Evaluating the Undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program at Eastern Mediterranean University

Şansel Zorba

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
February, 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçioğlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

_____
Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı
Chair, Department of English Language Teaching

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

_____
Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan
Supervisor

Examining Committee
_____

1. Prof. Dr. Ülker Vancı Osam   _____

2. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı   _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan   _____

ABSTRACT

This study mainly aimed to evaluate the undergraduate ELT program at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU). To this aim, the strengths and the weaknesses of the program perceived by the students, instructors and alumni were identified. The participants' suggestions for the improvement of the program were also elicited. Finally, the extent to which the undergraduate ELT program meets the needs of the provided students was explored.

This case study was a program evaluation study which was designed to evaluate the undergraduate ELT program at EMU and to recommend some suggestions for its improvement. Peacock's (2009) Evaluation Model was used in the study and the data were collected through a student questionnaire, student interviews, student essays, teacher interviews, an alumni questionnaire, and document analysis. Twenty six third and fourth year ELT students, eight instructors and thirty three alumni participated in this study.

The results of the study showed that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU has various strengths and weaknesses which need to be taken into consideration. The major strengths of the program are that the program trains well qualified English language teachers; balances the teaching of English, teaching skills, and classroom management skills; has a clearly stated philosophy and the reflection of this philosophy. The existence of qualified teacher trainers and the open-door policy in the department are the other strengths of the program. On the other hand, the weaknesses of the program perceived by the students, instructors and alumni are that

the program seems to not have sufficient practical components and academic events; and includes some unnecessary courses. The number of the courses in the program was also found excessive.

In relation to the strengths and the weaknesses, the students, instructors and alumni suggested some recommendations for the improvement of the program such as adding more practice, removing some of the courses, reducing the number of courses, adding courses on teaching culture and sociolinguistics, and organizing more academic events.

Overall, the results revealed that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU meets the needs of the students to a great extent. According to the results of the study, some implications for pedagogy and further research are proposed.

Keywords: program evaluation, language teacher education, English teacher education program evaluation, Peacock's (2009) model

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'ndeki (DAÜ) İngiliz Dili Eğitimi (İDE) Bölümü lisans programını değerlendirmeyi hedeflemiştir. Bu amaca uymak için programının güçlü ve zayıf yönleri öğrenci, öğretmen ve mezunlardan oluşan katılımcıların algıları baz alınarak saptamıştır. Ayrıca, programın daha iyi duruma getirilmesi için katılımcıların önerileri istenmiştir. Çalışmanın diğer bir amacı ise, lisans programının öğrencilerin ihtiyaçları ile ne derece örtüştüğünü saptamaktı.

Bu çalışma, esas olarak nitel yöntemin kullanıldığı bir olgu çalışması olup, İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştiren programı değerlendirmek için tasarlanmıştır. Katılımcılar, İDE bölümündeki 3. ve 4. sınıf öğretmen adayları, bölüm öğretim üyeleri ve 33 mezundan oluşmaktadır. Çalışma verileri, öğrenci anketi, öğrenci mülakatları, öğrenci kompozisyonları, öğretmen mülakatları, mezuniyet anketleri ve döküman analizi yoluyla toplanmıştır.

 Çalışma sonuçları DAÜ'deki İDE lisans programının dikkate alınması gereken çeşitli güçlü ve zayıf yönleri olduğunu göstermiştir. Programın güçlü yönleri şunlardır: iyi nitelikli İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştirmesi; İngilizceyi, mesleki becerileri ve sınıf yönetimi becerilerini program içerisinde dengelemesi; açıkça ifade edilmiş ve gerçeğe yansıtılmış eğitim felsefesinin varlığı. Deneyimli ve donanımlı öğretmen eğitmeni kadrosu ve açık kapı politikası, bölümün diğer güçlü yanlarıdır. Tüm bu güçlü yanlara ek olarak, programın zayıf yönleri ise şöyle sıralanabilir: pratik yapma olanağıve akademik etkinlikler konusundaki eksiklikler; programda mevcut gereksiz derslerin bulunması ve program genelinde ders sayısının fazlalığı.

Belirtilen güçlü ve zayıf yönlerlebağlantılı olarak, katılımcıların yaptıkları öneriler şöyle sıralanabilir: pratik uygulamaların artırılması; bazı derslerin programdan çıkartılması; ders sayısının azaltılması; kültür öğrenimi ve toplum-dilbilimsel ağırlıklı derslerin eklenmesi ve daha fazla akademik aktivitenin düzenlenmesi.

Genel olarak, sonuçlar DAÜ'deki İDE lisans programının öğrenci gereksinimlerine büyük oranda yanıt verdiğini göstermektedir.Çalışmanın bulgularına dayanarak programın iyileştirilmesi için bazı pedagojik sezdirimlerde bulunulmuş veileriki çalışmalar içinyapılabilecek bazı öneriler vurgulanmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: program değerlendirme, dil öğretmeni eğitimi, İngiliz dili öğretmeni eğitim programı değerlendirmesi, Peacock (2009) modeli

To my *former grandmother,*

parents and brothers

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank those who supported me throughout my thesis adventure.

My deepest pleasure goes to my angel mother Filiz, my hero father Ali, my brothers who are a part of me Berke and Burak, my lovely auntie Ayşe and my brave uncle Ahmet for their endless support and patience. I would also like to thank my lovely pets Rex and Chomsky who motivated me during my thesis writing.

Without her I could not have even start or finish my journey which began nearly 3 years ago, an unchangeable person of my life, my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan. It is an honor to thank her for her unscathed patience, support and boundless heart.

I should also express my gratitude to my teachers starting from pre-school up to this date. I cannot deny the fact that everything I have achieved is because of what they have contributed in me.

I would also like to thank the members of the examining committee – Prof. Dr. Ülker Vancı Osam and Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı – for their invaluable input and feedback on the final draft of my thesis. Furthermore, I am also grateful to all the administrative staff of the faculty as well as the secretaries for their encouragement.

Last but not least my lovely and funny office mates Ceyhan, Vedide and İlkim are the ones who have always been there for moral reinforcement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ITE	Initial Teacher Education
ELT	English Language Teaching
CAM	Context-adaptive Model
SEA	Science across Europe
REST	Reading English for Science and Technology
EST	English-Science-Technology
HEC	Higher Education Council
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
YÖDAK	Yükseköğrenim Denetlemeve Akreditasyon Kurulu (Supervisory Board of Higher Education and Accreditation)
CGPA	Cumulative Grade Point Average
AQAS	Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes
KPSS	Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı (State Personnel Selection Examination)
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Science
EMU	Eastern Mediterranean University
SER	Self Evaluation Report

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This introductory chapter provides a brief overview of the background of the study, the statement of the problem, followed by the purpose and research questions of the study, the significance of the study and the definitions of terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

English is a global language used all around the world for several purposes: educational, occupational, personal and survival (Coşkun &Daloğlu, 2010; Crystal, 2003; Hingne, 2013; Karakaş, 2012; Rohmah, 2005). For this reason, teaching and learning English is worldwide and crucial. As more and more people want to learn English, teaching English has become an important issue. With regard to this, English language teaching programs need to be organized, planned and applied carefully in order to raise well qualified language teachers. Karakaş (2012) points out the importance of training English language teachers and the evaluation of the teacher education programs with the following words: "Much emphasis, at this juncture, has been placed on the need to train highly qualified language teachers, with a direct relevance to the evaluation of English language teacher education programs (ELTEPs)" (p. 1). Moreover, the evaluation of a teacher education program needs to be done systematically in order to see if the current program is working well or not. Possible solutions to problems and some changes may be suggested at the end of the evaluation process for the improvement of the program.

The concept of evaluation has been defined differently by different scholars. In general, evaluation can be seen as a judge value of anything. More specifically it may be judging the value of situation(s), context(s), suggestion(s), history, objective(s), or goal(s) as well as a settled program or a newly introduced program in order to identify their effectiveness from various dimensions and different perspectives. Dictionary definition of 'evaluation' is: "In general, the systematic gathering of information for purposes of decision making. Evaluation may use quantitative methods (e.g. tests), qualitative methods (observation, rating) and value judgments" (Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics, 2002, p.188). In addition, Worthen and Sanders (1987) define evaluation as "the determination of a thing's value" (p. 22). In the same vein, Fleischman and Williams (1996) define evaluation as "… a tool which can be used to help teacher judge whether a curriculum or instructional approach is being implemented as planned, and to assess the extent to which stated goals and objectives are being achieved" (p. 2).

Educational evaluation is related to everything that is used in an educational context such as objectives, activities, materials, teachers and learners, their performance and administrative staff. Programs and curricula are the other elements of education so that they are the part of educational evaluation. As Worthen and Sanders (1987) point out, evaluation is a complicated process. The program evaluation process has a complex structure, and therefore, it needs to be done systematically. Program evaluation refers to judging everything related to that particular program by considering all the stakeholders. For instance, in program evaluation, the content of the courses, the materials, the teaching and assessment methods, available resources, teachers' and students' performances, administrative values and even the environment need to be taken into consideration. As Rea-Dickens and Germaine

2

(1998), Richards (1990), and Lynch (2003), who emphasize the importance of program evaluation in teacher education, Peacock (2009) states that "… it is important for every teacher-training programme to have a system for regular internal evaluation" (pp. 259-260).

Since systematic program evaluation is crucial, several program evaluation models have come out. For example, Worthen and Sanders (1987) categorize program evaluation approaches or models as follows:

1. Objectives-oriented evaluation approaches
2. Management-oriented evaluation approaches
3. Consumer-oriented evaluation approaches
4. Expertise-oriented evaluation approaches
5. Adversary-oriented evaluation approaches
6. Naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches   (p. 60).

One of the recent program evaluation models for evaluating teacher education programs has been developed by Peacock (2009). This particular model focuses on the evaluation of English language teacher education programs specifically. As it was mentioned above, learning and teaching of English language has become an important issue in education. Consequently, evaluating English language teacher education programs has been the focus of attention in the relevant literature. As in all around the world, evaluating English language teacher education programs is important in Turkish context, too. Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) and Salihoğlu (2012) have applied Peacock's (2009) model in Turkish context in order to evaluate English language teacher education programs in different settings in Turkey.

All program evaluation models have the following common purposes: examining the strengths and weaknesses of the program to improve it; providing a basis for decision making in policy formation; improving the teaching materials and programs; identifying the problems and their sources; indicating the program's impact on participants; determining the accountability of the program; suggesting possible changes in curriculum policies; defining program standards; providing a variety of information for the classroom application; improving the quality of the program users and administrators; and making the management of the program better (Lang, 2003; Parker & Lamont, 2010; Puett, 2000; Rea-Dickins & Germaine, 1992; Ross, 2003;Worthen& Sanders, 1987; Young, 1997;). In addition, Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005) state that in language programs, 'evaluation' has different roles such as a guideline for a new teacher, a dimension in analyzing the formal data, and a tool for evaluating the learning process. Because of the above mentioned purposes or functions of language program evaluation, the process can be considered very important, and therefore, it needs to be done systematically.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The undergraduate English Language Teaching program (ELT) at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) was revised in 2006-2007 academic year by the Higher Education Council (HEC) in Turkey due to a need for change. Macalister and Notion (2010) state that in educational settings, there is always a need for change in order to adapt the current situation according to the needs and the trends of the world as well as the stakeholders. As it is mentioned by Yavuz and Topkaya (2013), initial teacher education (ITE) quality needs to be kept up-to-date in order to follow and catch the fast-changing world and dynamic individual needs. Moreover, as stated by Diamond (2000, as cited in Ögeyik, 2009), the curricula of teacher education

faculties are supposed to reconsider the revision to be able to address the social demands.   Therefore, program evaluation needs to be conducted in order to check the quality of the 'change'.   Rea-Dickins and Germaine (1992) emphasize that "Evaluation should be planned systematically and based on certain principles" (p. 135). Revised undergraduate ELT programs in Turkey have been evaluated by different researchers. The revised ELT program at EMU also underwent a comprehensive evaluation, and at the end it was accredited by Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes (AQAS). However, evaluation research studies which aim at evaluating the overall program have not been conducted. Only Kunt and Özdemir (2010) evaluated the impact of methodology courses in the program, and Demirel (2014) examined student-teachers' perspectives on grammar and grammar teaching. In other words, how the overall undergraduate program works, and its strengths and weaknesses have not been examined internally through a systematic program evaluation research study which is based on one of the frameworks or models in the literature, such as Peacock's (2009) model.

For this reason, the main purpose of this study is to internally evaluate the undergraduate ELT program at EMU by using Peacock's (2009) model and considering all aspects of the program.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Considering the importance of program evaluation for the improvement of a language teacher education program the main purpose of this study is to evaluate the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. To this aim, the present study attempts to examine the strengths and the weaknesses of the revised undergraduate ELT program

at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni. In other words, it intends to find out the extent to which the program meets the needs of the prospective English language teachers enrolled in the program. Moreover, it aims to identify some suggestions for the improvement of the existing program. Overall, the present study attempts to fill the gap in the relevant literature, and trigger more language teacher education program evaluation studies in different contexts.

1.4 Research Questions

The present study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program in the ELT department at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni?

2) What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program in the ELT department at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni?

3) What are the suggestions of the ELT students, instructors, and alumni for the improvement of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU?

4) To what extent does the ELT program at EMU meet the needs of prospective English language teachers as perceived by the students and instructors?

1.5 Significance of the Study

As Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) state, the revised English Language Teacher Education Program was introduced in 2006-2007 academic year by the HEC. The ELT Department at EMU also follows the same program. In the Department of ELT at EMU, the former undergraduate ELT program was evaluated by Erozan (2005) in terms of the language improvement courses in the program, and the revised program was evaluated by Kunt and Özdemir (2010) in terms of the methodology courses' impact on student-teachers' beliefs. Additionally, the program has been comprehensively evaluated by an international institution, AQAS, and it was

accredited at the end of this evaluation process. As it can be seen, the revised undergraduate ELT program at EMU has not been evaluated as a whole program by following an evaluation model specifically designed for the evaluation of language teacher education programs, as in the studies conducted by Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010), Peacock (2009) and Salihoğlu (2012). Therefore, this study can be considered important because it attempts to fill this gap.

Peacock (2009) claims that it is crucial for every teacher-training program to apply regular and internal evaluation process systematically. In addition to the significance of program evaluation, in the relevant literature it seems that evaluating the English language teacher education programs is under-researched (Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; Peacock, 2009; Salihoğlu; 2012). Thus, this study is expected to fill this gap in the literature by conducting an internal evaluation study in EMU setting. More specifically, the revised undergraduate ELT program will be evaluated internally by considering all aspects of the program, and the strengths and the weaknesses of the program will be identified. Moreover, some recommendations for its improvement will be stated. As in the AQAS evaluation, various stakeholders' (students, instructors and alumni) views and ideas will be voiced in this study. Finally, in Peacock's (2009) study, the alumni part of the research was not successful since an adequate number of alumni was not reached. Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) and Salihoğlu (2012) did not involve the alumni in their research studies. Thus, reaching over 20 alumni (graduated after 2009) and getting their perspectives on the undergraduate ELT program at EMU can be considered another significant point of the present study.

1.6 Definition of Terms

There are fifty eight courses in the revised undergraduate ELT program (Appendix A) at EMU, and in this study the courses have been categorized under three main categories, namely language improvement courses, pedagogical courses and the others. This categorization is parallel to the ones in relevant studies (Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; Peacock, 2009). The researchers in these studies categorize courses as linguistic competence courses (language improvement courses), pedagogic competence courses (pedagogical courses) and managerial courses. However, in this study the researcher prefers to put managerial courses under the category of pedagogical courses and add one more category for the ones which cannot be placed under those two categories such as Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II, Computer I-II, and English Literature I-II.

1.6.1 Language Improvement Courses

Language improvement courses aim to develop ELT students' proficiency in English language. The courses under this category are: Contextual Grammar-I-II, Advanced Reading and Writing-I-II, Listening and Pronunciation I-II, Oral Communication Skills-I-II, Vocabulary, and Presentation Skills.

Table 1: Language Improvement Courses

1. Contextual Grammar I-II	4. Oral Communication Skills I-II
2. Advanced Reading and Writing I-II	5. Vocabulary
3. Listening and Pronunciation I-II	6. Presentation Skills

1.6.2 Pedagogical Courses

Pedagogical courses aim to inform the students about methods and principles in education; classroom management skills (education courses); various language learning and teaching skills; and, different theories, methods, approaches, and principles in foreign language teaching (subject-matter courses). Pedagogical courses can be sub-categorized into three categories: subject-matter courses, education courses and managerial courses. Subject-matter courses are: Approaches to English Language Teaching I/II, Language Acquisition, Language and Society, Literature and Language Teaching I/II, Materials Development and Adaptation in English, Major Area Elective I/II/III (English for Specific Purposes, Applied Linguistics, and Audio-Visual Aids), Research Methods in English Language Teaching, School Experience, Special Teaching Methods I/II, Teaching English to Young Learners I/II, Teaching Language Skills I/II, Teaching Practice, Testing and Evaluation in English Language Teaching, Linguistics I/II, Translation from English to Turkish, and Translation from Turkish to English. Education courses in the program are: Comparative Education, Counselling, Educational Psychology, Instructional Technology and Material Design, History of Turkish Education, Introduction to Educational Sciences, Measurement and Evaluation, Principles and Methods of Instruction, Special Education, and Turkish Education System and School Administration. The program has only one management course, which is Classroom Management.

Table 2: Pedagogical Courses

Subject-matter courses	Education Courses	Management Courses
1. Approaches to English Language Teaching I/II	1. Comparative Education	1. Classroom Management
2. Language Acquisition	2. Counselling	
3. Language and Society	3. Instructional Technology and Material Design	
4. Literature and Language Teaching I/II		
5. Materials Development and Adaptation in English	4. Educational Psychology	
6. Major Area Elective I/II/III (English for Specific Purposes, Applied Linguistics, Audio-Visual Aids…)	5. History of Turkish Education	
	6. Introduction to Educational Sciences	
7. Research Methods in English Language Teaching	7. Measurement and Evaluation	
8. School Experience		
9. Special Teaching Methods I/II	8. Principles and Methods of Instruction	
10. Teaching English to Young Learners I/II	9. Special Education	
11. Teaching Language Skills I/II		
12. Teaching Practice	10. Turkish Education System and School Administration	
13. Testing and Evaluation in English Language Teaching		
14. Linguistics I/II		
15. English-Turkish Translation		
16. Turkish-English Translation		

1.6.3 Others

Apart from language improvement courses and pedagogical courses, there are some

other courses in the undergraduate ELT program, which have been placed under the

category of others in this study. Some of these courses are university core courses

offered by the university (Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II,

Computer I-II), some of them are faculty core courses (Effective Communication Skills, Turkish I: Written Communication, Turkish II: Oral Communication, Application of Service to Community) and the rest are the courses taken from other faculties or schools such as Arts and Sciences Faculty and Modern Languages Division (English Literature I-II, Second Foreign Language I-II-III).

Table 3: Others

1. Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms-I/II	5. Second Foreign Language I/II/III
2. Computer I/II	6. Turkish I: Written Communication
3. Effective Communication Skills	7. Turkish II: Oral Communication
4. English Literature- I/II	5. Applications of Service to Community

1.6.4   Code of practice

Code of practice is related to professional ethics in a profession. More specifically, Jayamma and Sumangala define the professional ethics (equals to code of practice) as:

> Teacher professional ethics mean a set of dignified principles put into practice by the teachers. They are the valuable tactics that are exhibited and enforced by teachers in relation to the students, colleagues, community and to oneself, to produce a profound effect on strategy of education.

Moreover, as it is mentioned by Strike (1988), the ethical issues in teaching profession focus on questions of right and wrong which is related to teachers' duties and obligations, their rights, and responsibilities.

1.7 Summary

Information about the background of the study, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, the importance of the study and the definition of the terms have been presented in this chapter. In the next chapter, Literature Review, relevant literature on program evaluation, language program evaluation studies, studies on language program evaluation will be reviewed.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter aims to review the related literature. Firstly, the concepts of evaluation and program evaluation are defined. Secondly, the purposes of program evaluation are discussed. Thirdly, various program evaluation models are explained. Lastly, studies on language program evaluation and studies on language teacher education programs in different contexts are discussed.

2.1 Evaluation and Program Evaluation

According to Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005), the definition of evaluation is ambiguous and thus there are different definitions of evaluation in the literature. They define evaluation as "… a form of enquiry, ranging from research to systematic approaches to decision-making" (p.6). Like Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005), Oerman and Gaberson (2009, as cited in Stavropoulou and Stroubouki, 2014) define evaluation as "a process of making judgments about student learning achievement, clinical performance, employee competence, and educational programs, based on assessment data" (p.193).On the other hand, Weir and Roberts (1994) state that evaluation can be carried out for gathering information about a program or project to be able to declare the values and qualities of it in a systematic way.

Moreover, while Brown (1989, as cited in Weir and Roberts, 1994) describes evaluation as "the systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary to promote the improvement of the curriculum, and assess its effectiveness and efficiency, as well as participants' attitudes within a context of particular institutions involved" (p. 4). Alkin (1969) prefers to define it as "… process of ascertaining the decision areas of concern, selecting appropriate information, and collecting and analyzing information in order to report summary data useful to decision-makers in selecting among alternatives" (p. 10). According to Albright et al. (1998), however, "An evaluation should show what actually occurred, whether it had an impact, expected or unexpected and what links exist between a program and its observed impacts" (p. 1).

Trochim (2002), on the other hand, defines evaluation simply with the following words: "Evaluation is the systematic acquisition and assessment of information to provide useful feedback about some object" (p. 1). Similarly, Worthen et al. (1997) give the following definition of evaluation: "… the act of collecting and providing information to enable decision makers to function more intelligently" (p.5). Lastly, Lynch (1996) states that evaluation is an attempt for collection of various information for making judgments or descriptions.

With regard to program evaluation, Scriven (1990, as cited in Hogan, 2007) argues that program evaluation is "judging the worth or merit of something or the product of the process" (p.3). Lynch (1996), on the other hand, elaborates on the concept of program evaluation stating that program evaluation can be done through questioning the course effectiveness from the students point of view, teacher-questionnaires, administering an

achievement test at the beginning and at the end, or inviting an evaluator for reporting its strengths and weaknesses. He also lists some important questions that need to be taken into consideration when evaluating a program and the following two questions can be the combination of those questions "Has it been successful?" and "How has it succeed?" (p. 3).

Parallel to Lynch (1996), Tunç (2010) states that "Program Evaluation is therefore a systematic inquiry designed to provide information to decision makers and/or groups interested in a particular program, policy or other intervention" (p. 18).

In addition to others, Lang (2003) thinks that program evaluation is systematic processes for gathering information to be able to assess the strengths and the weaknesses of a program to provide suggestions for its improvement.

Therefore, based on the given definitions, program evaluation can be seen as assessing the various aspects of a particular program by considering the views of the stakeholders of the program; situations or the environment which program is being held; available resources that program sheltered; and strengths and weaknesses of the program in order to recommend different and possible suggestions for its betterment or improvement.

2.2 Purposes of Program Evaluation

It is obvious that program evaluation is an important process in education. Thus, various scholars have come out with several purposes of program evaluation in educational settings: analyzing the current situation related to the program; identifying strengths and weaknesses of the program; evaluating the teaching approaches, methods and techniques

as well as activities and materials used in the program, assessing the administrative duties, the effectiveness and the content of the courses and the mission and vision of the program and the values of the program in order to make it better with possible suggestions.

Worthen and Sandres (1987) list six goals of evaluation as follows;

1. to provide a basis for decision making and policy formation,
2. to asses student achievement,
3. to evaluate curricula,
4. to accredit schools,
5. to monitor expenditure of public funds,
6. to improve educational materials and programs (p. 5).

Parallel to Worthen and Sanders (1987), Posavac and Carey (2003) state six purposes of evaluation;

1. To assess unmet needs,

2. To document implementation,

3. To measure results,

4. To compare alternative programs,

5. To provide information to maintain and develop quality,

6. To detect negative side effects (cited in Erozan, 2005, p. 24).

However, Rea-Dickens and Germaine (1992) categorize the purposes of program evaluation into three categories: accountability, curriculum development and betterment and self-development (p. 23). For Scriven (1974), on the other hand, one of the aims of evaluation is to regulate the values or quality of the thing that is evaluated (cited in Worthen and Sanders, 1987, p. 5).

In addition, Tunç (2010) believes that the evaluation is a part of human life however, in relation to education she states that the basic purpose of evaluation is to attain information about the stakeholders' accomplishment in the classroom integration.

As others, Puett (2000) points out the intends of program evaluation as;

1. Identifying the effectiveness of the program,

2. Developing the processing of the program,

3. Managing limited resources in a better way,

4. Accomplishing program documents,

5. Legitimizing the funding of the program,

6. Maintaining the need for increased levels of funding

7. Fulfilling the moral duties to costumer in order to indicate positive and negative effects of program participation.

8. Recording the development of the program and activities to be able to assist effective increasing.

Moreover, Alkin (1969) categorizes the aims of evaluation into five categories: systems assessment, program planning, program implementation, program improvement, and program certification.

