subscales included statements about theme-based approach. Yet, as can be seen from the data collection instruments, this section is not totally parallel to one another. The teacher's version contains more items on about how theme-based approach is perceived.

On the first four items which were common in both versions students were quite positive except for the topics selected for the modules for CPR: half of them found the topics interesting (49.8%) while the other half did not (50.2%). However, although the teachers agree with the students on all of the four items related to the theme-based approach, their perception differs widely with those of the students as to the relevance of teaching language structures via themes and topics of a written or listening text; 78% of students think that they learnt language structures more easily than with theme-based approach, whereas only 32,2% of teachers found this approach viable when helping students learn and internalize language structures (M=2.88, SD:,63). To further investigate this wide gap in perceptions, one-way ANOVA was run to find out

whether students' perceptions differ in accordance with the proficiency group they belonged to at DBE last year. As the results did not yield a statistically significant value, the mean differences in perception on this item cannot be attributed to students' level of proficiency. In other words, regardless of their proficiency level, students thought that theme-based approach helped them learn the language structures easily. They believe that vocabulary worked even better (80.1%, M=2, 94, SD:.62), which is slightly lower than the ratings that teachers gave (81.3&, M=2,94, SD: .68).

The remaining items (items 94-98 on students' from), however, were not rated equally positively. Most of DBE students did not find the lessons interesting; 27,6% were not motivated (M=2.14, SD=71). More than half of them, 53.3 % were not content, (M=2.42, SD: .79) and 51.1 % (M=2.46, SD:.82) were not encouraged to improve their English, although more than half of them report that the instruction they received at DBE last year helped them to overcome the difficulties they have had in their departmental courses (58%, 2.55=.78).

Table 25: *Students' Attitude towards the New Program*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)	Agree and strongly agree (%)
90	Reading and listening to different texts under the same theme and speaking and writing about these themes and topics helped me to learn and internalize the target **language structures** more easily.	2,88	,63	22,1	78
91	Reading and listening to different texts under the same theme and speaking and writing about these themes and topics helped me to learn and internalize the target **vocabulary items** more easily.	2,94	,62	19,9	80,1
92	The topics we covered in class were mostly related to contemporary and current issues, so they helped me to broaden my world view and knowledge.	2,87	,84	29,9	70,2
93	I found the selected topics within the themes interesting.	2,48	,81	50,2	49,8
	The time allotted to each theme was just right.	2,65	,65	36,3	63,8
94	The instruction I received at DBE last year helped me to overcome the difficulties my I have had in my departmental courses	2,55	,78	42	58
95	I was content with the instruction I received at DBE last year.	2,42	,79	53,3	46,7
96	Studying sufficed to be successful (to learn English well) last year.	2,58	,86	46,2	53,7
97	I found the lessons interesting last year and my motivation was high.	2,14	,71	72,5	27,6
98	The lessons last year encouraged me to improve my English in the future (in the long-run).	2,46	,82	51,1	48,9

Table 26: *Teachers' Attitude towards the New Program*

Item no	Item	M	SD	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)	Agree and strongly agree (%)
86	Reading and listening to different texts under the same theme and speaking and writing about these themes and topics helped my students to learn and internalize the target **language structures** more easily.	2,33	,73	67,8	32,2
87	Reading and listening to different texts under the same theme and speaking and writing about these themes and topics helped my students to learn and internalize the target **vocabulary items** more easily.	2,94	,68	18,7	81,3
88	The topics we covered in class were mostly related to contemporary and current issues, so they helped my students to broaden their world view and knowledge.	2,78	,68	32,7	67,2
89	The students found the selected topics within the themes interesting.	2,12	,70	75,4	24,6
90	The time allotted to each theme was just right.	2,34	,78	63,7	36,2
91	The Teacher's Manuals were reader-friendly.	2,01	,81	70,2	29,9
92	The Teacher's Manuals included some teaching ideas that I found beneficial.	2,35	,83	52,6	47,4
93	The Teacher's Manuals helped me prepare for the lessons more easily.	2,21	,88	62,5	37,5
94	The tasks suggested in the Teacher's Manual served to achieve the aims specified.	2,07	,77	77,2	22,8

<u>Qualitative Data</u>

<u>PIN:</u>

On the whole, DBE teachers found the program too ambitious. One of the teachers said: "it was meant to be challenging, but it was too difficult for our students". Consequently motivation decreased to a great extent and students suffered a lot. They were frustrated.

Most of the teachers accentuated that they were not against theme-based approach itself but felt that the implementation failed. One of them said: I liked the mentality of the approach a lot, I expected enhancement of critical thinking and something challenging. I held onto it with hope at the start but it did not work.... though I wholeheartedly believed in it, it has been the toughest year of my life". Another teacher gave similar comments "the intention was good but at implementation level, it failed".