Worthen, Sanders and Fitzpatrick (1997) also think that evaluation has different aims such as to make sense of the worth of what is being assessed and "to determine the merit or worth of something (in program evaluation, of the program or some part of it)" (p.8).

2.3 Program Evaluation Models or Frameworks

Changing conditions and needs and looking for a better evaluation process have brought various program evaluation approaches or models into the field, and some scholars have categorized those approaches or models by considering their common characteristics.

Worthen and Sanders (1987) propose the following categories of program evaluation approaches:

1. Objectives-oriented evaluation approaches
2. Management-oriented evaluation approaches
3. Consumer-oriented evaluation approaches
4. Expertise-oriented evaluation approaches
5. Adversary-oriented evaluation approaches
6. Naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approaches (p. 60).

Objectives-oriented evaluation approaches: Worhten and Sanders (1987) state that the objectives-oriented evaluation approaches can be used in order to reset or reorganize the existing programs including their aims or the type of assessment methods to be able to identify the outputs. This approach seems to be appropriate for evaluating the outcomes and the goals of the activities which exist in the program or course, and inspecting the current assessment methods in the relevant program. All the evaluation procedure seems to be based on the 'objectives' of the activity, course or the program.

Hogan (2007) argues that the objective-oriented approach focuses on identifying the goals and objectives of the current program and to what extent they have been achieved.

Additionally, in the literature, this approach appears to be called 'Age of Tyler' (Sou, 2008).

The Tylerian Evaluation Approach, Metfessel and Michael's Evaluation Paradigm, Hammond's Evaluation Approach and Provus's Discrepancy Evaluation Model are important models in objective-oriented evaluation approach (Worhten and Sanders, 1987; Alderson and Beretta, 1992; Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005).

Management-oriented evaluation approaches: This approach seems to be mostly appropriate for decision-makers in order to make possible and necessary changes on behalf of administrative part (Hogan, 2007; Mizikaci, 2006; Rovai, 2003; Worhten & Sanders, 1987). Management-oriented evaluation approach seems to be the most applicable evaluation approach for decision making by the administrators. As stated by Worthen and Sanders (1987) "… decisions are made about inputs, processes, and outputs (p. 77). In other words, this evaluation model is used in order to examine the current situation and identify the necessary changes needed in the program by the stakeholders such as administrators, principals, teachers, policy-makers or school boards who have a role in the administrative staff.

The CIPP (context-input-process-product) Evaluation Model by Stufflebeam (1971) and The UCLA Evaluation Model by Alkin (1969, as cited in Worthen and Sanders, 1987) are the approaches under the category of management-oriented evaluation approach (p. 79).

As it was mentioned in Hogan (2007), the CIPP (context-input-process-product) Evaluation Model is developed by Stufflebeam (1971) in order to provide an opportunity for the decision makers for taking appropriate and good decisions. The name of the approach, CIPP, represents *context* (context evaluation, to serve planning decision), *input* (input evaluation, to serve structuring decisions), *process* (process evaluation to serve implementing decisions), and *product* (product evaluation to serve recycling decisions' (Worthen & Sanders, 1987).

Consumer-oriented Evaluation Approaches: After the Consumer Union approach was introduced, various checklists have emerged in order to assess the products by considering the consumers' or the students' satisfaction and pleasure about the program. According to Hogan (2007) these checklists are used by government agencies and consumer promoters who compose data to be able to evaluate product's effectiveness. Scriven's concerns and checklists are the most popular checklists in this approach (Worthen & Sanders, 1987).

Expertise-oriented Evaluation Approaches: This approach might be used by an expertise taking place in the current program or school in order to analyze its content, identify the actions taking place in the curriculum or examine the effectiveness of the theories used in the program to be able to provide sufficient and possible judgments about it (Hogan, 2007; Worthen & Sanders, 1987).

Adversary-oriented Evaluation Approaches: This approach draws a framework of the program or curriculum by considering both the weaknesses and the strengths. One step

of this approach is to examine the strengths of the program and the other is identifying the weaknesses for comparison and enhancement.

Naturalistic and Participant-oriented Evaluation Approaches: Basically, this approach aims to gain a natural situation in order to collect information about the participants (learners) such as their concerns, values and problems. Natural situation refers to the inartificial environment which program is being held. According to Hogan (2007) "The participant-oriented approach allows for the evaluator to engage with the stakeholder as a partner in solving the problems" (p. 9). Stake's Countenance Model and Parlett and Hamilton's Illuminative Evaluation Model can be given two examples of naturalistic and participant-oriented evaluation approach (Worthen & Sanders, 1987).

In addition to these six approaches to program evaluation, Kirkpatrick (1998) develops a four-level model to evaluate training programs: reaction, learning, behavior and results (Bates, 2004; Erozan, 2005; Warkins et al., 1998).

- Reaction is the first level of this model and it aims to identify the perspectives of the consumers. This stage helps the evaluator to collect information about the program and gives suggestions for its improvement. For this reason this stage is crucial. Shortly, as Clark (2012) states it aims to find an answer to the following question "How well did the learners like the learning process?"

- Learning is the second level of Kirkpatrick's (1998) model and it has been designed to find out what participants have gained throughout the program. Examining their knowledge and assessing their skills gained from the program are the basic goals of this stage. "What knowledge was learned?", "What skills

21

were developed or improved?", and "What attitudes were changed" are the main questions that need to be taken into consideration in this level.

- Behavior is the next level of the model and the main purpose of this level is to focus on the behavioral achievements of the consumers. The evaluator may like to see the degree of change of the participants' achievement in their behavior.

- Results is the last level of the model and it considers the outcomes of the program which occur as a result of the training program.

Kirkpatrick (1998) emphasizes that the levels in this model are interrelated to each other and applying all the four levels one after another may take time and it seems difficult. However, the information collected throughout this model is really valuable since it may help the evaluator to assess the program from various dimensions.

On the other hand, Nunan (1992) develops a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of a program by considering and answering the following eight questions:

1. What is the purpose of the evaluation?
2. Who is the audience for the evaluation?
3. What principles of procedures should guide the evaluation?
4. What tools, techniques and elements are appropriate?
5. Who should carry out the evaluation?
6. When should it be carried out?
7. What is the time frame and budget for the evaluation?
8. How should the evaluation be reported? (p. 196).

Lynch (1996) puts forward Context-adaptive Model (CAM) for evaluating language programs. Lynch (1990, as cited in Lynch, 1996) argues that "evaluation efforts do need

to be tailored to the specific concerns of language education programs by considering and accepting the following question: Is the program evaluation a generalized activity that has no need for a specific articulation within the context of applied linguistics?" (pp. 2-3). The CAM has seven steps:

Step 1 *Audience and goals:* examining the goals of the participants taking part in the program.

Step 2 *Context inventory:* creating a context inventory by considering the information identified in the first step.

Step 3 *Preliminary thematic framework:* introducing a thematic framework which is basic issue in the relevant context in the light of context inventory.

Step 4 *Data collection design and system:* developing a design and system by taking into consideration the information stated in the first three steps.

Step 5 *Data collection:* collecting the relevant data.

Step 6 *Data analysis:* analyzing the data.

Step 7 *Evaluation report:* reporting the results (Lynch, 1996).

He emphasized the importance and difference of this model with the following words "The distinguishing feature of this model is its flexibility in responding to the range of contextual constrains that program can encounter" (p. 24).

In addition to the program evaluation approaches, models or frameworks reviewed above, Peacock (2009) has developed a model for evaluating language teacher education programs. As a result of reviewing the relevant literature, he prepared a list of questions (Appendix B) that need to be considered in language teacher program evaluation.

By considering those questions, Peacock (2009) developed a model for evaluating the language teacher education programs. He followed the following steps in establishing this model and he recommended the researchers or evaluators to follow the same procedure in their studies:

a) Review the literature and produce a set of questions.
b) Establish appropriate sources of data in your setting.
c) Choose and design data collection methods and instruments.
d) Collect and analyse each set of data against your questions.
e) Construct an account by relating each interpretation to the others (p. 262).

He specifically developed six different instruments for different purposes in order to evaluate the teacher education programs: teacher interviews (gathering information about the program from the instructors' point of view), student interviews, student-questionnaires and student-essays(gathering information about the program from the students' perspectives), alumni questionnaires (collecting information about the program based on perceptions of graduates) and materials evaluation (examining the balance and distribution of competencies in the program). This model was used successfully in Hong Kong context by Peacock (2009), and it was also adapted to Turkish context by Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) and Salihoğlu (2012).

2.4 Studies on Language Program Evaluation

Since program evaluation is crucial in education, various studies have been conducted in the field. The common goal of these studies is to identify the effectiveness of the language programs. In other words, these program evaluation studies generally aim to analyze whether the language program is giving qualified language education by

focusing on its strengths and weaknesses. These studies also attempt to give some recommendations for program improvement.

Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005) evaluated the effectiveness of Science Across Europe (SAE) program in order to assess the effectiveness of the thematic units, identify the students' language development, and collect recommendations for program improvement. The researchers identified the focus areas to be searched as internationalism of the program (which languages are being learned), confidence level of the students, methods and approaches used by the language teachers (i.e.: English, French, German, Italian) and subject-matter teachers (science teachers), and the types of the activities used by both teachers and students enrolled in the program. The researchers spent one and a half year in order to complete this study. Teacher questionnaires and student questionnaires were administered to the representative samples selected from the schools which use the SAE program in their curriculum. The results provide the following information about the program;

- the materials of the program are easy to use,

- the program provides various activities and materials,

- the activities which require collaboration are effective,

- SAE materials motivate foreign language learning and science learning,

- no gender difference has been found,

- the experienced teachers are using the SAE frequently rather than novice teachers,

- the available facilities in school effects negatively to the use of program.

Lynch (1992) tried to investigate the effectiveness of both qualitative and quantitative methods in program evaluation in University of Guadalajara (UdeG) and University of California (Los Angeles) (UCLA) by carrying out a project named as "Reading English for Science and Technology (REST) Project. 116 3rd-year students, teacher-researchers, teacher-research assistants, program coordinators and some university professors and administrators associated with the UdeG and UCLA REST Project were the sample of this project and the data were collected in one year, between 1985 and 1986. At the end of the project, the curriculum developers of the project designed a course aiming at developing and improving the reading strategies of the science students. The results of the study show that the REST curriculum addressed the expectations of the students. However, since the proficiency level of the students was false beginners and the class sizes were bigger, it was difficult to teach and transfer reading strategies. Moreover, the low proficiency levels of students made teaching in English difficult since 2/3 of the REST Project teachers were unable to teach in Spanish. Lack of participation, bad rapport between the teachers and the students, lack of cooperation between teachers, tension and arguments, uncomfortable work office space and lack of available resources were shown as reasons for the results of the quantitative data. For example, the participants stated that bad relationship between the teachers and the students, cramped working conditions and participation problems could be reasons for reducing the effectiveness of the introduced curriculum in REST Project. The researcher also stated that the qualitative results show that the REST Project curriculum seems to introduce reading strategies and basic grammar and vocabulary skills that are necessary in reading EST (English-Science-Technology). Since the participation procedure of control group was based on willingness, qualitative data could not be collected from them.

26

On the other hand, another language program evaluation study which evaluated the effectiveness of a newly designed program was carried out by Palmer (1992) in University of Utah between 1985 and 1986. The main aim of this study was to evaluate Krashen's comprehensible input theory. To this aim, a special program had been designed. The researcher listed three reasons for the evaluation of the designed program: (a) feasibility (Is the program teachable and learnable?), (b) productivity (Is the program productive?) and (c) appealing (Is the program enjoyable?). An experimental and a control group were selected (two group of German language learners-German 101 Course) as a sample in this study and the experimental group followed the newly designed program whereas the control group was taught in a traditional way.

To collect data, three types of questions were asked to the students aiming to identify students' attitudes toward the program, students' opinions about the specific learning activities, and general attitudes toward if they had enjoyed during their learning process. The teachers were asked to state their ideas, beliefs and opinions on satisfaction level with the students' competence, grading policy, and time frame divided for the course preparation, students' confidence level in using German language, the amount of cultural issues, contents, fun and the relationships of the supervisors/staff and materials. They were also asked whether they would like to teach in the same class. In addition to students and teachers, the administrators were also asked to provide their opinions about the effectiveness of the instruction and how the experimental program contributed to the Language Department. The results of the study show that the program seemed to be practical as perceived by both the teachers and the students. At the beginning of the course (when the students were not required to produce the language) students felt

comfortable but as the course progressed the worries in using the language started to take place. Moreover, output filter (producing the language) affected the attitudes of the students negatively. Lastly, the comparative results of the experimental and control group show that the control group performed significantly better than experimental group in all of the tests.

Slimani (1992) is the other researcher who evaluated a language program. Slimani (1992) emphasized that since the learning outcomes are not reflecting the teacher's plan all the time, evaluating the classroom interaction is quite important. For this reason, the researcher thinks that 'uptake' identification process is crucial in classrooms. Allwrite (1984a, as cited in Slimani, 1992) defines the uptake as "the investigation of what individual learners claim to have learned from the interactive classroom events which have just proceeded" (pp. 198-199). In order to identify the uptake into the classroom, the participants of the study were distributed "Uptake Recall Cart" at the end of each observed session for stating their experiences gained in that particular section. Moreover, "Uptake Identification Probe" also was given to the students in order to collect detailed data on the same issue. After three class hours, students started to present their probes by using their charts. In addition, first six classes were observed by the researcher. Slimani (1992) also added interview sessions into the study for identifying the participants' reasons of the items written on the Uptake Recall Charts. It was also aimed to provide more opportunity to the students for stating more about the recall charts. Additionally, the results of the Michigan Test (a placement test used at the beginning of the course and at the end of the course without telling students that it was the same) were considered in order to compare the pre- and post-test results for seeing

the progress of the study group. The results of the pre-test and post-test show that the students who participated in the study got higher scores in the post-test compared to pre-test results. Additionally, Uptake Charts and Uptake Identification Probes' results reveal that 126 items (verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, connectors, auxiliaries, models and some set of phrases) seemed to be learned from the course (p.206). Slimani (1992) found out that 256 topicalized cases led to learning into classroom by relaying on the observation sessions. The researcher also stated that "… most of the (44%) lexical items claimed to be seen and learned for the first time in those observed events" (pp. 209-210).

As to language program evaluation studies, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) programs were evaluated by several scholars in the relevant literature. For example, the program evaluation study carried out by Alhuqbani (2014) aimed to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the English course at King Fahd Security College in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia as perceived by the teachers, current and former police cadets. Specifically, length of the course, objectives and content of the course were evaluated. The needs of the language learners were also identified. The data was collected through questionnaires and observations. The results of the study revealed that the course which was offered to the police cadets was not sufficient because it lacked the appropriate teaching principles of an ESP course as perceived by the current and former police cadets. Therefore, it was believed that the objectives of the course did not meet the needs of the learners. Furthermore, despite the English courses which police cadets took at university, both former and current cadets in addition to teachers decided that it was very crucial to teach English for security purposes. The time allocated for this course was insufficient since it was believed that learners needed more time for this course in

order to develop their language proficiency in the security field. The researcher gave various implications for the improvement of the English course for police cadets. Firstly, it was suggested that this course be reorganized considering the needs of the students. Similarly, the objectives of the course needed to be rewritten according to these needs. Lastly, this ESP course could be given to all police cadets since the English course offered at university level was not for security purposes.

Topkaya and Küçük (2010), on the other hand, identified the English language teachers' perceptions on the 4th and 5th grade English language curriculum of the state-primary schools in Beyoğlu, İstanbul. Specifically, they aimed to detect 4th and 5th grade English teachers' perceptions on the content, outcome and general characteristics of the program. 72 English teachers from 26 public schools were selected as a sample and the data was collected through a self-report questionnaire. The major results of the study indicated that the program is clear and understandable and can be a guide to preparing lesson plans. However, the teachers thought that the program is not applicable in all parts of Turkey. The findings also reveal that the program does not have a clearly stated philosophy. Even though the newly designed English language program aims to reflect Multiple Intelligences Theory, Constructivist Approach and student-centeredness, the results of the study showed that it doesn't. However, the teachers believed that the content of the program provides opportunities in group work and project assignment tasks. Moreover, the content of the curriculum gives flexibility to teachers in using various approaches and techniques in language teaching. Despite the teachers finding the course book (Key Stage I) effective, they mentioned that more seminars need to be organized which show guidance on the effective use of the course book as well as the

program. The researchers also recommended some possible implications for improving the program: organizing more seminars on the effective use of program and course book; proving more materials and available resources (CDs, CD players, printable materials etc…); and modifying the existing course book in order to address Multiple Intelligences Theory and Constructivist Approach. Lastly, since the 5th grade's course content is found ineffective and overloaded, the aims and objectives of the 5th grade program need to be revised.

Yanık (2007), on the other hand, evaluated the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades' English language curriculum from the teachers' and students' point of view in Turkey. 368 teachers and 1235 students from different public schools in seven regions of Turkey were selected as participants. Teacher and student questionnaires were used for collecting data. The major results of the study revealed that although the program was effective as perceived by both teachers and students, the facilities of the schools and classrooms were found insufficient. Moreover, the students were satisfied with the teacher-centered and student-centered classroom strategies which are organized according to the language skills. As also seen in Topkaya and Küçük (2010), the participants did not find the materials sufficient and effective which leads to problems in teaching and learning process and classroom environment. The level of teacher and student satisfaction regarding the program goals and content changed in respect to attainment of goals. For example, both parties believed that dictation activities, four skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening), and aspects of language (pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary) are attained at a moderate level. However, although reading is the most attained skill, the students still have problems with it.

Slightly different from Yanık (2007), Gunal and Demir (2012) aimed to evaluate the newly introduced 8th grade English curriculum at Polatlı, in Turkey as perceived by teachers and students. Specifically, 73 8th grade students and 10 English language teachers from the public schools in Polatlı participated in the study. Content analysis and interviews were used in order to collect the data. The results of the study reveal that the newly introduced 8th grade language curriculum lacks necessary materials in English language teaching and this deficiency leads to student demotivation. Moreover, the results of the study show that the newly introduced 8th grade English curriculum is not based on the Constructivist Approach even though one of the main aims of the newly revised curriculum was to apply this approach into English language education. The time limit, crowded classes, and limited guidance and knowledge in assessment techniques are the reasons for not using peer-evaluation, self-evaluation and portfolio as an alternative assessment. Moreover, the students also mentioned that since the given tasks are above their proficiency level, they require assistance from others to prepare them. Furthermore, as it was identified in Yanık (2007), both teachers and students expressed that the content of 8th grade English curriculum is inappropriate and ineffective when compared to the students' proficiency level and interests.

2.5 Studies on Language Teacher Education Program Evaluation

In addition to language programs, language teacher education programs have been evaluated in order to identify their strengths and weaknesses and to provide recommendations for their improvement. Evaluating the effectiveness of language teacher education programs have been the focus of attention since their effectiveness is very important for training well qualified language teachers.

One of the English language teacher program evaluation studies was carried out by Chen (2009) who aimed at evaluating the English training courses in the four-year bachelor degree in Applied English Department in Taiwan by considering the opinions and beliefs of instructors, students (mainly who want to be English Language Teachers of Young Learners) and graduates of the department. In this study, the following components of the program were taken as a basic consideration in the evaluation process: aims and objectives of the courses, course contents and materials, course conduct and teaching-learning process, and assessment and student performance. Questionnaires, interviews and document analysis were used as data collection instruments. Some of the major results of the study show that the program is achieving its goal. Both students and alumni are satisfied with the course contents and the materials in the program and they think that the instructors are qualified. They also think that the goals and the objectives of the courses meet their needs and expectations. However, they think that the program provides few opportunities in practical aspects, and they are not happy with the use of mix languages in the classroom (mother tongue and the target language). However, the instructors think that students do not participate in activities. During the interview sessions, some of the graduates on the other hand, state that the quizzes and the exams administrated to them could not assess their actual proficiency. The students also state that participation rate and presentations done in the classroom are effective but the lack of opportunity to use the target language in the classroom is a drawback since they believe that this lack may reduce their self-confidence in using the target language. Additionally, students emphasize that the materials used in the courses do not seem to be parallel with the course contents.

Regarding this, the graduates recommend adding different materials which can increase students' knowledge about and awareness of English language.

As it was indicated before, the undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program was revised in 2006-2007 by the HEC in Turkey, but, the revised program has been under-researched (Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; and Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013). In the following paragraphs some of the studies on the evaluation of the language teacher education programs in Turkish context will be reviewed.

One of the studies which try to evaluate the old undergraduate ELT program was conducted by Erozan (2005). Erozan (2005) aimed to evaluate the language improvement courses of the undergraduate ELT program at Eastern Mediterranean University in North Cyprus as perceived by the instructors and students. She used interviews, observations, and document analysis in order to collect data. The results of the study show that the language improvement courses are perceived positively by students and instructors. However, the participants contributed some suggestions such as increasing the amount of practice in the relevant courses, using more authentic materials, integrating different teaching methods and activities, and introducing intra-subject and inter-subject relationships to the curriculum.

Kunt and Özdemir (2010) identified the impact of methodology courses on pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs in the undergraduate ELT program at EMU in order to compare the first and second year students' beliefs on methodology courses. The results of the study revealed "that there were constant and conflicting beliefs among all the pre-service

teachers" (p. 3938), and taking methodology courses had a little impact on the improvement of student-teachers' beliefs.

In addition, Demirel (2014) examined student-teachers' beliefs about the role of grammar in learning and teaching English as a foreign language, their preferences in teaching grammar, and their opinions about the efficiency of the grammar courses offered in the revised undergraduate ELT program at EMU for their future profession. The data were collected through questionnaires and interviews in which 66 student-teachers participated. The results of the study showed that most of the student-teachers agreed that in learning and teaching English as a foreign language grammar has a crucial role. Although it was emphasized by most of the students that teaching grammar inductively is important, they would probably prefer to teach grammar deductively. Moreover, the findings of the study indicated that the student-teachers thought that these courses offered in the program increased their readiness level for teaching grammar in the future.

Recently, the revised undergraduate ELT program at EMU has undergone a comprehensive internal and external evaluation by an independent organization Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programs (AQAS), and at the end of this evaluation process, the program has been accredited for five years without any condition. AQAS is an independent non-profit organization which has accredited more than 4500 programs at universities since it was founded in 2002. It is a full member of the European Association of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the

European Consortium of Accreditation Agencies (ECA), and the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (ECAR).

For AQAS evaluation, the department prepared a very detailed file of evidence including 'Self Evaluation Report', a 'Programme and Module Learning Outcomes Matrix', graduate surveys, surveys with co-operating teachers and other documents. Additionally, the AQAS officials interviewed a group of BA students (years 1-4), all instructors and 2 alumni in the audit visit. The results of the Graduate survey report were also taken into consideration in this comprehensive evaluation. The program has been accredited unconditionally, but the experts made three recommendations in their report. Although the experts agreed that theory and practice were well-balanced, it was also suggested to add more practical courses to the program. The panel discussion results showed that the quality of the curriculum was strong; however, it was believed that more attention needs to be given to logistic and infrastructural development. Regarding the issue of student support, the AQAS report spoke highly of the open door policy in the department by stating that the students can always find and freely talk to instructors about any problem or question which they may experience and have in their education. Furthermore, the experts indicated that the stakeholders were highly satisfied with the program based on the results of the interviews with the alumni and the students. Other strong points noted by the AQAS experts are the existence of an adequate number of well-qualified staff, richness and availability of materials and resources of the department, and the adequate amount of facilities within the department. The followings are the recommendations of AQAS for further improvement of the program:

- More activities for fostering student experience in English speaking countries should be provided

- The number of school experience and teaching practice courses should be increased

- Participation of the students in quality-assurance-procedures should be reflected in the related documents.

According to the graduate survey report, the majority of the participants expressed strong satisfaction with the courses and the quality of education. Similarly, when the graduates were asked if they were satisfied with the instructors and the program itself in terms of objectivity of assessment and evaluation, quality of assessment and evaluation criteria, academic advisorship, students-instructors communication, teaching effectiveness of the academic staff, academic background and effectiveness of the academic staff, and program content, most of them believed that these components were highly satisfying. Additionally, a great number of graduates were satisfied with the events organized by the department. The results also showed that they were satisfied because they could easily reach the head of the department. All the graduates (100%) agreed that the program sufficiently prepared them for their professional life. Parallel to this, nearly all of the graduates (96%) mentioned that the quality of education in the department was good and 93% of them were satisfied with the learning experiences at EMU.

When the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' was analyzed, it can be seen that a great number of courses 'highly' matched with learning outcomes of the

program. For instance, ELTE 205-206 (Approaches in English Language Teaching I-II), ELTE 301-302 (Teaching English to Young Learners I-II), ELTE 401 (Materials Development and Adaptation in English), ELTE 411 (School Experience), and ELTE 406 (Teaching Practice) courses 'highly' matched with most of the learning outcomes. However, there were some courses, such as ELTE 107 and ELTE 108, in which the matching level was comparatively lower.

Another study which attempted to evaluate old undergraduate ELT program in Turkey was carried out by Seferoğlu (2006). She identified the opinions of teacher trainees in terms of methodology and practice components of a teacher education program at Middle East Technical University in Ankara by administering a report writing task to 176 students. Specifically, the research tried to identify if the methodology and practice components of the program prepare the students to the teaching profession (research question 1); what the students' suggestions for the improvement of the program are (research question 2); which components of the methodology and practice courses components are important in their teaching profession (research question 3); and how students conceptualize their education (research question 4). The first three research questions were given as a guideline to the participants and the participants were asked to organize their reports by considering those questions. The results of the study show that the prospective language teachers think that the time they spent for practice teaching is not enough and there is a lack of linkage between the materials and the real-life practice. In addition, student-teachers recommended some points for the improvement of the program such as increasing the opportunities for practice in general, introducing various opportunities into school experience and practice teaching course like providing

observation sessions with different teachers and students in different contexts, and providing various tasks for observation sessions in order to observe the class from different perspectives.

On the other hand, Karakaş (2012) tried to report the overall strengths and the weaknesses of the newly introduced undergraduate ELT program introduced by HEC in 2006 by revising various language teacher education program evaluation studies (Altan, 2006; Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; Çoskun & Ögeyik, 2009; Erozan, 2005; Salli-Çopur, 2008; Sanli, 2009; and Rea-Dickins & Garmine, 1998) both in local and international contexts in order to compare the results and to recommend some suggestions for its betterment. In other words, he generalizes the overall strengths and weaknesses of the revised undergraduate ELT program, and then, he comes up with some possible suggestions.

According to Karakaş (2012) the following can be the strengths of the revised undergraduate ELT program compared to the old one: adding (i.e. Listening and Pronouncing) and separating (i.e. listening and speaking became two different courses) some of the courses in the curriculum; making "Computer" course compulsory in order to train technology-friendly teachers and address European Profile for Language Teacher Education (EPLTE), increasing the amount of Second Foreign Language course; and revising some of the courses' contents (i.e. English Grammar became Contextual Grammar). On the other hand, as to the weaknesses, it seems that the undergraduate ELT program: is out-of-date; is lacking culture-based lessons; is lacking practical issues; does not provide enough opportunities for micro-teaching sessions; and

does not have clearly stated philosophy. Furthermore, Karakaş (2012) emphasizes that by focusing on the weaknesses the program can be improved by stating a clear-cut program philosophy, updating the program considering the recent developments in the field, and adding more practical issues to the program.

Slightly different from Karakaş (2012), Sanlı (2009) selected ten different universities from various regions in Turkey in order to compare and contrast their curricula and course contents. Document analysis was used for collecting and analyzing the data. Şimşek and Yıldırım (2005, as cited in Sanli, 2009) explained this by saying that "In qualitative research, document analysis can be a data collection method and at the same time it can be used with the other data collection methods" (p. 839). The results of the study show that although the undergraduate ELT programs in Turkey have similarities in terms of subject matter courses and educational courses, they also have some differences such as differences in elective courses, general information lessons, and lesson hours. In addition, the results of the study reveal the fact that the undergraduate ELT program is lacking practical issues compared to theoretical courses. The document analysis revealed that the English language teacher education programs do not have variety in elective lessons. Therefore, it is suggested that increasing the teaching hours of practical courses and providing more and different elective courses can be some of the possible suggestions for the improvement of the program.

On the other hand, the newly intorduced undergraduate ELT program has been evaluated by considering the stakeholders' perspectives. For example, Ögeyik (2009) evaluated the re-structured ELT program by administering a questionnaire to 53 third year student-

teachers. The students were asked to state their beliefs about the content of the program, content of the courses, course characteristics and effectiveness of the courses of the newly introduced ELT program. The results of the study show that the majority of the participants think that the restructured ELT program addresses students' needs in terms of teaching profession, social benefits and objectives, and learner autonomy. The results also show that the prospective language teachers believe that the program is practice-oriented. However, the participants find the program poor in terms of developing cultural competence. Moreover, it is also stated that the translation courses are not fully efficient and related to the teaching profession. In other words, the prospective language teachers state that they find the translation courses unnecessary and unrelated to English language teaching and they think that this course is not going to be beneficial in their teaching profession.

Besides these studies reviewed in the literature, one of the studies focuses on the evaluation of the undergraduate ELT program as perceived by instructors conducted by Yavuz and Topkaya (2013). They try to identify teachers' satisfaction level based on the changes introduced in the revised program in terms of content, procedure and the rationale of the program. To this aim, 18 ELT teachers from five different universities were selected as a sample for administrating open-ended questionnaire. According to the results, the participants have positive responses about the modified and newly added courses such as Public Speaking course, Public Service course, Literature and Language Teaching course, and Effective Communication Skills course which are stated that they are beneficial in teacher education. With regard to the convergence of the courses, such as Course Book analysis and Material Evaluation, is another strength of the program as

perceived by the teachers since it is believed that this combination avoids overlaps. Moreover, some of the courses are modified by separating courses and increasing the teaching hours. For example, language teaching skills were separated from specific teaching skills and teaching hours of 'Literature and Language Teaching' were increased. Although there are some strengths of the undergraduate ELT program, some of the drawbacks are also mentioned by the teachers. The negative responses of the teacher trainers are related with the sequence of the courses. For instance, it is mentioned that research skills course needs to be in the 3rd or 4th year rather than in the 2nd. In addition, the structure of the Public Service course is stated as a weakness because it is believed that this course is not directly related to teacher education. Moreover, reducing the credit (3 credits) of the Listening and Pronunciation course is mentioned as a drawback because in the old program this credit was 4 (2 theory + 2 practice) and it was more efficient. Furthermore, the teachers are not satisfied with removing some courses such as School Experience I and Advanced Writing Skills from the undergraduate ELT program. The results also reveal the fact that there is a communication gap between HEC and universities and by relying on the participants' responses it is recommended that faculties should be free to use their own programs.

Peacock (2009) on the other hand developed an evaluation model for evaluating English language teacher education programs. His main purpose was to plan an evaluation procedure for assessing the foreign language teacher training programs and answering Zhong's (1985) question, "What constitutes adequate training of a foreign-language teacher?". Specifically, he aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the pre-service teacher training program in Hong Kong and judge the new systems in the program as well as

evaluating its values in various contexts. To this aim, Peacock (2009) reviewed the relevant literature in-depth and listed 15 questions which need to be considered in evaluating language teacher education programs. By considering those 15 questions he developed six different instruments: student questionnaire, student interview, student essay writing task, teacher interview, alumni questionnaire and course materials evaluation. The results of Peacock's (2009) study shed light on the strengths and the weaknesses of the teacher training program in Hong Kong context.

The results show that although the English language teacher education program at the City University in Hong Kong has a clear-cut philosophy, the program does not reflect the philosophy successfully. The collected feedback from the students' essays indicates that there is an imbalance between the subject matter competence, skills and awareness. Another result is related with the nature of the program; it promotes flexibility in teaching different contexts, reflection and self-evaluation. However, a great number of participants think that the program does not have a good linkage between some of the courses and it is not up-to-date. Prospective language teachers also state that the program lacks the balance of teacher-centeredness and student-centeredness learning. Although the student teachers find the teaching practice courses effective, they think that the available time frame and opportunities for teaching practice courses is not enough. Therefore, they want to have more opportunities for practicing and experiencing the theories in language teaching that they learned through the program. In addition, the results show that the prospective language teachers are not satisfied with work load of the third year program. They think that there are too many theoretical courses and this situation overloads them.

Peacock (2009) suggests using this particular model in different contexts because it can be beneficial in order to evaluate the effectiveness of pre-service teacher training programs. Therefore, this particular model has been used by several researchers in Turkish context.

One of these studies was conducted by Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) who aim to identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the pre-service ELT program in a Turkish university from the teacher trainers' and 4th-year ELT students' perspectives. To this aim, Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) interviewed three instructors and ten 4th year students in the department and administered a questionnaire to 55 last year students in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the pedagogical courses, language improvement courses and managerial competence courses. The major findings of the quantitative results can be listed as follows: The student teachers think that the program promotes reflective teacher training; it provides valuable strategies for materials development and adaptation; and, it introduces how they can use foreign language teaching materials effectively. Moreover, the results driven from the students interviews show that the program has a qualified theoretical background; there is positive rapport between the teacher trainers and the trainees; and Materials Development Course, Teaching Technologies and Material Development Course and Community Service Course courses are the most beneficial courses in the undergraduate ELT program. However, the students highlight that the program has some drawbacks. For example, the program does not provide sufficient teaching practice opportunities; some of the course contents are not directly related to teacher education; the role of teachers and students are imbalanced; and types of assessment methods are not effective. In addition to student-teachers, teacher trainers

think that distribution of the pedagogical, linguistic and managerial courses is not balanced. Additionally, one of the instructors points out that the prospective language teachers are not able to transfer the knowledge that they have already gained from one course to another even though the program promotes the linkage. According to the results of the study, Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) suggest several recommendations like restructuring some of the course contents for avoiding overlapping, balancing the theory and practice, providing more opportunities for teaching practice, and adding new courses in management since there is only one managerial course.

Another study in which Peacock's (2009) Model was used in Turkish context was conducted by Salihoğlu (2012). His purpose was to examine the perceptions of prospective language teachers and the teacher trainers in the ELT department. A slightly adapted student-questionnaire, re-worded version of student-questionnaire for the instructors, group discussions with the teacher candidates and semi-structured interview sessions with the teacher trainers were used in order to collect the data. Gaining knowledge on how to teach English, learning how to use and adapt foreign language teaching materials, getting prepared to teach English, being trained in various teaching skills, combining the theory and practice in some of the courses, the up-to-datedness of the program, and the positive linkage between the courses are stated as strong points of the program. However, the results demonstrate that some of the courses are overlapping and the program components are not adequate. Moreover, it is believed that some of the courses do not have clearly stated objectives, intensively assign presentations do not effectively reach their aims and lack of opportunities in practicing language teaching can

be listed other weak points of the program as perceived by the student-teachers and the instructors.

The same revised undergraduate ELT program which was introduced by HEC is also used at EMU and this study attempts to evaluate the undergraduate ELT program at EMU by using the same evaluation model (Peacock's (2009) model).

2.6 Summary

In this chapter the concepts of evaluation and program evaluation have been explained. Then, some program evaluation approaches, models or frameworks have been reviewed. Moreover, several studies on language program evaluation and those on language teacher education program evaluation were discussed. The next chapter will present the method of the study.

Chapter 3

METHOD

This chapter presents detailed information about the method of the study. First, overall research design is discussed. Second, the context of the study is described. Third, the research questions are stated. Fourth, detailed information about the participants is provided. Fifth, data collection instruments are presented. Sixth, data collection procedures are explained, and lastly data analysis procedures are described.

3.1 Overall Research Design

The present study is a program evaluation study; it is a descriptive case study designed for internal evaluation of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU to recommend some suggestions for its improvement. The study also adopts qualitative and quantitative method.

Since the aim of this study is to internally evaluate a teacher education program, it is an internal program evaluation study which aims to identify strengths and weaknesses of the existing program in order to recommend some possible suggestions for its betterment. As it is described by Lang (2003), "Program evaluation is a systematic process of collecting information in order to judge strengths and weaknesses of a program and to lead to the improvement of the program being evaluated (p. 1).

The present study is a case study which includes both qualitative and quantitative data. Cresswell (2002, as cited in VanWynsberghe and Khan, 2007) states that "A case study is a problem to be studied, which will reveal an in-depth understanding of a "case" or bounded system, which involves understanding an event, activity, process, or one or more individuals" (p. 2). On the other hand, Gerring (2004) prefers to define case study as "…an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units" (p. 342). In addition, Puett (1987) highlights the importance of case study and the data gathered from case studies in the following sentence:

> Case studies are useful where one needs to understand some particular problem or situation *in great depth* and where one can identify cases *rich in information-rich in the sense* that a great deal can be learned from a few examples of the phenomenon in question (p. 19).

Moreover, a descriptive case study is defined by Mills, Durepos and Wiebe (2010) as follows:

> A descriptive case study is one that is focused and detailed, in which propositions and questions about a phenomenon are carefully scrutinized and articulated at the outset. This articulation of what is already known about the phenomenon is called a descriptive theory. It helps to specify the boundaries of the case, and it contributes significantly to the rigor of the finished case study. The power and promise of a descriptive case study lie in its potential for mining for abstract interpretations of data and theory development (p. 3).

This study aims to evaluate an existing language teacher education program from the teachers', students' and alumni's perspectives to provide suggestions for its improvement. Therefore, this study does not aim to make any changes in the program and observe the results. Furthermore, it does not attempt to explain the impact of a certain procedure. Puett (1987) states that the naturalistic inquiry approach focuses on seizing the processes and recording variations in the program as well as among

stakeholders. Therefore, this research adopts a naturalistic inquiry approach and it follows descriptive-interpretative research method too.

3.2 Peacock's (2009) Evaluation Model

In this program evaluation study, Peacock's (2009) evaluation model has been used because Peacock's (2009) model serves the purpose of this evaluation study. Peacock (2009) has developed a special model for evaluating the English Language Teacher Education programs by considering the gap in the relevant literature. Highlighting the importance of having a system for regular internal evaluation in a teacher-training program, more specifically, he explains the reason for developing a new evaluation model for pre-service teacher programs by saying that "I suggest there is a need for an evaluation procedure for foreign language teacher training programmes, including a mechanism for obtaining and using feedback on whole programmes, not individual courses, from students, teachers and others" (p. 262). Reviewing a number of studies, he comes up with a set of questions which address the overall evaluation of the teacher education program (Appendix B).

The questions set by Peacock (2009) focus on if the program: has a philosophy; reflects the philosophy; promotes adequate training in teacher education; meets the needs of the students; prepares students to teaching profession; and balances student- and teacher-centeredness as well as received knowledge and experiential knowledge.

Peacock (2009) uses different instruments to answer the questions that he listed in his review: student-questionnaire, teacher interviews, student interviews, a student-essay writing task, alumni questionnaire and materials evaluation procedure.

49

In conclusion, as Peacock's (2009) model is one of the recent models designed especially for evaluating language teacher education programs, and it has already been used in Turkish context in two different studies, it has been selected as a program evaluation in the present study. In other words, Peacock's (2009) program evaluation model has been used as the overall research design of this research study.

3.3 Context

The present study was conducted in the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department of Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) in 2013-2014 Academic Year.

EMU is one of the international universities and the oldest university in North Cyprus. Faculty of Education aims to train well-qualified and modern teachers who can function in various contexts and adopt themselves according to the recent developments and trends in the world and in the field of education (Faculty web-page). ELT Department is the oldest department in the Faculty and it has three different programs. The ELT department has an undergraduate program (Bachelor's Degree/BA), a master of arts program (MA) and a doctor of philosophy program (PhD) in English Language Teaching accredited by HEC and Supervisory Board of Higher Education and Accreditation (Yükseköğretim Denetleme ve Akreditasyon Kurulu-YÖDAK).

The undergraduate ELT program has also been recently accredited by Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes (AQAS). The department has undergone a comprehensive internal and external evaluation process and for this reason the department prepared a comprehensive file of evidence including a 'Self Evaluation Report' (SER), a 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix', graduate and co-operating teacher surveys and other documents. The experts also

interviewed the instructors, students and 2 alumni in their audit visit and at the end of the evaluation process the undergraduate ELT program has been accredited unconditionally.

The university gives a diploma when the students complete the fifty eight courses, in the BA program, successfully and this diploma is acceptable both in Cyprus, in Turkey and in most of the other countries around the world. This BA diploma gives the opportunity to teach at any public or private secondary or high school, or preparatory schools of the universities to the graduates of the program. There are fifty eight courses in the undergraduate ELT program (Appendix A) and the students have to take and pass all the courses with a CGPA of 2.00 or above in order to graduate from the program. Most of the courses in the first year are language improvement courses. During the second and third years, prospective language teachers learn the theories of foreign language teaching and they are given theoretical information in educational courses. Especially in the second semester of the third year, student-teachers start to put their theoretical knowledge into practice through various activities, tasks, assignments, projects and peer/group/team work activities. In the fourth year, teacher candidates continue to learn about foreign language teaching and testing but the major focus is on practice. To this aim, in the first semester of the fourth year, they take 'School Experience' course which provides them opportunities to observe real classes at different schools. In the last semester they take 'Teaching Practice' course in which they are expected to put what they have learned during their education into practice. In this course, they plan lessons and teach them in real classes at schools. They also practice being a reflective teacher by writing various reflection reports after each formal teaching session.

3.4 Research Questions

The research questions of the study have been formulated according to the evaluation model used in the study. The main aim of this study is to identify the strong and the weak points of the undergraduate ELT program in order to suggest some improvements and to identify whether or not the program meets the needs of the students. To this aim, the study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program in the ELT Department at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni?

2) What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program in the ELT Department at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni?

3) What are the suggestions of the ELT students, instructors, and alumni for the improvement of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU?

4) To what extent does the ELT program meet the needs of prospective English language teachers?

3.5 Participants

Since the aim of this study is to evaluate the undergraduate ELT program at EMU internally, all the instructors in the department, all the 3rd and 4th year ELT students and the alumni (graduated after 2009) of the department were selected as a convenience sample of the study.

3.5.1 ELT Instructors

There are eight instructors in the department, and all the instructors participated in this study. Three of the instructors were professors, one of them was an associate professor, three of them were assistant professors, and one of them was a senior instructor. One of

the instructors answered the questions as an instructor of the department as well as the head of the department.

Four of the instructors were female and the other four were male. Their age range changed between 36 and 56+. The year of experience of the instructors ranged between 17 and 40 years. Five of the instructors were form Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, one of them was from Turkey, and the other two were from Azerbaijan. While Turkish was the mother tongue of six instructors, Azerbaijani was the mother tongue of two instructors.

3.5.2 ELT Students (student-teachers)

The 3rd and 4th year ELT students participated in the study. 3rd year students have already taken most of the methodology courses and started putting theory into practice through micro-teachings although they lack school experience or teaching practice. Since they lacked teaching experience they were not asked to participate in interview sessions. On the other hand, the 4th year students were about to graduate because the data were collected towards the end of the spring term after they had finished their teaching practice at schools. The total number of the students who study in the 3rd and 4th year in the department was 26 (14 male-12 female). 25 of those students responded to the student-questionnaire (Appendix C) whereas 16 of them accepted to write student-essays (Appendix D) and seven 4th year students accepted to participate in interview (Appendix E) sessions. The age range of the students was between 17 and 34. The number of the 3rd year students was 16, and nine students were 4th year students. Moreover, since two of the students from the 4th year were irregular students they had not taken the teaching practice course yet. For this reason, those two students were not

asked to participate in interviews. In addition, 15 of the students were from North Cyprus, 6 of them were from Turkey and 5 of them were from other countries. 21 students' native language was Turkish while 4 students' native language was English.

3.5.3 ELT Alumni

ELT graduates were involved in the participants of the present study in order to elicit their perspectives as regards the effectiveness of the undergraduate ELT program, and identify the problems that they experience in their profession as well as their suggestions for the solution of these problems (Appendix G). When selecting the alumni sample, the year of graduation was taken into consideration in order to have a group of sample who studied the revised version of the undergraduate ELT program. Therefore, the alumni participants were selected from among the ones who graduated after 2009.

In total 33 alumni participated in the present study. Twenty-five of the graduates were female and 8 of them were male. Twelve of the participants stated that they are not working as a teacher and the other participants' year of experience varied between 3 months to 4 years. Seventeen of the graduates were working as a teacher while 16 of them either were not working or doing a different profession such as trader in a foreign company, research assistant, operation controller at an airport or translator; The ones who were teaching worked at all levels, from kindergarten to university(preparatory school).

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

The present study used instruments developed and used by Peacock (2009). They were interviews, student-questionnaire, student essays, alumni questionnaire and document analysis.

3.6.1 Teacher Interviews

Teacher interviews aim to obtain ELT instructors' perceptions regarding whether there is a clearly stated program philosophy, if the program reflects the reality, if there are overlaps between the courses, if there is a balance among pedagogical courses, language improvement courses and managerial courses, if the program is up-to-date, if the program is student-centered or teacher-centered, and if there is a balance between theory and practice. In other words, they attempt to find out information about the instructors' overall evaluation of the undergraduate ELT program.

Semi-structured interview structure was used during the teacher interviews. The instructors were given a set of questions but the researcher also asked various questions according to the given responses in order to elicit more specific and detailed information. As it was mentioned by Dörnyei (2007):

> Although there is a set of pre-prepared guiding questions and prompts, the format is open-ended and the interviewee is encouraged to elaborate on the issues raised in an exploratory manner. In other words, the interviewer provides guidance and direction (hence the '-structured' part in the name), but is also keen to follow up interesting developments and to let the interviewee elaborate on certain issues (hence the 'semi-' part) (p. 136).

The teacher interview (Appendix F) includes three parts: demographic information, internal evaluation of the program, and the overall evaluation. First part of the interview was designed for collecting demographic information about the instructors such as their gender, age, years of teaching experience, nationality and mother tongue. The second part of the interview was taken from Peacock (2009). In addition to Peacock's (2009) 15 questions (Appendix B), one more question was added by Instructor 1's suggestion; this question was related with the issue of 'code of practice' (Question 12: "Does the

programme promote code of practice?"). The reason for adding this question was to address one of the values of the department emphasized in the mission and vision statements (Student Handbook, 2013).

In the third part of the interview, the instructors were asked to do an overall evaluation of the program by answering the following questions:

- What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program?

- What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program?

- What are your suggestions for the improvement of the ELT program?

3.6.2 Student-Questionnaire

The student questionnaire (Appendix C) was administrated to 3rd and 4th year students to identify their perspectives on the effectiveness of the undergraduate ELT program. It consists of three parts: demographic information, internal evaluation of the undergraduate ELT program, and overall internal evaluation.

In the first part of the questionnaire, the students were asked to state their gender, age, class (3rd year or 4th year), nationality and mother tongue. In the second part, Peacock's (2009) 22-item instrument was used. Students were given 22 statements about the undergraduate ELT program and asked to express their opinion on a five-point Likert scale (1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-uncertain, 4- disagree and 5-strongly disagree). The questionnaire focuses on the following issues: the up-to-datedness of the program, avoidance of overlapping, effectiveness of the materials development, teaching skills, methodological, pedagogical and managerial courses, centeredness of the program, and

if the program provides reflection in its nature. It also asks if the program meets students' needs.

Lastly, in the third part, the students were asked the following questions to yield more detailed qualitative data about the strengths and the weaknesses of the program, as well as some recommendations for its improvement, as perceived by the students:

a) What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program?

b) What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program?

c) What are your suggestions for the improvement of the ELT program?

3.6.3 Student Interviews

As in teacher-interviews, student-interviews were of semi-structured type. In the student interviews, the three open-ended questions in the third part of the student-questionnaire were asked to the students. They were requested to state their ideas and beliefs regarding the strengths and the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program in detail by providing specific examples and evidence. They were also asked to suggest some recommendations for the program betterment. The same questions were asked to the students both in the student-questionnaire and student-interviews in order to obtain more detailed, in-depth data.

3.6.4 Student essays

This instrument (Appendix D) was designed by Peacock (2009) in order to collect prospective language teachers' ideas and beliefs about the philosophy of the program. To the same aim, in this study the 3rd and 4th year students were required to write one-page essay on the philosophy of the program by answering the following question:

"*Does the program reflect program philosophy?"*. The students were given a copy of the program philosophy and one-month time in order to write the essay.

3.6.5 Alumni Questionnaire

The ELT alumni (graduated after 2009) were given a questionnaire (Appendix G) and asked to answer five open-ended questions regarding the strengths and the weaknesses of the 4-year undergraduate ELT program, problems that they face in their teaching profession and how they solve those problems, as well as their suggestions for the improvement of the program. The researcher was inspired by the Peacock's Model (2009) in designing the questions of the alumni-questionnaire. In other words, since Peacock (2009) aimed to receive alumni's suggestions for the improvement of the program and identify their problems, the questions in the alumni-questionnaire were designed accordingly.

3.6.6 Document Analysis

Each semester the instructors in the ELT Department distribute course policy sheets to the students which show the learning outcomes of the course, the topics that will be covered in the course, and the assessment criteria as well as the resources to be used. Those course policy sheets were analyzed to obtain data concerning the balance between linguistic competence, pedagogic competence, and managerial competence. Additionally, all the goals, classroom procedures and learning outcomes of the ELTE coded courses were compared with the values and the overall learning outcomes of the department in order to reach more reliable data by crosschecking data for the last research question. First, all the aims, classroom procedures and learning outcomes of the ELTE coded courses read carefully. Then, the requirements, weekly instructional

plans and evaluation criteria were checked. Finally, all those components were compared with the values and the overall learning outcomes of the program.

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

After getting official permission to conduct a research at the Department of ELT, the data collection process started. The data were collected in several steps. First, the $3^{rd}$and 4th year ELT students were informed about the aim of the study, and then, their written consents were taken. Second, the student essays on the program philosophy were distributed and the participants were given one month time to read the philosophy and write an essay to state their ideas and beliefs about the philosophy of the program. Third, the alumni questionnaires were distributed via e-mail. Fourth, the student questionnaires were administrated within two weeks. Student questionnaires were distributed towards the end of the spring semester just before the final week. Fifth, the interview appointments were taken from the instructors and the fourth year students. The interview sessions were recorded with the interviewees' permission, and the researcher took down some notes as well. The instructors were given the "Teacher Interview Guideline Form" and asked to answer the questions by providing specific evidence and examples based on their experience. The interviewees were conducted in the instructors' offices and they lasted approximately 30 minutes.