All of the teachers said that the necessary "foundation" had not been laid beforehand and no piloting was done; there was definitely lack of adequate preparation. Elaborating on the reasons of the alleged failure teachers mentioned management problems such as lack of teacher training, and hasty preparation of the material or inadequate preparation and implementation. One said "there had to be a preparation of a year or two.. We should have proceeded slowly. The first term upper group, the second term the intermediate group could have done this...there was not enough "scaffolding" although the right goals were set; the materials could not live up to what the program called for..... Theme-based approach could yield unfavorable results even at upper levels if we lay it too thick... Other people (those teaching upper levels) warned us, saying "be careful, it is something risky"... Maybe we should give up being too obsessed with

being "academic". Beginners need some daily English too; we literally smothered the kids... Yes we will prepare them for the departmental needs, but they need a solid foundation first".

Another teacher stated that they were all positive towards the TBA but the attitude of the administrators, the people who advocated this and the way they related –or could not relate to people- put her off. All along, they kept giving feedback and but their feedback was ignored. She called last year "worst ever".

One of the teachers said that the new administration did not, in fact, introduce anything new as they have always been doing contextual teaching and she felt that last year was a total mess.

In brief, it would not be wrong to say that all the respondents believed that the problem lied with the implementation and management of TBA, not the approach itself although they have apparently questioned the applicability of this approach at lower levels of proficiency such as elementary and beginners at DBE.

INT

All the respondents indicated that such a program offering drastic changes should have been piloted before it was implemented. All of them claimed that the program could have been successful at intermediate and upper intermediate levels, with some modifications at least. Some of the teachers said that the failure of the program was directly related to its implementation.   They claimed that the administration imposed the change without asking the opinions of the teachers. Moreover, the administrators were not open to criticisms from the house and were not willing to make the suggested modifications and ignored teachers' opinions. Two of the teachers said that "there was too much effort and seeing that this effort came down to nothing at the end was too sad". They claimed that modifying the materials and supplying teachers with proper assistance could result in success. They all indicated that with an open-door administrative policy and cooperation with teachers, the new program could be successful and might be better for the students than the one before. In brief, intermediate teachers were and are not against the program but, according to them, the implementation process was the only reason for its failure.

UPP

All the respondents insisted that such a change should have been piloted before implemented. They all agreed that the themes were too long and should be shortened. Moreover the variety of the themes should be increased. One of the teachers indicated that such an approach was very different from the one she used to use, and therefore, she had some problems in adaptation to the new program. All the teachers mentioned that there was a training session for the new program at the beginning of the term. One of the respondents said that the training sessions were not sufficient for her to adapt herself. However, they all said that they did not ask for help from the administration to supply teachers with more training although it was offered by the administration. Except for one teacher, they all said that with some modifications especially in materials this program could be very successful, and be beneficial for the students. They indicated that motivation of both the students and the teachers were higher in this program.

Administrators

The attitude of the non- administrator- respondent was very positive to CRP. She said she admitted some shortcomings did exist, but she added that it was perfectly natural with new launches anyway. In her opinion, the program was new after all, and minor inconveniences and errors are bound to happen.

The other respondent also had a very high opinion of the CRP as she said she had fully internalized the rationale. However, she mentioned several points. First, she said such a change should have been piloted before implementation, yet, since they did not have enough personnel, or, labor force, as she put it, they had to implement it at all levels all together. Such piloting meant "more material writers, more testers, and so on".

Second, she said they were not able to explain the idea, and the rationale of the new curriculum to the teachers. This, they could have done through training sessions but the sessions ultimately did not exceed a few orientation sessions introducing the new program at the beginning of the academic year. Therefore,

teacher training came down to next to nothing; this area was definitely neglected as the teacher trainers were, presumably, intimidated by the idea of training all the house teachers including senior ones.

The same respondent also indicated that such a change was not their own decision. It was a result of the newly launched curriculum the document of which was prepared by the Directorate of the School of Foreign Languages with the contribution of the teaching staff. She also claimed that since they use the same document it is impossible to understand the change in this years' approach. She said that one of the basic principles of the document was to integrate all the skills but all the components were being taught in a disintegrated manner. Therefore, this year, she said, the program was not in harmony with this principle, which is totally different from the philosophy of the existing curriculum document. Still, she thinks that last their program was successful in upper levels to a great extent and she also believes that it would be successfully applied in other levels with some modifications in the materials. The other respondent said that she was happy with the new approach though some components require modifications. She said that if the program were given a second chance, both the teachers and the students would be happier since the approach was more contributive to meaningful learning. They both indicated that if they continue to disintegrate the skills, a big problem will arise for the future of the School of Foreign Languages.

5. CONCLUSION

Research Question 1:: "**To what extent were the intended goals and objectives of the CRP (Curriculum Renewal Project) achieved at the Department of English**"?

Sub-question 1 **What do the teachers think that the goals of the CRP are?**
Sub-question 2: "**To what extent were each linguistic goal and non-linguistic goals of the CRP achieved?**"

1. As it can be observed from the interviews with teachers and administrators, most of the respondents agree that having a written curriculum document and integrating all language skills were one of the basic motives triggering such a change. However, almost none of the teachers mentioned specific goals and objectives written in the curriculum document.
2. According to ANOVA results run for the students on linguistic goals, no difference was found among the students from different proficiency levels in listening. Yet, in reading, a significant difference was observed between PIN and UP groups. Moreover, in productive skills, speaking and writing, all groups differ from one another significantly. Teachers and students have different views; students are more positive in terms of achievement of non-linguistic goals. While teachers think only" using technology and language resources appropriately" was achieved, students believe they fail only on "completing a task that requires multiple academic language skills" and " "being a highly motivated and active learner". No significant difference was found among the different proficiency groups except for "using a variety of skills". Here, quantitative data obtained from teachers were verified by qualitative data but the same does not hold for students, for they provided few responses to open-ended questions and interview questions.
3. One significant finding of this study is that there is often a big discrepancy between the perceptions of teachers and student, especially in terms of the extent that the CRP goals were achieved. Teachers are much more negative.
4. According to the results of the interviews with teachers and administrators, it would not be wrong to claim that the ideas of administrators and teachers from INT and UP groups are in harmony with each other in terms of linguistic goals.
   They all indicated that
      - the program was successful in fulfilling goals for reading and writing to a great extent,
      - the time allocated for listening should have been increased,
      - speaking was the weakest component of the program.
   A total disagreement was observed about the goal accomplishment of the program between the
PIN teachers and administrators:
PIN teachers indicated that the program was far from catering the needs of their students in any of the skills, whereas administrators admitted that theme based approach proved to be a bit hard for the proficiency level of PIN students, they were more successful especially in reading and writing compared to the performance of previous years. She said that results of EPE validate her view.

Such a finding was also available in the results of the students' questionnaire: Students of PIN group were happy with the reading and writing components of the program.

These differential results can result from dissatisfaction of PIN group teachers from the newly launched program due to several reasons including the level of materials offered by the administration, implementation of the program, and lack of communication between teachers and administration. Similarly, teachers of UP and INT groups mostly indicated that there were some problems related to the implementation of the program.

As for the non-linguistic goals, similar findings have been observed: there was a harmony between the ideas of administrator and teachers of UP and INT groups. They all indicated that such skills as autonomous learning and critical thinking were developed well. However, teachers of PIN group indicated that the program failed to accomplish its non-linguistic goals. According to the results of the quantitative data, the program was not successful in terms of reaching its non-linguistic goals. This would be partially related to the fact that half of the respondents of the questionnaire were form the PIN group teachers, who were frustrated with the theme based approach. However, most of the students were more optimistic about the accomplishment of non-linguistic goals. Their opinions did not differ according to the proficiency group they belong to except for one. This finding also supports the idea that the teachers have some more problems related to the achievement of CRP goals.

Research Question 2: To what extent do students cope with the linguistic and educational demands of their departmental courses?

When student responses about to what extent they cope with the linguistic and educational demands of their departmental courses are analyzed, it can be concluded that students were in trouble with speaking. Out of the five questionnaire items, students expressed their positive opinions in three items. The remaining two items which were marked as *not well enough* and *poorly* were both related to speaking: answering questions using grammatically and stylistically appropriate discourse patterns in oral form and asking questions during lectures, participating in debates and expressing opinions.

Teachers' perceptions on how students cope with the linguistic demands of their departments are much more negative than the students'. According to teachers, students are only competent in reading authentic and field-specific material (52,7). In other words, teachers found students weak in some skills in which students considered themselves successful such as answering questions in written form and note-taking while following a lecture.

Research Question 3: To what extent were the materials used as a part of CPR effective/useful?

In response to several questions regarding the usefulness and effectiveness of the materials, most of the students and teachers expressed their positive opinions according to quantitative findings. However, there were certain trouble spots that both the teachers' and students' written and verbal comments revealed.

To start with, the students were predominantly satisfied with the materials in general. It is obvious that **the students** found **handouts** much more useful than the books. Almost all the students agreed that they were very useful. Especially, reading (83,9%) and writing handouts (82%) were considered to be very useful. The students stated that handouts were parallel to the books, compensating for the weaknesses of the books by shortly summarizing the topics and by providing exercises about the topics. However, some students claimed that handouts were a little complicated. They thought that their appearances were not very attractive and they sometimes came very late.