As to student interviews, the students were given the interview questions and asked to answer them. During the semi-structured interviews, the researcher asked some extra questions to guide the interviewee for providing specific and detailed information about

the strengths and the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. The interviews with students lasted approximately 10 minutes.

Lastly, during the spring semester, course policy sheets of the fall and spring semesters were collected. The department supplied the course outlines which were prepared for a comprehensive external evaluation study: AQAS.

3.8 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data collected in the second part of the student questionnaire and the closed-items part of the student questionnaire were analyzed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program, version 18.0, and frequencies were calculated. Then, the frequencies for 'strongly agree' and 'agree' and the ones for 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' were combined, respectively.

Qualitative data were collected through the third part of the student questionnaires, student and teacher interviews, student essays, alumni questionnaires and course policy sheets. The open-ended questions were analyzed by using cross-case analysis and coding. *Case analysis* and *cross-case analysis* are two strategies described by Patton (1990, as cited in Erozan, 2005). The former requires writing each participant's case or each unit focused. The latter means collecting different responses under one question or unit (p. 365). Moreover, Dörnyei (2007) says that "Researchers usually code and recode a text several times, with the initial, usually descriptive and low-inference codes gradually being replaced or supplemented by higher-order 'pattern codes'" (p. 251).

With regard to course policy sheets, the researcher analyzed course outlines in order to find out to what extent they address the values and the learning outcomes of the undergraduate ELT program specified in the Student Handbook (2013). More specifically, the aim of the courses, classroom procedures, evaluation methods, weekly instructional plans, and learning outcomes of each course were analyzed against the values and the learning outcomes of the program. The values of the undergraduate ELT program are: learner-centeredness; the code of practice; contemporary language education; high standards in teaching; quality research; multilingualism; and multiculturalism.

> Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have: developed skills for effective oral and written communication in English; developed analytical, critical thinking and problem solving skills; acquired core ELT concepts, as well as theoretical and practical knowledge compatible with contemporary professional requirements; developed skills for effective planning, preparation and execution of language teaching; applied acquired knowledge and skills to practice through microteachings as well as in actual English Language Teaching classrooms; become confident, creative, and autonomous language teachers; gained an adequate competence in English language Teaching or for MA studies; become aware of professional ethics; become receptive to the philosophy of lifelong learning as well as continuous professional development; and become aware of the ELT impact in the globalizing world

are the learning outcomes of the undergraduate ELT program (Student Handbook, 2013).

3.9 Limitations and Delimitations

There are several limitations and delimitations of this study. The size of alumni and lack of observation sessions can be some of the limitations of the study. The results of the alumni questionnaire cannot be generalized because of the limited number of alumni. Another limitation is that the study is lacking observation sessions. Although adding

61

observation sessions into the model is suggested by Peacock (2009), Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) and Salihoğlu (2012), also did not include observations in their studies. On the other hand, the present study has also some delimitations: successfully obtaining data from the alumni-questionnaire, using document analysis in a different angle, and being the first MA study conducted in the department which uses Peacock's (2009) model to evaluate the overall BA program. In the Hong Kong context, the alumni part of the study was not successfully completed due to the limited number of the alumni, and in the two Turkish contexts (Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; and Salihoğlu, 2012) this part of the model was not used at all. Therefore, reaching most of the alumni and collecting 33 alumni questionnaire can be shown as one of the delimitations. In addition, Peacock (2009), Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) and Salihoğlu (2012) used the course policy sheets in order to calculate the percentages of the linguistic, pedagogic and managerial courses in the program. However, in this study, apart from calculating the percentages, the course policy sheets were also used in order to find out to what extent the course outlines address the values and the learning outcomes of the program. In other words, adding to one more step in the document analysis may be helpful for going one step further. Another delimitation of the study is that the study followed Peacock's (2009) model and being able to compare findings with findings in the other Turkish contexts in which the same model was used.

3.10 Summary

In this chapter, the details concerning the method of the study have been presented: overall research design, the context of the study, the research questions, participants,

data collection instruments, data collection and analysis procedures and limitations and

delimitations of the study.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The aim of this chapter is to present the results of the study. To this aim, the results obtained from the student questionnaire, student essays, student interviews, teacher interviews, the alumni questionnaires and the course policy sheets are explained respectively.

4.1 Student-Questionnaire

The purpose of this instrument was to identify students' perceptions of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. More specifically, the student questionnaire aimed at finding out strengths and weaknesses of the program as perceived by the students as well as identifying their suggestions for its improvement.

4.1.1 Quantitative Data (Closed Items)

In the second part of the questionnaire, first the students were given 22 statements about the undergraduate ELT program at EMU, and they were asked to express their opinion on a 5-point Likert scale. The results of the overall responses were presented in Appendix H. Moreover, in this chapter, as in Peacock (2009), the data obtained from the quantitative part of the student questionnaire were presented by combining the percentages of strongly agree and agree and strongly disagree and disagree, respectively. The results of this part of the questionnaire are shown in Table 4. Overall, the level of agreement (strongly agree and agree) ranged between 100 - 72 % whereas the level of

disagreement changed between 8 – 4%.Level of uncertainty (neither agree nor disagree)

changed between 0 - 8%.

Table 4: Student Questionnaire Results

Number	The undergraduate ELT Program at EMU…	Agree or strongly Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree or strongly disagree
1	… has good linkage between different courses.	88%	8%	4%
2	… avoids overlapping information between different courses.	76%	20%	4%
3	… gave me adequate training in English.	92%	4%	4%
4	… gave me adequate training in teaching skills.	92%	4%	4%
5	… gave me adequate training for the needs of the local context.	72%	24%	4%
6	… is up-to-date.	72%	28%	0%
7	… encouraged me to reflect on my past experiences as a language learner.	80%	16%	4%
8	… encouraged me to be a reflective teacher (when I start teaching).	88%	4%	8%
9	… promotes flexibility in using different teaching practices for different situations.	80%	16%	4%
10	… balances teacher-centered and student-centered learning on its courses.	76%	24%	0%
11	… taught me how to teach English.	92%	4%	4%
12	… taught me how to evaluate myself as a teacher.	88%	8%	4%
13	… taught me classroom management skills .	96%	4%	0%

14	… taught me how to use foreign language teaching materials.	88%	8%	4%
15	… taught me how to adapt foreign language teaching materials.	84%	12%	4%
16	… increased my powers of self-evaluation.	92%	8%	0%
17	… taught me foreign language testing and evaluation skills.	80%	16%	4%
18	… is relevant to my needs.	72%	28%	0%
19	… has a good balance between the teaching of; English, teaching skills, and classroom management skills.	100%	0%	0%
20	… prepared me to teach English in the classroom.	96%	4%	0%
21	… met my needs.	76%	20%	4%
22	By the end of the Undergraduate ELT Programme at EMU, I will be ready to teach English.	88%	12%	0%

As can be seen in Table 4., the highest level of agreement is for item 19 about which all of the student teachers (100 %) thought that *the undergraduate ELT program at EMU has a good balance between the teaching of; English teaching skills, and classroom management skills* (item 19). This is followed by items 13 and 20: 96 % of the students thought that the program *teaches classroom management skills* (item 13) and *prepares to teach English in the classroom* (item 20) whereas only 4 % of them were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed). The students also expressed high level of agreement with items 3,4,11 and 16. More specifically, 92% of the students agreed that *the undergraduate ELT program at EMU gives adequate training in English* (item 3) and *teaching skills* (item 4), *teaches how to teach English* (item 11), and *increases powers*

of self-evaluation of the students (item 16) while 4 % of them disagreed and the other 4 % expressed uncertainty with items 3, 4 and 11. On the other hand, 8 % of the students neither agreed nor disagreed with item 16 while no one disagreed with it.

Moreover, the results reveal that 88 % of the students thought that *the program has a good linkage between different courses* (item 1); *encourages to be a reflective teacher (when they start teaching)* (item 8); *teaches how to evaluate themselves as a teacher* (item 12); *teaches how to use foreign language teaching materials* (item 14); and *by the end of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU, they will be ready to teach English* (item 22). However, only 4% of the students were not sure about item 8 and the rest (8%) did not believe that the program *encourages being a reflective teacher.* Additionally, 8% of the students were not sure if the program *teaches how to evaluate themselves as a teacher* (item 12) or *teaches how to use foreign language teaching materials* (item 14) whereas 4 % of them did not believe (i.e. disagreed or strongly disagreed) that the program teaches those aspects. Moreover, 12 % of the students neither agreed nor disagreed that *they will be ready to teach English by the end of the program* (item 22).

The results given in Table 4.1 also show that the majority of the students believed that *the undergraduate ELT program at EMU teaches how to adapt foreign language teaching materials* (item 15): while 84% of them agreed or strongly agreed with this item, 12 % of them did not state any agreement or disagreement, and 4 % of them did not think that the program provides this to them.

Moreover, 80% of the students showed agreement with item 7 (*the program encouraged me to reflect their past experiences as a language learner*), item 9 (*the programs flexibility in using different teaching practices for different situations*) and item17 (*it taught foreign language testing and evaluation skills*).However 16 % of the participants neither agreed nor disagreed with these items, while only 4% of them disagreed or strongly disagreed.

With regard to items 2, 10 and 21, 76 % of the students thought (agreed or strongly agreed) that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU *avoids overlapping information between different courses* (item 2), *balances teacher-centered and student-centered learning on its courses* (item 10)| and *met their needs* (item 21). On the other hand, 20 % of the students expressed uncertainty and 4 % of them disagreed with items 2 and 21 whereas 24% of the students were not sure about item 10.

Furthermore, 72 % of the students believed that the program *gave them adequate training for the needs of the local context* (item 5), *it is up-to-date* (item 6), and *is relevant to their needs* (item 18) whereas 28 % of the students did not state any agreement or disagreement on items 6 and 18. 24 % of the participants were neutral regarding whether or not *the program gave them adequate training for the needs of the local context* while 4 % of them disagreed on that.

Overall, the results of the second part of the student questionnaire (quantitative data) show that the ELT students have positive attitudes towards the undergraduate ELT

program at EMU because they generally expressed high levels of agreement with the statements about different aspects of the program given in this part of the questionnaire.

4.1.2 Qualitative Data (Open-ended items)

The qualitative data were obtained through the three open-ended questions in the student questionnaire. With regard to the strengths of the program (question 1), the results show that there are various strengths of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. 64 % of the students (16 students) believed that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU trains effective language teachers. For example, Student 5 said "This program really helps and prepares us to be good English language teachers", and Student 15 stated "I believe that our department is one of the best ELT departments in North Cyprus". In addition, student 22 stated: "Our department provides us to be a flexible and reflective teacher. Our courses concentrate on making us very good teachers". Another student (Student 23) stressed that the ELT program equips them with theoretical knowledge regarding how to manage the classroom, and gives them the opportunity to choose which methods they are going to use in their prospective classes, as well as teaching them how to use certain teaching skills in their professional life.

Another strength mentioned by 7 students was that in the department, the instructors are well qualified. For example, one of the students (Student 15) said "I think teachers are very kind and friendly. We (students) can easily co-operate with our teachers. For that reason, we feel secure and happy". In addition, Student 12 stated that the teachers are very helpful and experienced.

Moreover, the results show that there is a technology enhanced teaching and learning environment in the department (5 students). Student 4 stressed that "Using technological devices and teaching how to use them may be one of the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program". Parallel to this student, Student 6 emphasized: "Technological equipment gives us very good opportunities to learn how to use methods and approaches effectively".

Another strength of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU as perceived by four students is the effectiveness of teaching materials like books, articles, and equipment and resources. For instance, one of the participants stated that "ELT books are good". To exemplify, Student 21 focused on the course books and argued that "they have got good and detailed examples and the topics are explained clearly." On the other hand, student 24 concentrated on the classroom activities and mentioned that they are "effective in majority of the lessons".

Furthermore, two of the students thought that *the undergraduate ELT program helps develop self-esteem* by emphasizing that "The undergraduate ELT program brings our self-esteem out through micro-teachings which give us a chance to see what we will do and how we will feel when we become teachers in the future" (Student 17).

The other strengths of the undergraduate ELT program as stated by the students are as follows:

- There is good rapport between the instructors and the students. ("Teacher-student relationship is great," stated by Student 7)

- The ELT program promotes autonomy (Student 9 said: "Most of our ELT courses focus on autonomous learning which is the most important thing for us.")

- Apart from training effective language teachers, Student 10 believed that the program also educates teacher trainers who can train English language teachers. (Student 10 explains his/her beliefs with the following sentence: "In the ELT program, when the students graduate, they will teach English like a native and also, they will teach the students how to teach the English language.")

- The courses include well-designed activities such as presentations and micro-teachings.

- The undergraduate ELT program has just been accredited by AQAS. ("Lastly, we have gotten AQAS. It gives us really good status as prospective English teachers," stated by Student 11)

- The program meets the needs of the students. (Student 16 said: "The four-year program has an important contribution to the students. Both the presentations and the projects meet the needs of the students.").

Although students stated various strengths, they thought that the undergraduate ELT program also has some weaknesses. 32% of the students believed that *the undergraduate ELT program at EMU seems to lack practical components.* They also complained about *the existence of unnecessary courses such as Turkish (Turkish I: Written Communication and Turkish II: Oral Communication), Computer (Computer I and Computer II) and History (Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II).* For example Student 2 stressed that there should be more emphasis on Teaching Practice course (ELTE406) instead of having History classes and some education courses. Another student also

expressed the same beliefs concerning the lack of sufficient teaching practice by saying that "ELTE 406-Teaching Practice Course is very important for us and we did only 4 hours of real teaching and I think it should be more than 4 hours because it is not enough to get experience" (Student 6).

Regarding the issue of unnecessary courses in the program, one of the students (student 12) interestingly stated his/her opinion as follows: "ITEC105-106!! Waste of time." Parallel to this student, Student 16 mentioned that History and Turkish classes are not necessary in English language teacher education stating "Some of the courses like History and Turkish should not be placed in the undergraduate ELT curriculum since they do not meet the needs of the students".

Furthermore, three of the students considered *the number of courses in the ELT program* and *the infrastructure of the department* as weaknesses. For instance, one of the students (Student 12) stated: "Poor Wi-Fi, no canteen, poor classroom settings, and poor toilets".

Lack of further options in Second Foreign Language Course (French or German only) and the unequal proficiency level of the students are the other weaknesses mentioned by two of the students. For example, Student 21 said "I did not have a chance to take Greek or Russian as a second foreign language course. I was pushed to take German". Additionally, one of the students thought that the ELT students should have more or less the same proficiency level in order to go through effective teaching-learning process by stressing "There is a huge gap between some students. This creates unstable learning environment." (Student 7).

Other weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU as perceived by the students are as follows:

- Listening and writing skills are not taught effectively enough.

- Teaching Practice course lacks practice on testing a real classroom atmosphere due to lack of time allocated for this course (stated by Student 3 "Teaching practice is only one class and can't show us the reliable testing practices with real students."),

- Some of the lessons are boring.

- The ELT program does not provide sufficient speaking practice.

- The attendance system is compulsory (80 % compulsory attendance); there is no need for "NG" grade.

- Some instructors do not give enough detailed feedback (For instance, Student 15 said: "When the projects are submitted most of the teachers give us only a grade. Because of that you cannot evaluate yourself and your mistakes.")

- The submission dates of the projects are not at the right time (Student 16 stated: "The projects should not be assigned during exam weeks."),

- The Department library is not used effectively.

- The number of grammar and vocabulary courses is insufficient (Student 19: "Many students come to the department lacking basic grammar and vocabulary, and the grammar and vocabulary courses in our program are few.").

- Some instructors do not use effective teaching methods (as stated by Student 21 "Lessons are not explained well in the classroom. Some teachers should be clearer in teaching lessons."),

- Summer school is not given in the department ("I want to take courses in the summer school to graduate earlier," said Student 21)

- The book used in the 'Measurement and Evaluation' course is not effective (as stated by Student 24, "Measurement and evaluation book is not very relevant to the course.").

After stating the strengths and the weaknesses of the program, the students were asked to provide suggestions for its improvement. 44 % of the students (11 students) suggested adding *more practice to the program*. For example, while Student 1 said that "More importance should be given to the presentations rather than projects", another student (Student 11) thought that students can learn theory and put this theoretical information onto paper but they lack the necessary practical skills by stating "We will be 4th year students next semester. We write many lesson plans in many courses but we can put only half of them into practice as micro-teachings. This is not enough. Of course knowing some topics is important but practice makes perfect." Parallel to those two students, Student 23 suggested "In order to improve students' teaching skills more practice-based courses should be added so students can easily mix their theoretical knowledge with practical skills"

One of the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU as stated by the students is the existence of unnecessary courses such as History and Turkish. With regard to this weakness, the students thought that these courses need to be removed from the undergraduate ELT program. They believed that more ELT related courses can be added to the program. For example, Student 5 thought that instead of History and

Turkish classes, more and different courses related to English language and English language teaching can be added to the program. Like Student 5, Student 21 suggested replacing History courses with other ELT courses. Student 6 added that Turkish and History classes are waste of time by saying "Turkish and History are waste of time for ELT students; so, instead of these courses they can add courses which are related with ELT; for example, History of Language".

The followings are the third mostly stated (2 students) suggestions for the improvement of the program: *the number of the courses should be decreased*; *infrastructure of the department should be reconsidered*; *more options for Second Foreign Language should be given*; *criteria should be set to accept students to the department*; *some of the courses should be combined*; and, *more detailed feedback should be given by the instructors*. For instance, Student 22 argued that the number of courses should be decreased since "the students are overloaded". With regard infrastructure of the department, Student 4 mentioned that the classroom environment needs to be redesigned in order to create effective atmosphere for both the teachers and the students. Furthermore, two of the students mentioned that the options given for Second Foreign Language Course are not satisfying. They believed that the students should have more options in Second Foreign Language Course like Spanish and Italian languages. For instance, Student 21 thought that the options for second foreign language should not be limited to only German and French. Concerning feedback, two students suggested that the instructors in the department give more detailed feedback to students about their projects and assignments, instead of providing a grade.

The rest of the suggestions given by the students are as follows:

- Teaching listening and writing skills should be improved; more emphasis should be put on listening and writing skills.

- Testing and assessment methods should be revised.

- Lessons should be more active.

- More speaking-based activities should be done; speaking practice should be increased.

- Timetables should be reorganized so that there will be no long breaks between lessons.

- Real teaching practice elements should be added to Teaching English to Young Learners course (as suggested by Student 14 "Maybe 3rd year ELT students can go to nursery schools or primary schools to practice teaching young learners before they go to secondary schools for teaching".)

- More seminars and conferences should be organized ("More seminars and conferences" suggested by Student 15)

- Variety should be added to some courses (Student 17 proposed: "Make the lessons more fun by preparing different activities. Teachers can take feedback from students and they can see what is enjoyable for their students.")

- Courses should be offered during the Summer School.

- The same course should not be given by the same teachers all the time (Student 12 suggested: "Change teachers for courses; not always the same teacher")

4.2 Student Essays

The aim of this instrument was to find out students' opinions about how the undergraduate ELT program reflects its philosophy. Sixteen students from 3rd and 4th year accepted to write essays on the philosophy of the program. The data from the student essays were analyzed in two steps: First, the responses were categorized as 'Yes', 'No' or 'Partly Yes', and then the given reasons were categorized as 'positive' or 'negative'. The results show that 12 students believed that *the program reflects its philosophy* whereas 4 students thought the program *partly* reflects the philosophy and no one thought that the program does not reflect the philosophy. The students gave both positive and/or negative reasons to explain their opinions.

As stated in the Student Handbook (2013), the program aims to provide both theoretical knowledge and practical skills about the profession in order to prepare the students for their future careers. Thirteen students argued that the program gives qualified training, and they stated various reasons for that: the existence of quality research; effective courses which train students professionally; developing autonomy; high standards in teaching; and practical tasks. Moreover, two of the students (Students 5 and 6) agreed that the ELT Department at EMU is the best ELT department in North Cyprus. For example, Student 5 stated:

> Yes, the program reflects the philosophy. Before I came here, I thought that it was impossible for a department to achieve all of these but since I came here, I have improved myself, my knowledge and skills about teaching. In most of the universities when you graduate you are inexperienced in teaching, but in our department all the courses prepare us to be ready for our future teaching career.

Another positive reason mentioned by four students is about the effectiveness of ELTE406 (Teaching Practice) course. In addition to this, 3 students gave the existence of 'Code of practice', which is one of the values of the undergraduate ELT program as another positive reason to show that the program reflects the philosophy. In the Student Handbook (2013), one of the learning outcomes of the undergraduate ELT program is to help students to be accurate and fluent in English language through language improvement courses, and two of the students emphasized that language improvement courses are important and necessary and these courses helped them a lot to improve their language proficiency.

The other two students thought that the program reflects its philosophy because it gives effective guidance for a successful career. Moreover, offering Major Area Elective courses was mentioned as a positive reason by two of the students. The balance between received knowledge and experiential knowledge is another positive reason mentioned by two of the students. Finally, the other positive reasons given by the students can be summarized as follows:

- The undergraduate ELT program reflects the aims and objectives stated in the philosophy.
- The contents of the courses are up-to-date.
- The program focuses on multilingualism and multiculturalism.
- The program is up-to-date.
- Since the undergraduate ELT program has been accredited by an international institution (AQAS), it shows that the program reflects the philosophy.

- As there are students from different countries in the department, various cultural values are present. This shows that the nature of the program meets one of the values of the department which is 'multiculturalism'.

Along with the above-explained positive reasons, some negative reasons were also given by the students who thought that the program partly reflects the program philosophy. One of the students thought that the proficiency levels of the students are not equal so that the department needs to be more selective in accepting students in order to follow what is stated in the philosophy; it is believed that students with low proficiency cannot achieve the learning outcomes stated in the philosophy. In addition, one of the students mentioned that some of the teachers in the department do not use effective teaching approaches and methods, and this makes the program philosophy unrealistic. Moreover, one of the students believed that the number of the courses makes the philosophy of the program out-of date compared to European universities. Similarly, another student stated that there are some unnecessary courses in the program which are History and Turkish courses. Lastly, one of the students considered not having summer school opportunities as a barrier to the program fully reflecting its philosophy.

4.3 Student Interviews

Student interviews aimed at collecting in-depth data as regards students' perceptions on the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program as well as their suggestions for its improvement. Through interviews, the data obtained from the open-ended questions in the student questionnaire were supported and elaborated on.

With regard to strengths, five of the students believed that the undergraduate ELT program raises effective language teachers. For example, Student 2 uttered: "The

program teaches 'how to teach' with various courses and I think all the courses in this program help us to be a well-trained language teacher in the future."

Another strength of the program stated by five students is the *effectiveness of the subject matter courses in the program*. To exemplify, Student 6 said that the methodology courses successfully prepare students to be English teachers by saying "All the approaches, methods, and techniques in English language teaching, how to adapt materials, how students learn, learning styles, as well as how to be a flexible teacher were taught in the program." In addition to the effectiveness of the subject matter courses, four of the students thought that the language improvement courses in the program were also effective. It is believed that those courses helped them to improve their English language proficiency, and the courses also equipped them with adequate knowledge they can use when they teach grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation in the future.

Moreover, three of the students mentioned *the given assignments and projects as a strength. They believed that they were fruitful for the students*. For instance, Student 2 believed that learning by doing is very effective and students can learn better through practice instead of memorization. More specifically, Student 2 added:

> Additionally, I can say that projects are more important than exams because the exams are based on memorization. For example, right now I am taking ELTE 402 (Testing and Evaluation in English Language Teaching) course and I really like it because the teacher not only asks 'the five principles of testing' in the exam but also assigns a project about it, and we have learned them very well. I believe that I will never forget these 5 principles since I had a chance to practice it. I always support learning by doing.

Regarding the strengths of the program, two of the students stated that *the Classroom Management course was effective* by emphasizing some of the features of the course. The students argued that the course was effective because it was based on management skills. For instance, Student 4 thought that if a teacher cannot manage the class, s/he cannot teach as well ("I believe that the classroom management course was really effective. If we don't know how to manage the class, we cannot teach properly").

Another strength, as mentioned by Student 1is that the undergraduate ELT program has a linear structure, which makes the program stronger because the structure of the program follows a stepwise progress. In other words, the first step prepares the student for the second step. For example, the first and second year courses prepare the students for the third and fourth year courses by supplying them relevant and necessary knowledge in order to understand and perform successfully in them.

The *linguistics courses* (Linguistics I-II and Applied Linguistics) were also stated as a strength of the program by a student (Student 2). In addition, Student 3 believed that the *instructors in the department are well qualified* and the same student also mentioned that *the existence of open-door policy* is another point which makes the program more effective. More specifically, he/she said: "I am really satisfied with the teachers in the department. They have valuable knowledge and they are friendly and helpful. Any time we want, we can reach them to ask for help and they are ready to help." Moreover, Student 5 said that the *program meets his/her needs*. Finally, one of the students thought that *the education courses in the program were effective*. On the other hand, a student said that the subject matter courses were effective, since they taught them how to teach

English, but the education courses helped them in terms of psychological part of the teaching. She/he explained: "I am satisfied with EDUC coded courses. I have learnt human psychology. Ok, we have learnt how to teach English in ELTE coded courses, but in EDUC coded courses we have learned how to teach by considering human psychology" (Student 6).