However, about the handouts, there were different opinions among the teachers. Some thought that they were very beneficial, but some others claimed that they were waste of paper. However, the common point of all instructors was that the handouts always arrived at the last moment and they were full of mistakes. The teachers complained about not having enough time to integrate those handouts into their lesson plans because of their late arrival. Moreover, they thought that in order to catch up with the program, handouts were prepared very quickly and as a result, there were spelling and grammar errors. Even corrections to some correction papers were mentioned by the instructors.

According to the results of qualitative data gathered from students, reading was the most successful skill in terms of the materials. Among the books, **reading books** are believed to be the best by students (69,5 %). They especially found *Reader at Work* very beneficial. Almost all students mentioned that RAW was very appropriate especially in terms of difficulty level and pacing. Moreover, responses about *Off-line* series showed that the students found them boring but useful. However, they stated that while *Off-line 1* was appropriate in terms of difficulty, *Off-line 2* was incredibly difficult. Although upper students

thought that *Insights* was a difficult book, they liked it as it forces them to comprehend challenging texts. Similarly, the majority of the teachers found the reading materials useful or very useful

As for the **listening books**, there is a balance between students who found them useful and who didn't (50,5 %- not useful to 49,5 %- useful). According to the qualitative data, many students –especially in lower levels- complained about not having enough listening practice in class. They said that in EPE it was 20% but in class, only 5-10% of the time was allocated in the curriculum. Moreover, they added that the formats of the listening practice in class and the Proficiency Exam were quite different. Therefore, the students did not find *Contemporary Topics* very beneficial as the listening texts were quite long and its format was different from the exams. Finally, the students pointed out that the quality of the listening cassettes was very bad and that was not fair in exams.

Writing seems to be the most problematic area in the program. 53,1% of the students claimed that writing books were not very useful. Criticisms mainly focused on *PAW*. Almost all students declared their negative opinions about the book. About the other two books- *Paragraph Power* and *Paragraph Development*, students did not voice any feelings or thoughts. Parallel to their views, 84,4% of the teachers regarded writing books as not very useful or not very useful at all. This figure showed that teachers had more problems with writing books than the students (not very useful- 84,4% teachers and 53,1% students).

This can be closely related to the fact that PAW was a material intended to be used in PIN group, and the most dissatisfied group of teachers with the newly launched program was the teachers of PIN group.

According to the qualitative data, teachers mainly thought that they had enough materials. However, almost all teachers found the materials above the students' level which decreased the motivation of both students and teachers. They all claimed that they had implemented the entirety of the program. Moreover, they added that although there was not enough time, they had to use some extra materials to supplement the weaknesses of the materials. This seems contradictory. As one teacher explained, they might have assigned part of the materials to students instead of doing them in class.

As for the Teachers' Manual, apart from some upper group instructors, teachers are quite negative according to the results of both qualitative and quantitative data. They assert that it was too detailed and therefore, very restrictive and difficult to understand. According to some teachers TMs are not user-friendly and they limit the creativity and initiative of the teachers. Experienced teachers told that TMs might be helpful for novice teachers but they are very insulting for themselves. The only positive opinion about TMs was that as they included the goals and objectives, it was easier to prepare lesson plans.

Research Question 6: How was the CRP perceived by students and teachers at DBE?

The attitudes of teachers and students towards the new curriculum also vary. While students much more satisfied with the program, teachers, particularly those teaching the pre-intermediate level were totally dissatisfied. They found the new program inappropriate and too ambitious for those students who don't have the rudimentary knowledge and skills in a foreign language. This seems a very rightful complaint since theme-based approach is recommended for higher levels of proficiency and especially in an academic context in the literature (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The lower scores given on achievement of goals, especially those on productive skills by PIN students account for this view.

Also, all the teachers with a negative attitude made the point that the real problem does not lie with the educational approach but the attitude the administration and suggested ways of implementation, thinking that they were forced upon them. They felt they were not valued, as they put it "the admin ignored their criticisms altogether". On the other hand, the administrators state that the decision was not theirs; it was the natural outcome of the curricular studies and they were just implementers. They also admitted the program had shortcomings but was not something that cannot be solved, had they had been given the opportunity to improve it. In their opinion the Directorate school of Foreign Languages had to stand by CRP all the way since the curriculum document is still valid. Both the teachers and administrators believed in the necessity of piloting the program, yet, given the constraints, as one administrator pointed out, this was not possible. As a consequence, the implementation of the program began.

Another significant point is that no difference was found on the student attitudes towards CRP. In other words, the lower level students were not more significantly dissatisfied with the program unlike their teachers. It is important to note that the dissatisfaction of PIN teachers with the CRP cannot be verified quantitatively due to low number teacher questionnaire participants. Unlike the PIN teachers, the attitude of intermediate and upper-intermediate seem to be more positive as the interviews with teachers revealed.