The students thought that the undergraduate ELT program also has some weaknesses. All of the students thought that the undergraduate ELT program lacks sufficient practical issues; it does not give students enough opportunities to practice teaching. The basic point raised during the interviews was related with ELTE 411 (School Experience) and ELTE 406 (Teaching Practice) courses. All of the students mentioned that the time allocated for those two courses was not at the desired level and this was the biggest weakness of the undergraduate ELT program. For example, Student 1 said "The teaching practice and school experience courses could be beneficial if we took them in the third year as well." Likewise, Student 6 emphasized that there is too much theory in the program and there needs to be a balance and more practice opportunities need to be given earlier to the students. She explained:

> The program focuses too much on theory. Teaching practice opportunity is given in the 4th year and it is only 4 hours (in ELTE 406 course). We are not going to teach our students the approaches and methods we have learnt. We are going to use these methods in order to teach them English. For this reason, 4 hours of teaching experience is not enough. In the 1sthour you get used to the class, in the 2ndone the students get used to you, in the 3rd hour you try to get used to the classroom atmosphere and in the last one when you feel completely ready it finishes. If it was 8 hours it would be ideal. In the previous semester, we did observations in classes but this was different from teaching. You just observe, but in teaching practice course you both teach and observe yourself.

Moreover, Student 1 also mentioned that they could not have a chance to practice the theories that they learned in ELTE 402 (Testing and Evaluation) and ELTE 301-302 (Teaching English to Young Learners I-II) courses since the course contents were mostly based on theory. Although these courses require micro-teaching sessions and projects, they were not perceived at the desired level.

As another weakness, four students stated that *the department does not organize sufficient academic events*. They believed that students need to attend more academic events in order to develop themselves in their profession and they thought that the department does not fulfill their needs in this respect. For example, Student 2 emphasized:

> I think the number of seminars and conferences is not satisfying, I think the department should organize more seminars and conferences. Every year those kinds of events should be organized. When they are organized in Turkey, we should be asked whether we want to go or not. We can afford it because it is for our future; we can pay for it. I know that teachers keep going to conferences but they do not tell us.

Another weakness of the undergraduate ELT program as perceived by three students is that *the program contains unnecessary courses*. Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II, Turkish I: Written Communication and Turkish II: Oral Communication, English Literature I-II and Computer I-II were some of the unnecessary courses mentioned by these students (Students 2, 3, and 4).

The other weaknesses uttered during the interviews can be listed as follows:

- Having only one semester Classroom Management course is not sufficient; two of the students mentioned that the course was really effective.

- The program does not include a course on teaching English with technology; the students (two students) emphasized the importance of technology by saying that it covers a very big part of their lives.

- Not enough choices are given for the second Foreign Language. One of the students explained "Another weakness of the undergraduate ELT program is the lack of enough options for Second Foreign Language Course. Why is there only German and French? I really would like to learn Spanish but it is not in the options. Greek, Spanish, Italian and other languages could be given as options, for example."

- Some ELTE coded courses overlap with EDUC coded courses. However, according to one student this can be seen as an advantage for some students who prefer to cover the same topics more than once.

- The physical conditions of the department are poor and does not have enough technological devices (one student).

- The submission dates of the projects constitute another weakness of the undergraduate ELT program. For instance, Student 5 stated that the submission dates of the projects are right before the exam weeks, and this makes the students feel overloaded.

- The number of courses in the ELT program is too high and the options for elective courses are limited. Student 6 argued that all the elective courses are related to the field of ELT, but they need to relax by taking elective courses from

other fields. S/he said: "Another weakness of the program is about the elective courses we are taking. We want to relax by attending other elective courses, which are not related to ELT, such as 'scuba diving'. It would be good for socialization, as well."

During the interviews, the students were also asked to give suggestions for the improvement of the program, and they came up with various suggestions. According to all students *the program should provide more practice opportunities*. They mainly focused on School Experience and Teaching Practice courses. They suggested that these two courses be offered in previous semesters as well since they were supplied the relevant methodological knowledge. They believe that these courses are really helpful and beneficial in preparing them for the teaching profession. For example, Student 2 explained: "In Teaching Practice course, 4 hours of teaching practice is not enough; 10 hours of teaching would be more effective. When I check the universities abroad, they send their students to teaching practice for 10 or even 20 hours. Four hours of actual teaching is not enough."

Another suggestion is concerned with the class management course. The students found this course effective, and therefore they (2 students) suggested that *such a course should be offered more than one semester* (Students 2 and 5). One of the students (Student 1), on the other hand, recommended to add a *course on 'Teaching English with Technology'* to the program.

In addition to the above-mentioned suggestions, the following recommendations were given:

- *More importance should be given to projects instead of quizzes in the 1st and 2nd years.*

- *There should be more courses on linguistics.*

- T*he instructors should reorganize the submission dates of the projects* for the coming semesters.

- *The content of Computer courses need to be revised* since the program is lacking a course based on teaching English with technology.

- *Instead of some 'unnecessary' courses, more ELT-related and practice-based courses can be added to the program.* For instance, Student 3 proposed: "Instead of Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II and Turkish I: Written Communication and Turkish II: Oral Communication courses, more teaching practice courses can be offered in the program."

- *More academic events should be held by the department.*

4.4 Teacher Interviews

The main purpose of this instrument was to identify the effectiveness of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU as perceived by the instructors. In other words, teacher interviews aimed to find out the instructors' opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. They were also asked to state their suggestions for its improvement. The results obtained from this instrument are presented by following the order of the questions in the interview. First, the responses to the 16 questions in part II were categorized as: 'yes', 'no', 'partly yes', and 'mostly yes' as the instructors said.

Then, the instructors' explanations for each question were analyzed. Finally, the three open-ended questions in Part III were analyzed and he results for each question were presented respectively.

The responses to the 16 questions in Part II are summarized and presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5 : Instructors' Response Results

Does the programme…	Yes	Mostly Yes	Partly Yes	No
… have a clearly stated philosophy?	8	-	-	-
… reflect program philosophy ?	5	2	1	-
… promote trainee flexibility in using different teaching approaches for different situations?	3	2	3	-
…promote the ability to use, and adapt, foreign-language-teaching materials?	8	-	-	-
…balance received knowledge versus experiential knowledge?	4	2	4	-
…incorporate and encourage trainee reflection on the experiences and values they have when they enter the program? In particular, does it encourage trainee reflection on their 'apprenticeship of observation'?	3	2	4	1
…promote the skill of reflection and self-evaluation as a teacher?	6	-	2	-
…promote future reflective practice?	5	-	3	-
…promote the 'long-term, developmental nature of learning to teach' – does it promote post-qualification teacher growth and development?	7	-	-	-
…have good linkage among courses avoiding overlaps?	2	-	3	3
…balance teacher- and student-centered learning?	4	-	3	1
…promote code of practice?	7	-	1	-
…prepare EFL teachers to function in the sociocultural context in which they will work?	7	-	1	-
…incorporate and balance linguistic, pedagogic, and managerial competence to an appropriate degree?	6	-	2	-
Is the program up-to-date?	6	-	2	-
Do students believe the program meets their needs, is relevant to their needs, and adequately prepares them for classroom teaching?	5	1	1	1

With regard to the first question, all of the eight instructors thought that the program has a clearly stated philosophy. Generally they explained that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU has been accredited by three different institutions which show that the program has a clearly stated philosophy and reflects it.

For instance, Instructor 1 emphasized that the program has recently had an explicitly stated philosophy by referring to the preparation period for AQAS accreditation. More specifically, she said:

> I think the program now does have a clearly stated philosophy. Why do I emphasize 'now'? Because we are done with the accreditation procedure but it doesn't mean that we should stop and try not to further enhance the quality assurance in this department, overall, especially in terms of the quality teaching, quality learning, quality research as well as the quality of our services."

Then s/he added:
> Now we have an explicit clearly stated philosophy. By philosophy, I understand our mission, our vision, values, the program goal, the overall program learning outcomes which are, in a way, new things because although for years we have been producing learning outcomes for every specific course, the overall program learning outcomes have been prepared recently and specifically for the purposes of the international accreditation of our BA program.

The instructors gave different responses to the second question (Does the program reflect program philosophy?): 'yes' (5 instructors) 'mostly yes' (2 instructors), and 'partly yes' (1 instructor).Most of the instructors believed that the program reflects the philosophy since there are qualified teacher trainers in the program who try hard to reflect the philosophy of the program. Instructor 4, for example, mentioned that the program reflects 70 % of the philosophy since she thought that there are some deficiencies. She said:

I can say 70% it does, we attempt to do most of the things mentioned in the program philosophy but sometimes the outcome may not be the expected one. Here, for example, it says we try to train English language teachers with theoretical knowledge and practical skills but sometimes graduates may not meet these standards. Even though they don't meet these standards they can graduate maybe in 5 -6 years. This is why I said maybe 70% it reflects.

The third question focuses on the promotion of trainee flexibility in using different teaching approaches for different situations. Three of the instructors mentioned that *it does ('Yes'),* two of them stated that it *mostly* does ('Mostly yes') whereas three instructors believed that it *partly* does this ('Partly yes'); noone thought that it doesn't ('No'). In general, the instructors preferred to refer to courses which focus on different language teaching approaches in ELT. Specifically, they said that in those courses the students are taught various approaches to ELT. Moreover, they are given different projects, assignments and micro-teachings to put all this theoretical knowledge into practice. ELTE 205-206 (Approaches in English Language Teaching I-II), ELTE 301-302 (Teaching English to Young Learners I-II), and ELTE 305-306 (Teaching Language Skills I-II) were the mostly referred courses by the instructors. Instructor 7 provided examples to explain his answer:

I think with most courses, especially for those I have been teaching, there is a good degree of flexibility in which different teaching approaches are used. We try and incorporate different teaching approaches that our graduates may need to use in different situations; we simulate different situations in the classroom. For example, what approaches they may use with adult learners, young learners, learners with different needs, specific purposes and so on.

"Does the program promote the ability to use, and to adapt, foreign-language-teaching materials?" was the next question. All the instructors believed that the program gives the relevant theories and knowledge to the students that they can use in their profession. For example, Instructor 7 stated:

This is one of the courses I have taught before, Materials Development and Adaptation, and I think this question is related. I can say yes because in that particular course students learn how to adapt readily available material and also how to develop appropriate materials to be used in different contexts.

In response to question 5, four of the instructors mentioned that *the program balances the received knowledge versus experiential knowledge* whereas the rest thought that the program *partly* balances theory and practice. For instance, Instructor 1 stated that the program balances theory and practice by referring to the 'Student Handbook'. She explained:

Yes, I believe it does. It also appears in our 'Student Handbook' and as well as in the strategic plan, and this information also appears in the ELT part of the faculty web and the university web also. We believe that yes there is a healthy balance between the theory and the application across four-year B.A. studies which start with the language work, which is followed up by graduate buildup of the academic and professional courses and which culminates the school experience and teaching practice at the very end.

However, Instructor 4 who believed that the program partly balances received knowledge and experiential knowledge said:

The program tries to balance received knowledge and experiential knowledge. We give them theoretical knowledge in mini-courses, and in micro teachings and in some projects like making lesson plans and in the 4thyear, School Experience and Teaching Practice courses; we give them a chance to put this theoretical knowledge into practice. But maybe this balance is not an ideal one, it could have been better if we had a chance to focus more on the practical part of it because most of the 4thyear students complain about the amount of teaching practice they do. So, they find it insufficient just to do four formal teachings and spend only one semester at school for teaching practice. For example, if we had a chance it would be very helpful to send them to schools in the 3rdyear to observe, and to spend more time at schools.

When the instructors were asked the sixth question, three of them argued that *the program incorporates and encourages trainee reflection on the experiences and values they have when they enter the program.* However, four of them believed that the

90

program *partly* does this whereas one instructor thought that it *does not*. According to Instructor 1, for example, in some of the courses, the teachers try to do so, but enquiries such as mini-surveys are not given to freshman students in the department formally. She explained:

> Whether the program incorporates and encourages trainee reflection on the experiences and values when they enter the program. To be honest with you, I don't think that this is something we have done. Maybe it needs high time for the department that the department should consider in the near future to start applying mini surveys to our 1st year students at the very start of the program because you ask ***when they enter the program***.

When asked Question 7, six of the instructors indicated that *the undergraduate ELT program promotes the skill of reflection and self-evaluation as a teacher* whereas two instructors believed that it partly does this. The tasks and assignments given in different courses (i.e. School Experience, Teaching Practice, and Literature and Language Teaching) aim to give this skill to students by assigning reflection paper writing tasks. To exemplify, Instructor 4 said:

> I think in all of my courses, after we discuss a topic I ask them what they have learned. What that specific session has added to their existing knowledge. And after all micro teachings and those kinds of practical things I always ask them. After micro teachings first I ask the students to do self-evaluation in front of his or her peers so the student has a chance to reflect on his or her own teaching, and then I ask the class to tell the strengths and weaknesses they have observed in the presentation and then I also give feedback in the classroom and also in my office. But I do ask them to do reflection.

On the other hand, Instructor 7 mentioned that the program, course contents and teachers try to transfer this skill but it is up to the students to use it in the future in their profession by saying that "I keep reminding them that professional development requires reflection and if they want to develop in their careers and become better English

91

language learners they need to incorporate reflective practice components into their teaching. And I believe they will use this strategy somehow."

With regard to the eighth question, five of the instructors thought that the program promotes future reflective practice and Instructor 5, for instance, stressed the importance of Teaching Practice course and the micro-teaching sessions in fostering reflective practice, as well as the skill of self-evaluation by saying:

> Yes as I answered in the previous question, reflection is something they learn. They need to be trained on how to reflect on their own teaching and how to do self-evaluation as a teacher. They have this chance only when they complete their portfolio in the Teaching Practice course. They are required to evaluate themselves critically, the things they did well and the things they felt they need to improve. So, I think this chance is especially given in the Teaching Practice course. Also, in micro teaching sessions they are expected to develop this self-evaluation attitude.

Nevertheless, Instructor 3 who believed that the program partly focuses on this issue argued: "Some courses 'yes', such as Teaching Language Skills. Something related to teaching and teaching practice they have direct relationship but others don't."

Responding to Question 9, seven instructors expressed that the program promotes the 'long-term, developmental nature of learning to teach' by providing specific examples. For instance, Instructor 4 articulated that the requirements of the courses give this kind of habit to the students: "I think indirectly yes because when we give them this habit of reflecting on their teaching or on their practices I think hopefully when they become teachers in the future they will continue to do it". Another example is given by Instructor 1:

I try to share with my students that, and I quote this very frequently. This is my favorite quotation "*We can teach you, we can train you, but we cannot develop you. You develop yourselves*" So this is something that I am trying to promote especially amongst our graduate students who are already in the profession by being engaged in the school experience, teaching practice and who have already done their professional and vocational courses.

Concerning Question 10, although two of the instructors believed that *the program avoids overlaps*, the other 3 instructors thought that it does not, and the rest mentioned that it *partly* does. Some of the instructors referred to a study conducted by two of the instructors in the department. According to the results of this study, most of the 4th year students thought that some of the ELTE coded courses and some of the EDUC coded courses are overlapping. Some of the instructors found it beneficial to have overlaps, arguing that overlaps show that there is coherence among courses, which can be considered an advantage. They also mentioned that this nature of the courses show that the courses and the topics are related to each other. For instance, instructor 1 clarified:

In this respect there is a linkage among ELT courses, as well as coherence across the entire program. However, I am not sure about overlaps so that's why it's crucial that my colleagues share their results with the Educational Sciences department. A new head of department has been appointed recently, they may also share their results with him to ensure that if there are overlaps, and apparently there are overlaps, we can minimize those if need be my colleagues in this department can come together with our colleagues downstairs, go through the content and format and requirements for our courses and ensure that they minimize and eventually get rid of those.

On the other hand, Instructor 4 expressed the following ideas:

I think there are some overlaps in the program; for example, they learn some learning theories in education courses and we repeat them in our ELT courses as well. Another thing is, for example, in language acquisition course they learn about Krashen's theories and we also teach it in some other courses; so, there are some overlaps among ELT courses or between ELT courses and education courses. For example there are two testing courses and they repeat more or less the same things in these courses, or we focus on lesson planning, how to plan a

93

lesson in some education courses and in two or three ELT courses; so I think there are some overlaps.

When the instructors were asked whether the program balances teacher- and student-centered learning, four of the instructors responded as 'Yes', whereas 3 of them thought that the program *partly* does this. In contrast, one of the instructors expressed that *the program does not balance teacher- and student-centered learning*. To exemplify, Instructor 8, who stated that the program balances the two types of learning, gave this explanation:

> Mostly it does because we have a great deal of project work in class, outside class, assignments in which students are supposed to work together so student-centered learning is indeed encouraged, and to me at least in the courses that I have been teaching there is a balance between teacher- and student-centered learning.

However, Instructor 5 believed that the program does not have this balance stating the following ideas:

> For student-centered teaching I think the students need time to work on some projects and group work activities outside the classroom, but they are overloaded by courses: so, unfortunately the design of the program is teacher centered. With the effort of individual teachers it may turn out to be a learner-centered teaching, yes but by its nature the 4-year curriculum seems to be teacher-centered because of the number of courses.

As to the issue of 'code of practice', while seven instructors thought that the program promotes the code of practice, one instructor believed that the program partly promotes it. Instructor 8 also raised a question at this point by asking: "Is it the program, or the individual teachers' effort?" but I would say more the teachers. They try to promote the code of practice. I think the program also does but more I would say teachers." In

addition to this comment, another important point was pointed out by Instructor 3 on the

proficiency level of the students:

> Generally it does and it depends on the course and on the proficiency level of the learners. It is a matter of degree. For some courses that is a very low-degree but in some courses it's very important. …the degree depends on the students' language proficiency level and on the aim of the course.

With respect to Question 13, almost all the instructors (7) agreed that *the program*

prepares EFL teachers to function in the socio-cultural context in which they will work;

only one instructor believed that the program *partly* accomplishes this. To verify her

opinion, Instructor 1 denoted the alumni survey results which were conducted for the

AQAS report. She said the following:

> I think we are doing a good job because I have some evidence here; this evidence again has been collected owing to the international accreditation. We collected extensive information from the ministry of national education and culture, from the alumni office and again because I know EMU very well and most of the instructors at the EMU College, school of foreign languages have been my former graduate students. We see that this department has graduated hundreds of students who have been successfully teaching at the preschool level, at the preparatory level in freshmen classes, in secondary school as well as private sector not only on this island but also in Turkey and elsewhere.

Other instructors also agreed that the program gives this to the students through various

courses. For example, Instructor 5 indicated: "Again in class, in the department they are

only advised to consider all these sociocultural variables that they may face in the

classroom, but again in practice teaching they may realize the importance of the

sociocultural variables that may shape their teaching better."

With regard to the balance among linguistic, pedagogic and managerial competences

(Question 14), six instructors believed that the program incorporates and balances these

competences whereas two of them thought that the program *partly* does this. For example, Instructor 4 who believed that the program balances these skills through various courses and tasks mentioned:

> I think it does because when we have a look at the courses in 4 years we have courses which focus on linguistic competence, we have language improvement courses, we have linguistics courses, we have translation courses, I think all these courses help students to improve their linguistic competence. On the other hand we have a number of ELT courses and education courses which equip students with necessary theoretical knowledge and practical kills regarding how to teach. And we also have courses focusing on managerial competence we have classroom management course which is an education course. Also, in ELT courses we focus on classroom management as a topic so I think we incorporate all these in the program.

However, Instructor 8 stated that it is difficult to measure this but he believed that the managerial skills seem to be weaker compared to linguistic and pedagogic competences. He said:

> I think we do have a bit of all these but whether this is a good balance or not I am not so sure. But we do incorporate linguistic, pedagogic and managerial competences. Maybe the managerial is a bit weaker but I think we do try linguistic and pedagogic. We also try to address managerial skills as well in micro teachings but the real practices in the real classroom might be a bit weak.

Upon the question "is the program up-to-date?", six of the instructors said 'Yes', while two of them thought that it is '*partly up-to-dat*e'. One of the instructors (Instructor 3) also focused on the necessity to update the contents of some courses.

Finally, when posed the last question (Question 16), all the instructors argued that more valuable and reliable answer can be collected from the alumni but they also shared their perceptions by relying on the interaction and informal conversations with the graduates. While five instructors indicated that *the program meets the needs of the students*, one

96

instructor thought *it does not*. Another instructor believed that it *partly* meets the needs. Instructor 8 stated:

> In general I keep hearing positive things from my students although we receive some criticisms from the same students. But overall when I look at the proposition I would say the positive side is more than the negative criticisms. So I would say 'yes'. In general, the program meets their needs and is relevant to their needs, but of course nobody is perfect therefore it serves the purpose.

In contrast, Instructor 6 expressed a different opinion regarding this question by emphasizing that some of the students could not see any connection between the education that they take and the real classroom environment in which they teach ("Theoretically yes but practically our students say that the classroom is a different story, when we go to our classes it is a completely different story. They are simply saying that what they study in the department does not match with what they are exposed to in the schools that they go to teach").

The last part of teacher interviews focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program as well as instructors' suggestions for its improvement. As to the strengths, instructors indicated the existence of open-door policy in the department. They believed that this procedure makes the program stronger. For example, Instructor 4 said: "One of the strengths of the ELT program is the relationship between teachers and students; the open door policy. Any time students can reach their teachers, they can discuss things; can get feedback, so open door policy is a strength". Another strength of the undergraduate ELT program is *the rapport between the instructors and the students,* which was mentioned by three of the instructors. They thought that it is related with the number of the students; since there are not too many students in the

department, the instructors know the students by name and they can follow their achievement or performance personally. For instance, Instructor 7 explained this as follows: "Another one is the close relationship between students and instructors of the department because it is not a very large department. The instructor knows every student by name, can follow their progress and help with their problems, and so on." The quality of the instructors in the department is another strength of the undergraduate ELT program mentioned by 3 instructors. Instructor 5 indicated that the instructors in the department are well qualified and they have good relationship with the students. She explained her ideas with the following sentences: "The biggest strength is the existence of qualified staff; the experienced and dedicated staff who are always willing to help the students, and the open door policy. The students can visit their professors anytime they want and the relations are very good between students and instructors."

The accreditations were also mentioned as a strength by three instructors. It is believed that *being accredited by three different institutions makes the program stronger*. Another strength of the program is that it *trains effective language teachers* as reported by two instructors. For example, Instructor 6 stated that the program provides high-quality education, and the instructors try their best to make the quality even better by considering various aspects in teacher education. She elaborated on this as:

> I think our students in the ELT department are quite lucky because even though we have a good program we as teachers are trying to make it quite rich by simply enhancing the course materials, also by using different kinds of techniques in evaluating the students, looking at their performance from many different angles, giving them opportunities to see different kinds of learning and teaching experiences. We go beyond that in most of the courses that I know, we go beyond the curriculum. And we contribute to their professional development, we give them research projects; they have the opportunity to present these research projects at professional conferences. Some of our undergraduate students even

manage publish papers, and these are the strengths because the teachers are just trying to put great emphasis on their professional development as well.

Since there are students from different countries in the department, the international and multicultural environment of the department was also mentioned among the strengths. It was indicated that *international and multicultural nature of the program* makes it more effective. To exemplify, Instructor 8 stated:

I would like to mention the importance of composition of the classes in the department; student population I mean. We have international composition. We have students from all over the world and this is a strong point I believe, not only in terms of learning the language but also in terms of learning the culture, and you know, when students are exchanging their ideas they have to exchange in English.

Other strengths which were mentioned by various instructors are as follows:

- The overall learning outcomes of the program (Instructor 1),
- The linear structure of the program (Instructor 2),
- The program is up-to-date (Instructor 2),
- The undergraduate ELT program is balanced (Instructor 3),
- Social and academic activities organized by the department (Instructor 4),
- The use of technology in the department (Instructor 4),
- The management system of the department is well-established (Instructor 5),
- The department has a strong advisory system (Instructor 8),
- The program has a competitive nature (Instructor 8),
- The program provides post-graduate studies to the students (Instructor 8).

On the other hand, with regard to the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program, first of all the number of the courses was founded to be above the ideal number. The instructors argued that this much load is not ideal for students, and this situation limits their research-based studies as well as their social life. For example, Instructor 2

emphasized that having many courses in the program does not seem humanistic by saying:

> I strongly believe that the number of the courses should be reduced. This much course load makes students stay away from the socio-cultural events and it affects their activities outside the school. For example, all around the world but especially at Boğaziçi University they have fewer courses in their undergraduate ELT program. This also prevents practice or research-based studies.

The results also show that *the undergraduate ELT program lacks practical issues*. Three of the instructors believed that the instructors try to create the best opportunities for practice, but especially the time allocated to School Experience and Teaching Practice courses was found to be insufficient. For instance, Instructor 4, who taught those courses before, verbalized: "Another weakness is not giving enough time for teaching practice; one semester is not enough." Additionally, two of the instructors articulated *the existence of overlaps among some of the courses* as another weakness of the program. However, they at the same time mentioned that there is no flexibility on this issue since they have to follow the program proposed by HEC in Turkey. In spite of this the instructors argued that the overlapping courses need to be re-considered carefully. With respect to this weak point, Instructor 7 indicated that "Especially in the first two years students have too many courses and they don't have enough time to do self-study and self-reflection". She added: "But again this is imposed by HEC so we must find ways to make it more manageable."

Proficiency level of the students (not at the desired level) was another weak point raised by two of the instructors. Instructor 2, on the topic of offering language improvement courses said: "The levels of language proficiency of the freshman students are not at the

desired level. They take language improvement courses at the first year such as contextual grammar and vocabulary. However, instead of language proficiency gaining they have to learn how to teach these courses."

In addition to the weaknesses presented above, the followings were also stated as weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program:

- The studies conducted by the instructors are not purely related to the field of ELT. They do not focus on issues in teacher education. (Instructor 2),

- There is lack of coordination among the people in charge. (Instructor 3),

- There is no available time for research for both students and teachers (Instructor 4).

- Received knowledge and experiential knowledge are not balanced (Instructor 5),

- The number of language improvement courses is high (Instructor 6),

- The HEC does not give an opportunity to be flexible in rearranging the program (Instructor 6),

- Some of the courses are misplaced in the program (Instructor 6),

- The department lacks mobile instructors and/or visiting professors (Instructor 7),

- The number of students in the department is less than expected (Instructor 8).

When the instructors were asked to state their suggestions for the improvement of the program, they mentioned various suggestions. 'More practical courses need to be added to the undergraduate ELT program' was the most frequently stated suggestion (5 instructors). The instructors thought that the program lacks practical issues and they suggested that more practice opportunities be given to the students. They also addressed the dissatisfaction level of the students concerning this issue by relying on informal

conversations that they have had with their students. For example, Instructor 4 suggested:

> We should increase the amount of time we spend for Teaching Practice; maybe not one course but two courses. For example, in the 3rd year Observation course and in the 4th year Teaching Practice course can be offered, 2 semesters each. I think students should spend more time in real school environment. Also, when we give projects, for example in the 2nd and 3rd year we should give them a chance to go to schools to do something at schools and spend more time there.

Another recommendation was about the number of the courses. Four of the instructors argued that the number of courses should be decreased. With respect to this suggestion, Instructor 1 also suggested that some of the courses be combined so that the number of courses can be decreased. Instructor 2, on the other hand, gave various suggestions on the combination of courses in order to reduce their number: ELTE 101 and 102 (Contextual Grammar I-II), ELTE 401 (Materials Development and Adaptation) and CITE 336 (Instructional Technology and Materials Design) courses can be combined, ELTE 305-306 (Teaching Language Skills I-II) and ELTE 301-302 (Teaching English to Young Learners I-II) can be given under the course ELTE 303-304 (Special Teaching Methods I-II);ELTE 209 (Presentation Skills) can be given with other courses such as ELTE 205-206 (Approaches to ELT I-II) and ELTE 303-304 (Special Teaching Methods I-II). Moreover, he recommended to combine ELTE 207 and ELTE 212 (English-Turkish Translation and Turkish-English Translation) courses because he believed that they are not directly related to the ELT field.

Moreover, the following suggestions were given by the instructors:

- Changing the place of some courses in the program (Instructors 2 and 6),
- Providing more options for Major Area Elective courses (Instructors 3 and 6).

- Removing some of the courses from the program (Instructor 2),

- Establishing a self-study center in the department (Instructor 4),

- Signing an agreement protocol with the cooperating schools (Instructor 5),

- Sending suggestions for change to HEC (Instructor 7),

- Making negotiations with the Ministry of National Education to sign an agreement protocol for sending students to schools (Instructor 8),

- Making more advertisement promotion in order to attract more students (Instructor 8),

- Organizing more academic events (Instructor 8).

4.5 Alumni Questionnaire

The alumni questionnaire aimed to identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU as perceived by the alumni, who graduated after 2009. It also aimed at collecting alumni's suggestions for the improvement of the program. Moreover, the alumni were asked to state the problems they face in their teaching and propose solutions for these problems. 33 graduates volunteered to participate in the study.

With regard to strengths, 81% of the alumni (25 graduates) believed that *the undergraduate ELT program at EMU trains effective language teachers*. They stated that the courses in the program provided various advantages to the alumni in their teaching, such as necessary approaches and methods in English language teaching, classroom management skills, information about different learning styles, and teaching English to young learners. For instance, Alumni 4 said:

Undergraduate ELT program in EMU has a huge strength in developing someone not just as a teacher, but also as a whole person… I believe the courses have been very beneficial for me, by teaching all different types of learning methods, approaches, classroom management styles and also the different learning styles. Knowing these, I am easily participating in my teaching and I have a fabulous relationship with my students.

Another strength of the ELT program as perceived by the alumni is the effectiveness of practical courses in the program. The results revealed that *the practical courses in the program helps students practice what they have learnt*. Seven alumni agreed that practical courses helped them practice what they had learnt. For example, Alumni 24 explained the importance of practical courses as follows: "The undergraduate ELT program gives sufficient and useful practical knowledge about language teaching. Students have a chance to learn current theories/methods about language teaching and put these theories into practice by doing micro-teachings and by experiencing real class teaching".

The responses given by five graduates showed that the instructors in the department make the program stronger. They believed that *the instructors in the department are well-qualified and friendly*. It was stated that the instructors were always ready to help students both academically and non-academically. It was also mentioned that they were well-equipped in teacher training and there was an open-door policy; the instructors were always available during their office hours to help students.

Another strong aspect of the program mentioned by two alumni was that it develops self-confidence and awareness and life skills. Additionally, two other alumni believed that the program helps students to be facilitative, problem-solver language teachers

104

through various tasks. The given responses also showed that like departmental courses, educational courses were fruitful for the students. More specifically, two of the alumni emphasized that some education courses helped them understand human psychology. Similarly, other 2 alumni indicated the effectiveness of the classroom management course as a strength. They stated that this course helped them a lot in their teaching profession. Lastly, the followings are the rest of the strengths stated by different alumni (only one time):

- The Department had a library (Alumni 6),

- The program helped to develop speaking skills (Alumni 14),

- The step by step structure of the courses made the program stronger (Alumni 21),

- The campus life of the university was good (Alumni 33).

In response to the second question in the questionnaire, the alumni stated some weaknesses of the program. More than half of the alumni (52%) mentioned that *the program does not offer sufficient practical opportunities*. Although they considered practical courses as one of the strengths of the program, they thought that the given opportunities to practice were not at the desired level. For example, Alumni 8 argued that not giving students enough chance to practice teaching was the biggest weakness of the program by using the following statements:

> The practical courses in the program need to be started earlier because when you start teaching you see that it is different from Teaching Practice course. In order to overcome this problem the practical courses should start from the 1st or 2nd year, I believe. I think this is the biggest problem of the undergraduate ELT program.

The existence of some unnecessary courses in the program was given as another weakness of the program by seven participants. They thought that some of the courses in the program should not be in the program; for example, history, Turkish, and second foreign language courses. More specifically, one of the alumni (Alumni 15) asked the following question in her response: "What is the aim of putting a history course into the program?". Another weak point indicated by the alumni was about the *overlaps in the program*. They said that sometimes in some courses they used to cover same topics and issues. For example, Alumni 3 stated:

> I think the weakness of the program was having a lot of repetitions. What I meant by this is that most of the course were repeating themselves under different names. I believe that it was waste of time and we could have had more practical sessions rather than repeating the theoretical lessons.

Moreover, three of the alumni stated that *the language improvement courses in the program did not reach their aims*. According to one of them (Alumni 15), Contextual Grammar course should be offered throughout four years in order to help students improve their language proficiency for being able to teach the language more effectively.

Requirement of memorization in some of the courses (Alumni 3); insufficient resources and materials used in the courses (Alumni 2); ineffective teaching skills of some instructors (Alumni 3); lack of enough options both in Second Foreign Language and Major Area Elective courses (Alumni 5);insufficient emphasis on Teaching English to Young Learners (Alumni 20); ineffective testing methods in some courses (Alumni 24); lack of technological equipment in teaching (Alumni 26); putting native and non-native students into the same class (Alumni 30); lack of culture-based lessons in the program

(Alumni 31); lack of sufficient emphasis on writing skills (Alumni 32); and, lack of a course on State Personnel Selection Examination (KPSS) (Alumni 33) were the other weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU as perceived by the alumni.

After expressing their opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program, the alumni came up with various suggestions by considering the weaknesses they mentioned in the previous question. Majority of the alumni (22) suggested that *the program needs to be improved in terms of practical issues (i.e. opportunities to practice what is learnt)*. They suggested that the courses that required practice helped them to put their theoretical knowledge into practice, and this helped them to develop themselves. They specifically emphasized the importance of the courses that required teaching practice. For example, Alumni 32 said:

> Although we had a teaching practice course for a short period, I think that the course wasn't sufficient and most of the students couldn't have a chance to gain enough experience in teaching in order to be a proper classroom teacher. I, therefore believe that there should be more intensive courses in which students can gain teaching experience. Every semester students might deliver lessons in real classrooms (public schools).

In addition, four alumni suggested that *some of the courses be removed from the program*. They thought that some of the courses in the undergraduate ELT program were unnecessary, and they were not relevant to their field. Therefore, replacing these courses with ELT-related and/or practice-based courses would be more beneficial. Regarding this, Alumni 15 listed Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II, Second Foreign Language I-II-III, Materials Evaluation and Adaptation, and Turkish I: Written Communication and Turkish II: Oral Communication courses as unnecessary courses, and therefore, she suggested:

The irrelevant courses that I have just mentioned above must be replaced with other courses. For example, there would be a course as 'Technology in the ELT classroom'. Students take Audio Visual Aids course in the last year and learn how to use smart boards or OHPs. I think there is a very short time for students to be familiar with the audio visual materials.

Furthermore, two of the alumni proposed that some of *the instructors in the department need to develop their teaching skills*. Alumni 7, for example, explained: "The teachers can follow the developments in teaching area and they can adopt the good points into their teaching." Finally, the followings are the other improvements suggested by different alumni:

- The materials used in the courses need to be improved (Alumni 2)

- The overlaps can be minimized (Alumni 4)

- Testing criteria in the department should be based on practice rather than written exams (Alumni 8)

- More options can be given for Second Foreign Language and Major Area Elective courses (Alumni 19)

- Some courses on State Personnel Selection Examination (KPSS)preparation can be added to the program (Alumni 33)

- A course on Teaching English to Adult Learners can be added to the curriculum (Alumni 29)

- Foreign students should be attracted to the department (Alumni 30)

- A course on technology-integrated language teaching can be added to the program (Alumni 15)

- Some of the courses in the program can be combined such as Audio-Visual Aids course and Materials Development and Adaptation course (Alumni 23)

- There should be native speaker instructors in the department (Alumni 14)

- Students in the department should be forced to read more ELT-related books (Alumni 24)

- Collaborative atmosphere for both teachers and students needs to be provided (Alumni 27)

- More technological devices should exist in the department (Alumni 28)

- More linguistics and research courses can be included in the curriculum (Alumni 10 and 12)

The alumni were also asked to state the problems that they face in their teaching, and they mentioned various problems upon this question. The results show that 10 alumni were having *classroom management problems* in their teaching. Some sources of the classroom management problems mentioned by different alumni are as follows: misbehaving students (disrespectful, crying, and naughty students); low proficiency level of students; mixed-ability classes; students with low motivation. They also expressed that these problems make it difficult to apply their lesson plans, control the classroom, catch-up with the schedule, and keep students' motivation and interest high during the lessons. Moreover, they added that having students with different proficiency levels in the same class creates problems for them in terms of effective teaching, managing the class, managing the time, and covering the topics. For example, Alumni 16 wrote:

> I work for a private language school and my students' age is +18; some of them are university students, some of them are employees, and some of them are retired, who are about 50 years old. It is difficult to teach language and learn language. For example, some students who are 50 can't understand anything and they forget quickly.

The other problems mentioned by the alumni can be listed as: catching and controlling students' attention (Alumni 13); fluency problems in speaking (Alumni 15); mother tongue use by the students (Alumni 18); parents' expectations (Alumni 18); being forced to use an irrelevant curriculum (Alumni 25); adapting to the Turkish education system (Alumni 27); and having difficulties in motivating adult learners (Alumni 29).

However, three of the alumni stated that *they are not having any problems in their teachings.*

The last question in the alumni questionnaire was about how to solve these problems. When asked for recommendations, six of the alumni suggested that *more practice opportunities could be given to student teachers in the program* so that they can get used to the classroom environment before they start their teaching profession. Another possible solution proposed by three of the alumni was *being a more flexible teacher;* they believed that this can help teachers to solve most of their problems. The two other alumni also emphasized the importance of family involvement in education and they considered this as a solution. Other suggestions are: using effective adapting and adopting techniques in selecting and using materials (Alumni 1); using authentic materials (Alumni 7); applying placement tests before placing students into the classrooms (Alumni 7); asking for help from Psychological Guidance and Counseling services in the school (Alumni 7); acting according to students' personality (Alumni 9); adding receptive skill activities to increase acquisition of the target language (Alumni 16); praising students frequently for reinforcement (Alumni 18); creating a natural environment in micro-teaching sessions conducted in language teacher education

programs (Alumni 20);using syllabuses for different age groups and levels (Alumni 25); ignoring grammatical mistakes of the students during lectures (Alumni 28); telling students about the importance of English language (Alumni 29).

Overall, although there are some drawbacks of the undergraduate ELT program, the results indicated that the course contents and the instructors individually try to apply the program effectively and sufficiently as perceived by the students, alumni and the instructors.

4.6 Document Analysis

The course policy sheets were analyzed to find out the distribution of linguistic, pedagogic and managerial competences in order to see if there is a balance or not. Moreover, they were investigated to identify to what extent the aims and learning outcomes of ELTE coded courses match with overall learning outcomes of the undergraduate ELT department. The data obtained contributed to answering the last research question.

As it was mentioned before there are 58 courses in the undergraduate ELT program and 10 of these courses are language improvement courses (linguistic competence), 35 courses are pedagogic courses (pedagogic competence), one course is a management course (managerial competence), and 12 courses are in the 'others' category. In percentages, 17% of the courses are linguistic courses, 61% of them are pedagogic courses, 1% of them are managerial courses, and 21% are in the 'others' category.

The results are presented according to years (i.e. course policy sheets of first year courses, those of second year courses, etc.). In the first year (fall-spring) of the

undergraduate ELT program, there are nine ELTE coded courses. The results show that most of the course policy sheets addressed the overall learning outcomes of the ELT program. More specifically, the results as regards the first year courses are as follows:

- All the ELTE coded courses in the first year matched with Learning Outcome 1 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have developed skills for effective oral and written communication in English) and Learning Outcome 2 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have developed analytical, critical thinking and problem solving skills) since these courses focus on knowledge and practice in developing written and oral communication skills, analytical and critical thinking skills as well as problem solving skills. To exemplify, 'By the end of the course, students will have been able to use the considered grammar points in various contexts' is one of the learning outcomes of ELTE 101 and ELTE 102 courses. In addition, when the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' prepared by the Department is checked, it can be seen that nearly all of the courses 'highly' matched with learning outcomes 1 and 2.

- ELTE 103, ELTE 104, ELTE 105, ELTE 106, and ELTE 112 are the first year courses which addressed Learning Outcome 3 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have acquired core ELT concepts, as well as theoretical and practical knowledge compatible with contemporary professional requirements). For example, in ELTE 105 and ELTE 106 courses, one of the aims is to introduce students the basics of articulatory phonetics and the phonetic alphabet which can be considered as ELT core concepts.

- ELTE 101, ELTE 102 are the courses which matched with Learning Outcome 4 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have developed skills for effective planning, preperation and execution of language teaching) since they provide opportunity to develop skills for effective planning, preparation and execution of language teaching. For example, one of the learning outcomes of these courses is 'By the end of the course, the students will have been able to get acquainted with preliminary considerations of how grammar can be taught to non-native speakers of English' which focuses on teaching students how to teach grammar. In the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' prepared by the Department it can be seen that ELTE 101 and ELTE 102 courses matched with this learning outcome at a medium level.

- None of the courses matched with Learning Outcome 5 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have applied acquired knowledge and skills to practice through microteaching as well as in actual English Language Teaching classrooms) because these courses do not include any microteaching sessions as indicated in the course policy sheets.

- ELTE 103, ELTE 104, ELTE 105, ELTE 106, ELTE 107, ELTE 108, and ELTE 112 are the courses which matched with Learning Outcome 6 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have become confident, creative and autonomous language teachers) since the students need to complete in and out of classroom activities such as podcast transcriptions and reading and writing activities which develop their confidence, creativity and autonomy. For example, one of the requirements of ELTE 103 course is completing out-of-classroom reading and writing activities. Similarly, all the courses in the program 'highly' matched with

this learning outcome in the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' as well.

- All the courses in the first year program addressed Learning Outcome 7 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have gained an adequate competence in English Language Teaching or for MA studies) because these courses aim at equpping students with necessary linguistic knowledge and practical skills which will help them to develop competence in English Language Teaching or for MA studies. One of the aims of ELTE 103 and ELTE 104 courses is to equip students with necessary reading and writing skills to help them progress in their academic studies in future. Thus, gaining this knowledge may provide students opportunity to carry on their academic development after they graduate.

- ELTE 105 is the only course in the first year which matched with Learning Outcome 8 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have become aware of professional ethics). The following statement is given as a separate point in this course which shows that this course meets the Learning Outcome 8:

> PLAGIARISM: This is intentionally failing to give credit to sources used in writing regardless of whether they are published or unpublished. Plagiarism (which also includes any kind of cheating in exams) is a disciplinary offence and will be dealt with accordingly).

- None of the courses matched with Learning Outcome 9 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have become receptive to the philosophy of lifelong learning as well as continuous professional development).

- ELTE 105 and ELTE 106 are the only courses which matched with Learning Outcome 10 (Upon successful completion of the course BA students will have become aware of the ELT impact in the globalizing world). For instance, one of the

learning outcomes of these courses is as follows: 'On successful completion of the course, the students will distinguish between standard American and British English by recognizing their major differences in pronunciation, which will help students for better understanding the speech of native speakers'.

In the second year (fall-spring) of the undergraduate ELT program, there are nine ELTE coded courses. The results show that almost all the courses addressed the learning outcomes of the program.

- All the courses in the second year of the program addressed Learning Outcome 1, Learning Outcome 2 and Learning Outcome 3 because the courses are conducted in English, and therefore the student-teachers have an opportunity to develop their written and oral communication skills, analytical and critical thinking skills as well as their problem solving skills. In addition, all the ELTE coded courses in the second year help students acquire core ELT concepts as well as theoretical and practical knowledge compatible with contemporary professional requirements. To exemplify, ELTE 205 and ELTE 206 courses aim to introduce students the main concepts in terminology used in ELT. The results of the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' also revealed that nearly most of the ELTE coded courses 'highly' matched with Learning Outcomes 1, 2, and 3.

- ELTE 205 and ELTE 206 are the only courses which matched Learning Outcome 4 because in these courses the students are taught different approaches and methods in ELT which will be fruitful in developing skills for effective planning, preparation and execution of language teaching in the future. Similar result can be observed in

the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' prepared by the Department as well.

- None of the courses in the second year matched with Learning Outcome 5 since there is no micro-teaching component in the second year courses.

- ELTE 203, ELTE 204, ELTE 205, ELTE 206, ELTE 207, ELTE 208, ELTE 209, ELTE 214, and ELTE 303 courses matched with Learning Outcome 6 because the given assignments, tasks and activities (in and out of class) in these courses help students develop confidence, creativity, and autonomy.

- The courses which matched with Learning Outcome 7 are ELTE 203, ELTE 204, ELTE 205, ELTE 206, ELTE 207, ELTE 208, ELTE 209, ELTE 214, and ELTE 303 because the activities done in these courses get students to gain an adequate competence in English Language Teaching or for MA studies.

- ELTE 203, ELTE 204, ELTE 205, ELTE 206, and ELTE 303 are the courses which matched with Learning Outcome 8 since these courses aim at raising students' awareness as regards professional ethics. For example, in ELTE 214, the students learn professional ethics in terms of conducting research (e.g. Chapter 5: Ethics).

- All the second year ELTE coded courses matched with Learning Outcome 9 since all these courses attempt to familiarize students with the philosophy of lifelong learning and continuous professional development. The same findings can be observed in the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' of the Department.

- ELTE 203, ELTE 204, ELTE 205, ELTE 206, ELTE 208, ELTE 209, and ELTE 303 addressed Learning Outcome 10 since they focus on issues which help students become aware of the ELT impact in the globalizing world.

In the third year (fall-spring) of the undergraduate ELT program, there are 10 ELTE coded courses. The findings revealed that the majority of the course outlines addressed the learning outcomes of the program.

- All the ELTE coded courses except for ELTE 310 matched with Learning Outcomes 1 and 2 since these courses directly or indirectly help students further improve their written and oral communication skills. In addition, they get students to develop their analytical and critical thinking skills and problem solving abilities.

- ELTE 301, ELTE 302, ELTE 304, ELTE 305, ELTE 306, ELTE 307, ELTE 308, and ELTE 309 were the courses which matched with both Learning Outcome 3 and Learning Outcome 4. In these courses, students not only learn core ELT concepts and theoretical and practical knowledge but also develop necessary skills for planning, preparation and execution of language teaching.

- ELTE 301, ELTE 302, ELTE 305, ELTE 306, ELTE 307, and ELTE 308 courses addressed Learning Outcome 5 since the students are expected to put their theoretical knowledge into practice through microteaching sessions in these courses.

- All the ELTE coded courses except for ELTE 212 matched with Learning Outcome 6. To exemplify, in these courses the students are required to prepare various projects, micro-teachings, lesson plans and reflection papers which help students develop confidence and autonomy.

- With the exception of ELTE 310, all the ELTE coded courses in the third year program addressed Learning Outcome 7 because what students learn in these courses help them gain an adequate competence in English language Teaching or for MA studies. Parallel results can be obtained in the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' of the Department.

- ELTE 301, ELTE 302, ELTE 304, ELTE 305, ELTE 306, ELTE 307, ELTE 308, and ELTE 309 courses were in line with Learning Outcome 8 these courses get students to be aware of professional ethics.

- Lastly, ELTE 301, ELTE 302, ELTE 304, ELTE 305, ELTE 306, ELTE 307, ELTE 308, and ELTE 309 courses addressed Learning Outcomes 9 and 10. For example, in ELTE 304, 'learner autonomy' and 'professional development' are among the topics studied. Moreover, these courses help students become aware of the impact of ELT in the globalizing world. Similarly, in the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix', parallel results can be found.

There are seven ELTE coded courses in the fourth year (fall-spring) of the program. The findings revealed that ELTE 401, ELTE 402, ELTE 411, ELTE 447, and ELTE 450 courses have learning outcomes which are compatible with the learning outcomes of the undergraduate ELT program excluding Learning Outcome 5. On the other hand, ELT 348 and ELTE 406 courses are the courses which matched with all the learning outcomes of the program including Learning Outcome 5. Parallel findings can be seen when the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' of the Department is analyzed.

To conclude, based on the above-presented results, it can be said that generally the ELTE coded courses address the overall learning outcomes of the ELT program; these findings are supported with the data in the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix' prepared by the Department for AQAS evaluation.

4.7 Summary

In this chapter, the results obtained through the analysis of the student questionnaire, student essays, student interviews, teacher interviews, alumni questionnaire and document analysis have been presented.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

This chapter aims to discuss the results of the study by addressing the relevant literature. The organization of this discussion follows the order of the research questions. After discussing the results of the study in the first section, the next section presents the conclusion, and the last section focuses on pedagogical and theoretical implications.

5.1 Discussion of Results

According to the overall results of the study, the perceptions of the participants seem to be positive. Although some drawbacks were mentioned by the participants, it can be said that generally they had positive attitudes towards the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. Moreover, various suggestions were recommended by the participants for the improvement of the program. Overall findings of the study also indicated that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU meets the needs of the students to a great extent.

5.1.1 Research Question 1: What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program in the ELT department at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni?

The major strength of the program as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni is that the program trains effective language teachers. The existence of qualified instructors, the open-door policy in the department, and rich contents of the courses can be some of the reasons for this perception. The same strength was also mentioned in the

AQAS report. Moreover, the parallelism between the learning outcomes of the program and the course aims, procedures, learning outcomes and the course contents can be another reason for that strength. The qualitative results of the relevant studies in which Peacock's (2009) Model was used did not reveal that those programs train effective language teachers. The reason for that can be related with the research questions since in the relevant studies, it was not asked stating the strengths of the programs to the participants specifically. In addition, as one of the instructors mentioned, if the documents are checked, it can be seen that most of the alumni who graduated from the undergraduate ELT program at EMU work in either governmental or private schools in North Cyprus, in Turkey as well as in various European countries, and this can be the indication of the program's effectiveness in training well-qualified language teachers.

The quantitative results of the study showed that the program balances the teaching of English, teaching skills and classroom management skills since 100 % of the students agreed on item 19 (The undergraduate ELT programme at EMU has a good linkage between the teaching of; English, teaching skills, and classroom management skills). However, the percentage of agreement for this item is lower in the relevant literature (Coşkun and Daloğlu, 2010; Salihoğlu, 2012; Peacock, 2009). The student questionnaire results in Peacock (2009) indicated that 13 % of the students agreed on this item. However, 87 % present of the students who participated in Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) agreed on this item. Similarly, the quantitative results in Salihoğlu's (2012) study showed that 46.5 % of the students agreed that the program balances the teaching of English; teaching skills, and management skills. The comparison showed that the students who participated in the above mentioned studies in three Turkish contexts were

satisfied with the balance of the relevant skills (teaching English, teaching skills and managerial skills) whereas in Hong Kong this is not the case (58 % disagreement). Rich course contents on classroom management in different courses such as micro-teaching sessions and observation reports in School Experience course in the undergraduate ELT program at EMU can be the reason for these results. Although there is only one Classroom Management course in the program, the students believed that the program has a good balance of those three components. The reason for that can be the existence of various courses in the program which also focus on classroom management, either directly or indirectly. ELTE 205-206 (Approaches to English Language Teaching I-II), ELTE 303-304 (Special Teaching Methods I-II), ELTE 305-306 (Teaching Language Skills I-II), ELTE 301-302 (Teaching English to Young Learners I-II), ELTE 411 (School Experience) and ELTE 406 (Teaching Practice) can be given as examples to such courses which provide knowledge about and practices on classroom management skills. For example, the courses listed above also focus on lesson planning and micro-teaching sessions in which classroom management skills are naturally included. On the other hand, it is obvious that, a teacher need to be equipped well according to the changing conditions of the world. Being knowledgeable not only in foreign language teaching but also in other issues related to native language and national history may help to a teacher candidate to be aware of the current issues in the world. This can be beneficial both in personal and academic development.

Other strengths of the program driven from the results of the student questionnaires were that the program teaches effective management skills (item 13); prepares the students to teaching profession (item 20); gives sufficient training in English (item 3); promotes

122

adequate teaching skills (item 4); and teaches 'how to teach' (item 11). Although 96 %
of the students who participated in this study believed that the program teaches effective
classroom management skills (item 13) and 92 % of them agreed that the program
teaches English sufficiently (item 3), the participant students in Peacock's (2009) study
were not positive on those two items (29% expressed agreement for both items)
whereas in Coşkun and Daloğlu's (2010) study 80% of the students agreed that the
program teaches classroom management skills and 69 % of students agreed that the
program gives adequate training in English. Similarly, in Salihoğlu's (2012) study it is
observed that 64 % of the students think that the program gives classroom management
skills and 39.5 % students agreed that the program trains the students in English. The
comparison among the results given above revealed that the undergraduate ELT program
introduced by HEC (Higher Education Council), in Turkey, as perceived in three
different contexts by the students is clearly effective however, the teacher education
program in Hong Kong context was not found sufficient enough. In addition to
quantitative results, the qualitative results showed that 4 of the students expressed their
agreement in the interviews that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU has effective
language improvement courses (parallel results with item 3). Moreover, 2 of the
interviewees and 2 of the alumni said that they found Classroom Management Skills
course sufficient (parallel results with item 13).

According to the quantitative results, it can be seen that 92 % of the students believed
that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU gives adequate training in English.
However, 52 % of the students in Peacock's (2009) study, 78 % of the students in
Coşkun and Daloğlu's (2010) case, and 59 % of the participants in Salihoğlu's (2012)

study agreed that the programs in the relevant contexts gives adequate training in teaching skills. Furthermore, as it was found in this study, the relevant studies' results showed that 65 % of the students in Hong Kong contexts, 85 % of the students in Coşkun and Daloğlu's (2010) context and 78 % of the students in Salihoğlu's (2012) case believed that the teacher trainer program in those contexts teaches how to teach English. Moreover, similar results for item 20 (The undergraduate ELT program at EMU prepared me to teach English in the classroom) were observed in the other studies in which Peacock's (2009) Model was used. 45 % of the participant students in Peacock (2009), 78 % of the students in Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010) and 76 % of the students in Salihoğlu (2012) agreed that those programs prepare the students to teach English in the classroom. According to the results for the items given above, it can be said that four of the teacher education programs in four different contexts satisfy the students. However, for item 15 which asks whether the program teaches how to adapt foreign language teaching materials, the students in EMU case, and in Coşkun and Daloğlu's (2010) case, and Salihoğlu's (2012) case, were positive (with 84%, 84%, and 80%, respectively) whereas the students in Peacock's (2009) study neither agreed or disagreed (47 %) on this item. The reason for this can be the practices done in the relevant courses (i.e. ELTE 401: Materials Development and Adaptation in English) which raise the awareness of the students on materials adaptation theories and practices in Turkish context. The students in Hong Kong context may not be aware of the theories and trends in materials adaptation due to various reasons. The reasons can be related to the content of the courses, requirements of the courses or presentation of the theories.

Another strength as mentioned by the students and alumni is the effectiveness of the 'Teaching Practice' course because this course provides an opportunity to the students to put the theory that they gained throughout the program into practice. It can be said that the students are aware of the importance of putting theories into the real classrooms with the real students in teacher education which may help students to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses before they start the teaching profession. Reflection papers (stated in the course policy sheet of the course) may be helpful in teaching students to evaluate themselves as a teacher (item 12) and to be a reflective teacher (item 8). These issues were also two of the items in the student-questionnaire and the results show that the students agreed that the program provides those features to the students (88% for both). The development of self-esteem can be raised up in this course through various tasks which help students to master their theoretical knowledge into practice. As the students experience teaching profession, they may start to feel more confident in their job. As it was mentioned by different alumni, those practical tasks helped them to be more sufficient at the beginning of their profession since they had chance to experience the real classroom atmosphere before they start their job. Since this is the only course which gives an opportunity to the students to put what they have learned into practice with real students in a real classroom environment, it is possible to say that this course helped them feel that they have ability to teach.

Both the students and the instructors thought that the undergraduate ELT program has a clearly stated philosophy. The same finding was reached in Peacock's (2009) study, too. This can be because of clearly mentioned mission, vision, values and learning outcomes of the program in the Student Handbook in North Cyprus and Hong Kong cases. Being

accredited by three different institutions, Higher Education Council (HEC), Supervisory Board of Higher Education and Accreditation, and AQAS can be another reason for the program having a clearly stated philosophy which shows that the program follows a clearly stated philosophy. It should be noted that the currently stated mission, vision and learning outcomes of the program were mostly due to requests of the preparation for a very comprehensive internal and external evaluation. However, other studies in the relevant literature was identified that the programs in those cases do not have clear-cut philosophy (Coşkun and Daloğlu, 2010; and Karakaş, 2012) whereas Salihoğlu (2012) did not focus on this issue at all in his study.

In addition, in Northern Cyprus case, it is believed that the program gives the ability to use and adapt foreign language teaching materials as it was identified in Ögeyik (2009), Peacock (2009), Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010), and Salihoğlu (2012), too. It can be said that the program provides life-long learning and practical issues, prepares students to function in different socio-cultural contexts and it is up-to-date with the hardest work of the instructors (who design and apply course contents) in the department by relying on the teacher interviews. At this point, it is important to talk about the existence of well qualified instructors who make the program work effective by relying on the students', instructors' and the alumni's responses. The instructors are the ones who prepare the course contents, transfer the relevant knowledge to the students and provide the necessary practical opportunities for the students. When the structure of the program is explored, it can be seen that the program does not directly focus on those issues but carefully designed course contents and carefully organized assignments and projects reveal that the instructors successfully meet those needs of the students.

The effectiveness of the language improvement courses is another strength of the undergraduate ELT program, which helps students to develop their language proficiency. Both the students and the alumni agreed that the language improvement courses are really effective. Although students have to come to the department with a certain degree of language proficiency, this degree can be verified according to the backgrounds of the students in various skills. For example, a student who can fluently speak may not perform in accurate writing. However, effectively designed and presented language improvement courses seem to be helpful for the students in developing their language proficiency. In addition, the multicultural structure of the department can be the other reason for that because the students have a chance to use the target language frequently. The multicultural environment of the university needs to be emphasized at this point as well since there are students from 76 different countries at the university.

In summary, it seems that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU has various strengths as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni but the major strength of the program is that the program trains effective language teachers which shows that the program reaches its main aim and trains qualified, well-equipped, up-to-date, flexible and modern language teachers who can function in different socio-cultural contexts.

5.1.2 Research Question 2: What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program in the ELT department at EMU as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni?

The findings of the study revealed the fact that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU lacks practical issues. Specifically, it is emphasized that the time allocated for School Experience and Teaching Practice courses is not at the desired level. The students,

instructors and alumni stated that the students keep receiving theoretical information about language teaching but they have only one semester to put all this theory into practice. Because of this, it seems that the major weakness of the program is the lack of sufficient teaching practice which should be the basic component of a teacher education program. The same finding was also found in Coşkun and Daloğlu (2010), Karakaş (2012), Seferoğlu (2006), and Peacock (2009). One of the reasons of insufficient Teaching Practice opportunities in the program can be the lack of agreement among the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), cooperating schools and the universities since accepting student teachers to the schools for School Observation and Teaching Practice courses is done on voluntary basis. Introducing a protocol between the MoNE and universities on this issue may reduce the problems in sending students to the schools.

Another major weakness of the program as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni is the existence of courses which were believed not to be related with teacher education. Both the students and the alumni stated the names of these courses: Computer I-II, Turkish I: Written Communication, Turkish II: Oral Communication, Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish I and Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish II are the most frequently mentioned courses which were seen as 'unnecessary' in teacher education. The reason for that can be the content of the courses. For instance, Computer lessons focus on the use of Microsoft Office programs, Turkish classes cover linguistic features of Turkish language and the History courses include information about the establishment of the republic which does not relate to teaching English profession. Another reason can be the language of instruction in these courses. For example, Turkish and History courses are held in Turkish language which makes the learning process

problematic for the students who study in an English medium department. By reorganizing the contents of the courses, the effectiveness of those lectures can be increased. For instance, Computer classes can focus on the use of computers or technological devices in language teaching and assessment. Moreover, since we live in a world in which technology has a huge role in human beings' lives, too many digital-natives and techno-geeks (Harmer, 2007) have appeared all around the world, and thus the students at this age and level need to be assumed that they already know how to use Microsoft Office programs.

The data gathered from the instructors indicated that some of the courses in the program are misplaced. This shows that the organization of the courses in the program does not follow the top-down structure. Thus, the students may have problems in learning the theories since the relevant knowledge and information is given at an early stage. For example, it is believed that ELTE 214 (Research Methods in ELT) should be in the 3rd year of the program, not in the 2nd. The same point was considered as a weakness in Yavuz and Topkaya's (2012) study and the same suggestion was also made by one of the instructors who participated in their study. It was mentioned by that instructor that, this course can be more effective if it is moved to the second semester of the 3rd year after students take the following courses: Teaching Language Skills I, Special Teaching Methods I-II, Teaching English to Young Learners I, and Language and Society.

5.1.3 Research Question 3: What are the suggestions of the ELT students, instructors, and alumni for the improvement of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU?

Adding more practical courses into the program is highly recommended by the students, instructors and the alumni. Moving School Observation course to the 3rd year may create an opportunity for adding another Teaching Practice course to the 4th year, as mentioned by the participants as well. The same suggestion was also mentioned in the relevant literature (Coşkun & Daloğlu; 2012, Karakaş; 2012, Peacock; 2009). The AQAS experts, at the end of the evaluation, recommended the same issue for the improvement of the program. In addition, Cangil (2000) finds out that the students who were studying in German Language Teaching in Istanbul University have positive attitudes towards the School Observation-I course which was placed in the 1st year of the old teacher education program. With regard to Cangil's (2000) result, Karakaş (2012) emphasizes that the place of the School Observation course in the previous program was much better than the newly introduced one since School Observation course in the 1st year provides students the chance of dropping the program at an early step if they feel that the teaching profession is not appropriate for them. It is important to give Dortmund University as an example at this point; in that university, the teacher candidates start going to schools right at the very beginning of their education and experience the teaching profession at an early stage. They also have to take a test at the end of the 1st year in order to assess their achievement and success so that at the end of the 1st year, the students have a chance to drop their education in case they think the teaching profession is inappropriate for them.

In relation to this, having an agreement among the government, schools and the universities may reduce the problems in sending teacher candidates to the schools, and this can create more opportunities for adding more practical courses into the program. Moreover, although the contents of Teaching English Young Learners courses include materials development projects for young learners and micro-teaching sessions, this artificial environment may not be sufficiently enough for a teacher candidate. Thus, providing opportunities for the students to practice teaching young learners in kindergartens and nurseries was another important suggestion for the improvement of the program.

Removing some of the courses from the program and reducing the number of courses was another highly recommended suggestion by the participants. As some of the courses were found unnecessary (i.e. Computer, Turkish and History) in a teacher education program, they can be removed (Application to Service to Community course) or combined (i.e. English-Turkish Translation and Turkish-English Translation) for reducing the number of the courses. It can be seen that having 8 courses in the first two semesters and 7 in the following semesters seems to make students overloaded. This may also create problems in their learning and social life. This situation also makes the students and teachers not to have enough time for research. Expecting from a person to attend all of the courses regularly, fulfill all the requirements of the courses successfully, and be successful in all of the exams may not seem to be very humanistic. Therefore, reducing the number of courses by combining some courses or removing some others can be a logical solution. For example, ELTE 207 (English-Turkish Translation) and ELTE 212 (Turkish-English Translation) courses can be combined since they are not

directly related to ELT (as suggested by instructor 2). Moreover, Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II, Turkish I: Written Communication and Turkish II: Oral Communication classes can be removed from the program as recommended by the majority of the students and alumni.

On the other hand, some courses need to be added to the program. When the program and the course contents were analyzed, it was found out that the program lacks a course on cultural issues. Although ELTE 301, ELTE 302, and ELT 304 courses have chapters on this issue, this cannot be sufficient. Adding another course which focuses on teaching language and Culture can be effective. Moreover, having only one course based on Testing and Evaluation in ELT is another point that needs to be improved. Therefore, removing the educational Measurement and Evaluation course which is not directly related to foreign language assessment, which was also mentioned by Instructor 2, and adding another Testing and Evaluation in ELT course can be more fruitful for the students. Likewise program has only one course on sociolinguistics (ELTE 309-Language and Society). Adding one more course on this subject may help students function more sufficiently in different socio-cultural contexts, which was also recommended by three of the students and one of the instructors.

When the weaknesses of the program were analyzed it was observed that given options in Second Foreign Language course is not at the desired level since most of the students and the alumni suggested to have more and different options in this course rather than being forced to take German or French. Italian, Russian, Greek and Spanish were the options suggested by the students and the alumni. The reason for that can be related with

the interest of the students. French and German languages are also given in secondary and high schools in North Cyprus. Thus, the students may want to learn other languages. In addition, Instructor 2 recommended that this course can start in the 2nd year and it needs to be based on certification procedure as it is in most of the European countries. For Major Area Elective courses, there can be other options apart from Applied Linguistics, English for Specific Purposes and Audio-visual Aids because the students have to take all of these elective courses since they are the only courses offered in the program. Therefore, offering different courses on various subjects can be one of the solutions.

To sum up, adding more practical issues to the program, decreasing the number of courses, removing Computer I-II, Turkish I (Written Communication)-II (Oral Communication), and Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I-II courses, adding courses which focus on teaching culture and socio linguistics, and offering more options in Second Foreign Language course and Major Area Elective courses are the major suggestions recommended by the participants.

5.1.4 Research Question 4: To what extent does the ELT program meet the needs of prospective English language teachers?

According to the results, the undergraduate ELT program at EMU meets the needs of the students. 76 % of the students agreed that the program meets their needs, and six of the eight instructors believed that the program meets the needs of the students. They said a great number of alumni keep sending e-mails and messages saying that the education that they got from the program helped them a lot to conduct their profession effectively, continue their education successfully and cope with the problems they face easily. Thus,

according to the results, it can be said that the program meets the needs of the students to a great extent.

Moreover, the document analysis showed that the courses have been designed carefully to meet the needs of the students because most of the learning outcomes of the ELT program were addressed in the ELT coded courses (i.e. aims, classroom procedures and the learning outcomes of the courses). Parallel results were obtained in the 'Programme and Module Learning Outcome Matrix" prepared for the AQAS evaluation.

Moreover, the results of the graduate survey administered by the university and used in AQAS evaluation indicated that the alumni were satisfied with the program and this can be the indication of the match between the needs of the students and the learning outcomes of the program. In other words, the program meets the needs of the students.

Based on the above-discussed results, it can be said that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU meets the needs of the students to a great extent. This was found in Coşkun and Daloğlu's (2010) case as well, whereas the students who participated in Peacock's (2009) and Salihoğlu's (2012) studies were not sure (they neither agreed nor disagreed) whether the program meets their needs or not.

5.2 Conclusion

Various strengths and weaknesses of the program were mentioned by the students, instructors and alumni. Some suggestions were also made by the participants in order to make the program better. The results of the data analysis showed that the participants have positive attitudes towards the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. The major

134

strength indicated by the students, instructors and alumni is that the undergraduate ELT program trains effective language teachers who are well-educated, can teach English language effectively, are up-to-date and modern, can function in different socio-cultural contexts, and can use materials development and adaptation techniques effectively. It is also believed by the students, instructors and alumni that the undergraduate ELT program at EMU trains well-qualified language teachers with the help of highly qualified teacher trainers. The existence of open-door policy in the department is another strength of the department and another reason of training qualified language teachers since the instructors in the department are always ready to help the students both in their academically and non-academically.

On the other hand, the results of the study reveal that the program also has various weaknesses as perceived by the students, instructors and alumni. One of the major weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU is that the program lacks sufficient practical issues. More specifically, the time allocated for School Observation and Teaching Practice courses was found insufficient. Moreover, the results of the document analysis indicated that the program lacks practical issues. There is no doubt that a program which trains teachers needs to provide as much opportunity as possible for application in order to familiarize the students with the classroom atmosphere. Another weakness of the program is the existence of some courses which are not directly related to English language teaching. It is believed that the existence of those courses make the students overloaded, limit their social life and limit the opportunities for research and affect their CGPA (Cumulative Grade Point Average) in a bad way. It is also emphasized by one of the students and the instructors that the language education

programs in European countries do not have that many courses in their programs. Instructor 2 also found the number of the courses non-humanistic. Computer I-II, Turkish I-II, and History I-II were the mostly stated courses by the students. In addition, the results of the study revealed the fact that the undergraduate ELT program does not organize many academic events as it was mentioned by four of the students. However, they said that they would like to have more academic organizations which might be helpful in developing themselves as a teacher. Another weakness indicated in student interview sessions was having only one course on classroom management. The students think that it is very crucial in teaching education. In other words, it is believed that this course is necessary for a teacher in order to teach effectively.

The document analysis results revealed the fact that the program lacks course(s) on teaching language and culture even though multiculturalism is one of the values of the program. Although there are some courses on this issue, it cannot be enough for a language teacher education program. Another weakness of the program identified in the course policy sheets is the lack of courses which need to be offered more than one semester in an expanded framework. For example, Classroom Management and Testing and Evaluation in ELT were the courses which were mentioned by the students. They wanted to have more courses based on those issues.

The participants of the study also recommended various suggestions for the improvement of the undergraduate ELT program at EMU. The students, instructors and alumni suggested that the program needs to include more practical issues. It is believed that the existence of courses which focus on application will make the program more

effective and of will be more sufficient in teacher training. Parallel to this suggestion, removing some of the courses which are not directly related to language teacher education may create various opportunities to add more practical courses into the program as recommended by the students, instructors and alumni. Furthermore, changing some of the courses' places was another suggestion given by two instructors. For instance, it is mentioned by Instructor 2 that the place of ELTE 214 (Research Method Skills) should not be in the 2nd year of the program since the content of the course is heavy for a sophomore student. Instead, the course needs to be moved to the 3rd or 4th year. The participants believed that the above-given suggestions may contribute various insights for the improvement of the program.

5.3 Implications of the Study

The results of the study can provide some implications for both pedagogy and the further studies.

5.3.1 Pedagogical Implications

The results of the present study may have a number of pedagogical implications. Firstly, the results of the study can provide feedback to the instructors and the administration for the improvement of the courses (i.e. Testing and Evaluation in English Language Teaching) and the overall program (i.e. reordering the courses, adding and/or removing courses). Secondly, the program can better address the needs of the practicing teachers if the results of this study as well as the points noted in AQAS evaluation report are taken into consideration. This study revealed that there is a communication gap between the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and the universities. Therefore, having a systematic and sufficient contact with the MoNE is another implication which can be

driven from this study and which was also mentioned by Yavuz and Topkaya (2013). Moreover, a protocol between the MoNE and universities can be signed in order to improve the School Observation and Teaching Practice courses and make them better address the students' needs. Lastly, another implication can be the organization of academic activities in the department which may help students to develop themselves. By organizing these kinds of organizations, the students may be encouraged to conduct researches or even do publications in English language teaching. Frequently organized academic activities may also help students to follow recent trends in English language teaching.

5.3.2 Implications for Further Research

The present study has some implications for further research. First, analysis of assessment methods can be added to the evaluation model. This component is missing both in this and the other studies (Hong Kong and Turkey cases). The assessment criteria and students' grades of the courses can be taken into consideration in order to identify to what extent the course aims and learning outcomes have been achieved which was also mentioned in AQAS-Self Evaluation Report. Second, observations can be conducted; this was also suggested by Peacock (2009). Observations may help to find out to what extent the course contents course policy sheets are put into practice. They may also be beneficial in assessing the up-to-datedness of the program by identifying the teaching approaches and methods used by the instructors. As Salihoğlu (2012) suggested, the classroom observations may create an opportunity to identify the extent of matching the expectations of the students and the real classroom practices. Third, the cooperating teachers at the schools could be included in future evaluation studies to identify their opinions about the effectiveness of the undergraduate ELT program in training English

language teachers. They can be interviewed and asked whether the program prepares the students to the teaching profession, equips them with modern approaches and techniques and so on. As part of AQAS evaluation process, the ELT Department already administered a survey to cooperating teachers at schools, but conducting interviews with them may provide further in-depth data on this issue. Fourth, as one of the stakeholders, the administer of Ministry of National Education could be interviewed to find out to what extent the philosophy of the ELT program matches with the language teacher standards set by the Ministry of National Education. Lastly, collecting and analyzing the educational and other courses' course policy sheets may be helpful in order to identify their relevance to English language teacher education. Similar studies can be conducted in other ELT Departments in North Cyprus to compare the results.

REFERENCES

Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes. (2014). Decision of the Accreditation Commission of AQAS. (AQAS Report. 1-11)

Albright, A., Howard-Pitney, B., Roberts, S., & Zicarelli, J. (1998). *Tell your story: Guidelines for preparing an evaluation report.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Health Service.

Alderson, J. C, & Beretta, A. (Eds.) (1992). *Evaluating second language education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alhuqbani, M. N. (2014). Teaching English to Saudi police cadets: An evaluation study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(5), 999-1008. doi: 10.4304/jltr.5.5.999-1008

Alkin, M. C. (1969). Evaluation theory development. *Evaluation Comment*, 2, 2-7.

Altan, M. Z. (2006). Preparation of foreign language teachers in Turkey: A challenge for the 21st century. *Dil Dergisi*, 134, 49-54.

Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluation practice: The Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *27*, 341–347. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2004.04.011

Cangil, B. E. (2000). Yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirmede uygulama boyutu. Bildiriler, II, Ulusal Öğretmen Yetiştirme Sempozyumu, 10-12 Mayıs 2000, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Çanakkale 2000, 368-373.

Chen, C. (2009). *A case study in the evaluation of English training courses using a version of the CIPP model as an evaluative tool.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom.

Coşkun, A., & Daloğlu, A. (2010). Evaluating an English language teacher education program through Peacock's model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(6), 24-42. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n6.2

Coşkun-Ögeyik, M. (2009). Evaluation of English language teaching education curriculum by student teachers. *İnsan ve Toplum*, *9*, 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.universite-toplum.org/text.php3?id=383

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Demirel, M. M. (2014). *Investigating the beliefs and preferences pf pre-service teachers as regards grammar instruction in EFL context*. Unpublished Master's Thesis dissertation. Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, North Cyprus.

Department of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University. (2013). Self Evaluation Report, Departmental Documentation, 1-102.

Department of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University. (2012). Strategic Plan, Departmental Documentation, 1-10.

Department of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University. (2013). The BA ELT Graduate Survey Report, Departmental Documentation, 1-12.

Department of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University. (2013). Programme and Module Learning Outcomes Matrix, Departmental Documentation, 1-4.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dudeney, G. & Hackly, N. (2007). *How to teach English with technology*. England: Longman.

Erozan, F. (2005). *Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergraduate ELT curriculum at Eastern Mediterranean University: A case study*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12606120/index.pdf

Fermilab ARISE Project website: http://ed.fnal.gov/trc_new/program_docs/eval.html.

Gerring, J. (2000). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review, 98* (2), 341-354. Retrieved from http://www.ie.ufrj.br/hpp/-intranet/pdfs/texto_3_-_aula_3.pdf

Gunal, Ö. D. & Engin-Demir, C. (2012). Implementation of the New Eight Grade English Language Curriculum from the Perspectives of Teachers and Students. *Proceia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *(47)*, 1002-1006. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.769

Hingne, P. G. (2013). Impressive tool to communicate in modern world is the language English. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *3*(3), 319-321. doi: 10.7763/ijssh.2013.v3.253

Hogan, R. L. (2007). The historical development of program evaluation: Exploring the past and present. *Online Journal of Workface Education and Development, (4)*, 1-14. Retrieved from http://www.aifs.gov.au/cafca/pubs/sheets/rs/rs1.pdf.

Jayamma, H. R., & Sumangala, N. (2012). Professional ethics in teaching community: strategies to promote ethical standards – A global concern. *International Journal of Education and Information Studies, 2*(1), 15-18. Retrieved from http://www.ri-publication.com/ijeisv1n1/ijeisv2n1_03.pdf

Karakaş, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English language teacher education program in Turkey. *ELT Weekly*, *4*(15), 1-16. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu-/1753911/Evaluation_of_the_English_Language_Teacher_Education_Program_in_Turkey

Kiely, R. & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program evaluation in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kunt, N. & Özdemir, Ç. (2010). Impact of methodology courses on pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 3938-3944. dio: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.620

Lang, Y. (2003). Program evaluation: Realities and challenges. *Association National Universitaria de Profesoresde Ingles, A.C, 1*, 1-13. Retrieved from http://anupi.-org.mx/PDF/03005_YongLang.pdf.

Lynch, B. K. (1990). A context-adaptive model for program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*(1), 23- 42. dio: 10.2307/3586850

Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, B. K. (2003). *Language assessment and program evaluation.* United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.

Mizikaci, F. (2006). A systems approach to program evaluation model for quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *4*(1), 37-53. doi: 10.1108/09684880610643601

Nation. I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning.* New York: Cambridge

Oermann, M. H., & Gaberson, K. B. (2014). *Evaluation and testing in nursing education* (4th ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Ögeyik, M. C. (2009). Evaluation of English language teaching education curriculum by student teachers.*Üniversite ve Toplum: Bilim, Eğitim ve Düşünce Dergisi*, *9*(1), 1-5. Retrieved from http://www.universite-toplum.org/text.php3?id=383

Paker, R., & Lamont, A. (2010). *Evaluating programs*. Cafca Resource Sheet: Communities and Families Clearinghouse Australia. 1-12. Retrieved from https://www3.aifs.gov.au/cfca/sites/default/files/publication-documents/rs1.pdf

Palmer, A. (1992). Issue in evaluating input-based language teaching programs. In J, C.D. Alderson, & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 141-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, *13*(3), 259-278. doi: 10.1177/1362168809104698

Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R.G. (2003). *Program evaluation methods and case studies* (6th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.

Puett, R. (2000). Program evaluation 101. Retrieved from http://www.musc.edu/-vawprevention/research/programeval.shtml.

Rea-Dickens, P., & Germaine, K. (1992). *Evaluation*. England: Oxford University Press.

Rea-Dickins, P., & Germaine, K. P. (Eds.). (1998). The price of everything and the value of nothing: Trends in language programme evaluation. In P. Rea-Dickins, & K. P. Germaine (Eds.). *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching*. 3-19. Harlow: Longman.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2012). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. (4th ed.). Great Britain: Longman.

Rohmah, Z. (2005). English as a global language: Its historical past and its future. *Bahasa dan Seni, 33*(1), 106-117. Retrieved from http://sastra.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/English-as-a-Global-Language-Its-Historical-Past-and-Its-Future-Zuliati-Rohmah.pdf

Ross, S. J. (2003*).* A diachronic coherence model for language evaluation program. *Language Learning*, *53*(1), 1-33. doi: 10.1111/1467-9922.00209

Rovai, A.P. (2003). A practical framework for evaluating online distance education programs. *Pergamon Internet and Higher Education*, *6*, 109-124. doi: 10.1016/S1096-7516(03)00019-8

Salihoğlu, M. U. (2012*).* Pre-service teachers' and their instructors' beliefs on the effectiveness of an English language teacher education program. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46,* 3440-3444. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.018

Salli-Copur, D. S. (2008). *Teacher effectiveness in initial years of service: A case study on the graduates of METU language education program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/3/12609430/index.pdf

Sanlı, S. (2009). Comparison of the English language teaching (ELT) departments' course curricula in Turkey's education faculties. World Conference on Educational Sciences, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*, 838-843. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.150

Scriven, M. (1974). Evaluation perspectives and procedures. In J. W. Popham (Ed.), *Evaluation in education: Current application* (pp.165-178). Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *32*, 369-378. doi: 10.1080/02607470600981953

Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 197-221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soy, S. K. (1997). *The case study as a research method*. Unpublished paper, University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~ssoy-/usesusers/l391d1b.htm

Stavropoulou, A., & Stroubouki, T. (2014). Evaluation of educational programmes- the contribution of history to modern evaluation thinking. *Health Science Journal*, *8*, 193-204. Retrieved from http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/95432729-

/evaluation-educational-programmes-contribution-history-modern-evaluation-thinking

Strike, K. A. (1988). The ethics of teaching. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(2), 156-158. doi: 193.140.201.33

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *5*(1), 19-25. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED062385.pdf

Tobin, R. (2010). Descriptive case study. In A. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research,* pp.289-290. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397.n108

Topkaya, E. Z. (2005). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (5. baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/sansel/Downloads/129-451-1-PB.pdf

Topkaya, E. Z., & Küçük, Ö. (2010). An evaluation of 4th and 5th grade English language teaching program. *Elementary Education Online*, *9*(1), 52-65. Retrieved from http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr/vol9say1/v9s1m6.pdf

Trask, R. L., & Stockwell, P. (Eds). (2007). *Language and linguistics: The key concepts*. New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library. Retrieved from
149

https://www.google.com.tr/books?hl=en&lr=&id=vN4ijhzrLcC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Trask,+R.+L.,+%26+Stockwell,+P.+(Eds).+(2007).+Language+and+linguistic&ots=m2TKHFXvN1&sig=YGdFAlkePpbRsTugkNDtyIeDAc&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Trask%2C%20R.%20L.%2C%20%26%20Stockwell%2C%20P.%20(Eds).%20(2007).%20Language%20and%20linguistic&f=false

Trochim, W. M. K. (2002). Introduction to evaluation. R*esearch Methods Knowledge Base*. Retrieved from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/intreval.htm

Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of English language teaching program at a public university using CIPP model.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/-upload/12611570/index.pdf

VanWynsberghe, R., & Khan, S. (2007). Redefining case study. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 6*(2), 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.ualberta.ca/~-iiqm/backissues/6_2/vanwynsberghe.pdf

Watkins, R., Leigh., D., Foshay, R., & Kaufman, R. (1998). Kirkpatrick plus: Evaluation and continuous improvement with a community focus. *ETR&D*, *46*(4), 90-96. Retrieved from http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/257/art%253A10.1007-%252FBF02299676.pdf?auth66=1424960397_c67c9992fb7b97ffca21056893311988&ext=.pdf

Weir, C., & Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. London: Longman.

Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. S., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Yanık, A. (2007). *A study of English language curriculum implementation in 6th and 8th grades of public primary schools through teachers' and students' perceptions*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Yavuz, A., & Topkaya, Z. (2013). Teacher educators' evaluation of the English language teaching program: A Turkish case. *Novitas Royal (Research on Youth and Language)*, *1*, 64-83. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_7-1/yavuz_topkaya.pdf

Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Young, J. (1997). Program evaluation: Background and methods. Retrieved from

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Undergraduate English Language Teaching Program at Eastern Mediterranean University

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM (A1)
İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ LİSANS PROGRAMI (A1)

FIRST YEAR - FALL SEMESTER

REF. C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1411	ELTE101	Contextual Grammar I	(3-0-0)3	3
A1412	ELTE103	Advanced Reading and Writing I	(3-0-0)3	6
A1413	ELTE105	Listening and Pronunciation I	(3-0-0)3	3
A1414	ELTE107	Oral Communication Skills I	(3-0-0)3	3
A1415	EDUC101	Introduction to Educational Sciences	(3-0-0)3	6
A1416	TREG111	Turkish I: Written Communication *	(2-0-0)2	3
A1417	ITEC105	Computer I	(2-2-0)3	3
A1418	GPSC109	Effective Communication Skills	(3-0-0)3	3
TOTAL			**23**	**30**

FIRST YEAR – SPRING SEMESTER

REF.C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1421	ELTE102	Contextual Grammar II	(3-0-0)3	3
A1422	ELTE104	Advanced Reading and Writing II	(3-0-0)3	6
A1423	ELTE106	Listening and Pronunciation II	(3-0-0)3	3
A1424	ELTE108	Oral Communication Skills II	(3-0-0)3	3
A1425	ELTE112	Vocabulary	(3-0-0)3	3
A1426	EDUC114	Educational Psychology	(3-0-0)3	6
A1427	TREG112	Turkish II: Oral Communication *	(2-0-0)2	3
A1428	ITEC106	Computer II	(2-2-0)3	3
TOTAL			**23**	**30**

SECOND YEAR - FALL SEMESTER

REF. C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1431	ENGL211	English Literature I	(3-0-0)3	3
A1432	ELTE203	Linguistics I	(3-0-0)3	3
A1433	ELTE205	Approaches in English Language Teaching I	(3-0-0)3	6
A1434	ELTE207	English-Turkish Translation*	(3-0-0)3	3
A1435	ELTE209	Presentation Skills	(3-0-0)3	6
A1436	EDUC205	Principles and Methods of Instruction	(3-0-0)3	6
A1437	EDUC207	History of Turkish Education	(2-0-0)2	3
TOTAL			**20**	**30**

SECOND YEAR – SPRING SEMESTER

REF.C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1441	ENGL212	English Literature II	(3-0-0)3	3
A1442	ELTE204	Linguistics II	(3-0-0)3	3
A1443	ELTE206	Approaches in English Language Teaching II	(3-0-0)3	6
A1444	ELTE208	Language Acquisition	(3-0-0)3	3
A1445	ELTE303	Special Teaching Methods I	(2-2-0)3	6
A1446	CITE336	Instructional Technology and Materials Design	(2-2-0)3	6
A1447	ELTE214	Research Methods in English Language Teaching	(2-0-0)2	3
TOTAL			**20**	**30**

THIRD YEAR - FALL SEMESTER

REF. C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1451	ELTE301	Teaching Eng. to Young Learners I	(2-2-0)3	6
A1452	ELTE304	Special Teaching Methods II	(2-2-0)3	3
A1453	ELTE305	Teaching Language Skills I	(2-2-0)3	6
A1454	ELTE307	Literature and Language Teaching I	(3-0-0)3	3
A1455	EDUC311	Classroom Management	(2-0-0)2	3
A1456	ELTE309	Language and Society	(3-0-0)3	6
A1457	SFLN1	Second Foreign Language I	(2-0-0)2	3
TOTAL			**19**	**30**

THIRD YEAR – SPRING SEMESTER

REF.C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1461	ELTE302	Teaching Eng. to Young Learners II	(2-2-0)3	6
A1462	ELTE212	Turkish - English Translation*	(3-0-0)3	3
A1463	ELTE306	Teaching Language Skills II	(2-2-0)3	6
A1464	ELTE308	Literature and Language Teaching II	(3-0-0)3	3
A1465	EDUC313	Measurement and Evaluation	(3-1-0)3	6
A1466	ELTE310	Applications of Service to Community	(1-2-0)2	3
A1467	SFLN2	Second Foreign Language II	(2-0-0)2	3
TOTAL			**19**	**30**

FOURTH YEAR - FALL SEMESTER

REF. C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1471	ELTE401	Materials Development and Adaptation in English	(3-0-0)3	6
A1472	ELTE01	Major Area Elective I	(2-0-0)2	3
A1473	ELTE411	School Experience	(1-4-0)3	6
A1474	EDUC312	Counseling	(3-0-0)3	6
A1475	EDUC413	Special Education	(2-0-0)2	3
A1476	TARH101*	Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms I*	(2-0-0)2	3
A1477	SFLN3	Second Foreign Language III	(2-0-0)2	3
TOTAL			**17**	**30**

FOURTH YEAR – SPRING SEMESTER

REF.C.	C. CODE	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS	ECTS CREDITS
A1481	ELTE402	Testing and Evaluation in English Language Teaching	(3-0-0)3	6
A1482	ELTE02	Major Area Elective II	(2-0-0)2	3
A1483	ELTE406	Teaching Practice	(2-6-0)5	9
A1484	ELTE03	Major Area Elective III	(2-0-0)2	3
A1485	EDUC412	Comparative Education	(2-0-0)2	3
A1486	TARH102*	Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms II*	(2-0-0)2	3
A1488	EDUC307	Turkish Education System and School Administration	(2-0-0)2	3
TOTAL			**18**	**30**

Appendix B: Peacock's Fifteen Question

Does the program…

… have a clearly stated philosophy?

… reflect program philosophy?

… promote trainee flexibility in using different teaching approaches for different situations?

… promote the ability to use, and to adapt, foreign-language-teaching materials?

… balance received knowledgeversus experiential knowledge?

… incorporate and encourage trainee reflection on the experiences and values   they have when they enter the program? In particular, does it encourage trainee reflection on their 'apprenticeship of observation'?

… promote the skill of reflection and self-evaluation as a teacher?

… promote future reflective practice?

… promote the 'long-term, developmental nature of learning to teach' – does it promote post-qualification teacher growth and development?

… have good linkage among courses, avoiding overlaps?

… balance teacher- and student-centered learning?

… prepare EFL teachers to function in the sociocultural context in which they will work?

… incorporate and balance linguistic, pedagogic, and managerial competence to an appropriate degree? Linguistic competence here means L2 proficiency. Pedagogic competence refers to teaching skills plus knowledge of language and second language acquisition.

Is the program up-to-date?

Do students believe the program meets their needs, is relevant to their needs, and adequately prepares them for classroom teaching?

Appendix C: Student Questionnaires

Dear students,

As part of my MA studies, I am conducting a research on the evaluation of the undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program. This questionnaire aims to identify your opinions about the English Language Teaching Program. To this aim, you are asked to state the strengths and the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program, and to give suggestions for its improvement. It is very important that you answer the questions sincerely. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential, and the data will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Şansel ZORBA

MA Student

English Language Teaching Department

Faculty of Education, Eastern Meditarranean University

e-mail: sansel_zorba@cc.emu.edu.tr

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used.

Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Part I: Background Information

Directions: Please provide the necessary information below.

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Age: ☐17-22 ☐ 23-28 ☐ 29-34 ☐ 35+

Class: ☐ 3rd year ☐ 4th year

Nationality: ☐Turkish (TR) ☐Turkish Cypriot (TRNC) ☐ Other _____ (please specify)

Mother Tongue: ☐Turkish ☐ English ☐Other _____ (please specify)

Part II: Evaluation of the undergraduate English Language Teaching Program

Directions: Please read the following statements and mark (X) as appropriate.

The undergraduate ELT programme at EMU…	1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Uncertain	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
1. … has good linkage between different courses.					
2. … avoids overlapping information between different courses.					
3. … gave me adequate training in English.					
4. … gave me adequate training in teaching skills.					
5. … gave me adequate training for the needs of the local context.					
6. … is up-to-date.					
7. … encouraged me to reflect on my past experiences as a					

language learner.					
8. *… encouraged me to be a reflective teacher (when I start teaching).*					
9. *… promotes flexibility in using different teaching practices for different situations.*					
10. *… balances teacher-centered and student-centered learning on its courses.*					
11. *… taught me how to teach English.*					
12. *… taught me how to evaluate myself as a teacher.*					
13. *… taught me classroom management skills .*					
14. *… taught me how to use foreign language teaching materials.*					
15. *… taught me how to adapt foreign language teaching materials.*					
16. *… increased my powers of self-evaluation.*					
17. *… taught me foreign language testing and evaluation skills.*					
18. *… is relevant to my needs.*					
19. *… has a good balance between the teaching of; English, teaching skills, and classroom management skills.*					
20. *… prepared me to teach English in the classroom.*					
21. *… met my needs.*					
22. *By the end of the Undergraduate ELT Programme at EMU, I will be ready to teach English.*					

Appendix C: Student Questionnaire (cont.)

Part III: Please answer the following questions about the four-year undergraduate ELT Program.

1) What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2) What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3) What can be done to improve the undergraduate ELT program? Please, list your suggestions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix D: Student Essays

Dear student,

As part of my MA studies, I am conducting a research on the evaluation of the undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program. This essay writing task aims to identify your opinions about the philosophy of the undergraduate English Language Teaching Program. To this aim, you are asked to write one-page essay to express your views regarding the philosophy of the program, and whether it reflects the reality or not. The philosophy of the program will be provided by the researcher and you are required to finish it before the end of the mid-term examination week. It is very important that you answer the questions objectively. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential, and the data will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Şansel ZORBA

MA Student

English Language Teaching Department

Faculty of Education, Eastern Meditarranean University

e-mail: sansel_zorba@cc.emu.edu.tr

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used. Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D: Student Essays (cont.)

The Mission Statement

To provide contemporary tertiary education, in line with the University mission statement, to maintain quality standards in teaching and research at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, to keep abreast of the academic developments and professional innovations, and to meet the educational challenges in the globalizing world.

The Vision Statement

To become one of the leading ELT Departments in the region, receptive to innovations as well as improvement, training well-rounded language teaching professionals in a multicultural environment.

The Values

- Learner-Centeredness	- Quality Research
- The Code of Practice	- Multilingualism
- Contemporary Language Education	- Multiculturalism
- High Standards in Teaching	

Undergraduate Program (B.A. in ELT)

The undergraduate degree program of the ELT Department is informed by the belief that language teacher training must combine academic knowledge, effective professional training and practice. The major objective of the BA program is thus to provide students with specialized knowledge in the field and to equip them with practical skills for teaching.

A well-balanced emphasis on theory and application is maintained throughout the BA study; commencing with the first year of language work and culminating with school experience and practicum at the close, students have opportunities to relate theory to practice and to explore career options. Moreover, a range of Major Area elective courses provide students with opportunities to familiarize themselves with the most recent developments in the field.

The program curriculum covers most of the courses that are considered critical to successful language instruction such as linguistic foundation, approaches to ELT, special teaching methods, teaching language skills, language acquisition, research methods, classroom management, testing and evaluation, as well as other courses crucial to effective teaching performance and professional growth.

Appendix D: Student Essays (cont.)

Directions: Answer the following question after you read the philosophy of the undergraduate ELT Program.

- **Does the program reflect program philosophy?**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix E: Student Interview Questions

Dear student,

As part of my MA studies, I am conducting a research on the evaluation of the undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program. This interview aims to identify your opinions about the English Language Teaching Program. To this aim, you are asked to state the strengths and the weaknesses of the program, and to give suggestions for its improvement. It is very important that you answer the questions realistically. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential, and the data will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Şansel ZORBA
MA Student
English Language Teaching Department
Faculty of Education, Eastern Meditarranean University
e-mail: sansel_zorba@cc.emu.edu.tr

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used.

Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E: Student Interview Questions (cont.)

Please answer the following questions by providing specific evidence and examples.

1. What are the strengths of the undergraduate ELT program?

2. What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT program?

3. How can the undergraduate ELT program be improved?

Appendix F: Teachers Interview Questions

Dear teacher,

As part of my MA studies, I am conducting a research on the evaluation of the undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program. This interview aims to identify your opinions about the English Language Teaching Program. To this aim, you are asked to state the strengths and the weaknesses of the program, and to give suggestions for its improvement. It is very important that you answer the questions sincerely. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential, and the data will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Şansel ZORBA

MA Student

English Language Teaching Department

Faculty of Education, Eastern Meditarranean University

e-mail: sansel_zorba@cc.emu.edu.tr

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used.

Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix F: Teachers Interview Questions (cont.)

Part I: Background Information

Directions: Please provide the following information.

1) **Gender:** ☐ Male   ☐ Female
2) **Age:** ☐ 25-35   ☐ 36-45   ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56+
3) **Years of Teaching Experience:** _____ years.
4) **Nationality:** ☐ Turkish (TR)   ☐ Turkish Cypriot (TRNC) ☐ Other_____
   (please specify)
5) **Mother Tongue:** ☐ Turkish   ☐ English   ☐ Other _____ (please specify)

Part II: Evaluation of the undergraduate ELT Program at EMU

Directions: Could you please state your ideas regarding the following questions?

- Does the program…

1) … have a clearly stated philosophy?

2) … reflect program philosophy?

3) … promote trainee flexibility in using different teaching approaches for different situations?

4) … promote the ability to use, and to adapt, foreign-language-teaching materials?

5) … balance received knowledge versus experiential knowledge?

6) …incorporate and encourage trainee reflection on the experiences and values they have when they enter the program? In particular, does it encourage trainee reflection on their 'apprenticeship of observation'?

7) … promote the skill of reflection and self-evaluation as a teacher?

8) … promote future reflective practice?

9) … promote the 'long-term, developmental nature of learning to teach' – does it promote post-qualification teacher growth and development?

10) … have good linkage among courses, avoiding overlaps?

11) … balance teacher- and student-centered learning?

12) ... promote the code of practice?

12) … prepare EFL teachers to function in the sociocultural context in which they will work?

13) … incorporate and balance linguistic, pedagogic, and managerial competence to an appropriate degree? Linguistic competence here means L2 proficiency. Pedagogic competence refers to teaching skills plus knowledge of language and second language acquisition.

Appendix F: Teachers Interview Questions (cont.)

14) Is the program up-to-date?

15) Do students believe the program meets their needs, is relevant to their needs, and adequately prepares them for classroom teaching?

Part III: Overall Evaluation of the undergraduate ELT Program at EMU

1. What are the strenghts of the undergraduate ELT Program?
2. What are the weaknesses of the undergraduate ELT Program?
3. What are your suggestions for the improvement of the program?

Appendix G: Alumni Questionnaire

Dear ELT graduate,

As part of my MA studies, I am conducting a research on the evaluation of the Undergraduate English Language Teacher Education Program. This interview aims to identify your opinions about the English Language Teaching Program. To this aim, you are asked to state the strengths and the weaknesses of the program and to give suggestions for its improvement. You are also asked to specify the problems that you are facing in your teaching. It is very important that you answer the questions subjectively. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential, and the data will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Şansel ZORBA

MA Student

English Language Teaching Department

Faculty of Education, Eastern Meditarranean University

e-mail: sansel_zorba@cc.emu.edu.tr

_____

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used.

Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Alumni Questionnaire

Part I- Background Information

1) **Gender:** ☐ Male ☐ Female
2) **Age:** _____
3) **Years of Teaching experience:** _____ years.
4) **Mother Tongue:** ☐ Turkish ☐ English ☐ Other_____ (please specify)
5) **Do you work as a teacher?** ☐ Yes ☐ No
   a. **If yes, which level(s) do you teach**_____
   b. **If no, please specify your job and place of work:** _____

_____

Part II- Evaluation of the undergraduate English Language Teaching Program

1. What were the strengths of the undergraduate English Language Teaching Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What were the weaknesses of the undergraduate English Language Teaching Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. What can be done to improve the undergraduate ELT program? What are your
   suggestions on how to improve the undergraduate ELT Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What kinds of problems you face in your teaching?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. How can these problems be solved? What are your suggestions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix H: Detailed Results of the Student Questionnaire

The undergraduate ELT programme at EMU…	1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Uncertain	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
… has good linkage between different courses.	20	68	8	4	0
… avoids overlapping information between different courses.	16	60	20	4	0
… gave me adequate training in English.	40	52	4	4	0
… gave me adequate training in teaching skills.	52	40	4	4	0
… gave me adequate training for the needs of the local context.	16	56	24	4	0
… is up-to-date.	40	32	28	0	0
… encouraged me to reflect on my past experiences as a language learner.	64	16	16	4	0
… encouraged me to be a reflective teacher (when I start teaching).	52	36	4	8	0
… promotes flexibility in using different teaching practices for different situations.	52	28	16	4	0
… balances teacher-centered and student-centered learning on its courses.	32	44	24	0	0
… taught me how to teach English.	72	20	4	4	0
… taught me how to evaluate myself as a teacher.	68	20	8	4	0
… taught me classroom management skills .	72	24	4	0	0
… taught me how to use foreign language teaching materials.	56	32	8	4	0
… taught me how to adapt foreign language teaching materials.	60	24	12	4	0
… increased my powers of self-evaluation.	44	48	8	0	0
… taught me foreign language testing and evaluation skills.	24	56	16	4	0

… is relevant to my needs.	36	36	28	0	0
… has a good balance between the teaching of; English, teaching skills, and classroom management skills.	44	56	0	0	0
… prepared me to teach English in the classroom.	60	36	4	0	0
… met my needs.	40	36	20	4	0
By the end of the Undergraduate ELT Programme at EMU, I will be ready to teach English.	48	40	12	0	0