

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPECIAL TEACHING METHODS I COURSE IN PREPARING STUDENTS TO SPECIAL TEACHING METHODS II COURSE: A CASE STUDY

AUTHORS: Ömer Faruk Ipek,Aysegül Daloglu

PAGES: 231-249

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/292002>

İpek, Ö.F., Daloğlu, A. (2017). The effectiveness of special teaching methods I course in preparing students to special teaching methods II course: a case study. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (1), 231-249.

Geliş Tarihi:11/10/2016

Kabul Tarihi: 15/02/2017

ÖZEL ÖĞRETİM YÖNTEMLERİ I DERSİNİN ÖĞRENCİLERİN ÖZEL ÖĞRETİM YÖNTEMLERİ II DERSİNE HAZIRLAMADA ETKİSİ: DURUM ÇALIŞMASI

Ömer Faruk İPEK*
Ayşegül DALOĞLU**

ÖZET

Bu nitel çalışmada, Türkiye'nin batısında bulunan bir üniversitenin İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümünde okutulan Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri I dersinin öğrencileri Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri II dersine hazırlamada ne kadar etkili olduğunun Patton'un (1978) Utility Focused Evaluation isimli program değerlendirme yaklaşımı ile değerlendirmesi çalışılmıştır. Bu çalışmaya bir bölüm idarecisi, iki ders öğretim elemanı ve dersleri alan kırk beş öğrenci katılmıştır. Dört ana veri toplama aracı kullanılmıştır. Bunlar, bölüm idarecisi mülakatı, ders öğretim elemanları mülakatı, dökümanlar ve öğrenci kontrol listesidir. Bu çalışmanın ana bulguları, Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri I dersinin öğrencileri öğrenci, öğretmen ve bağlam özelliklerini tanımlama, öğrenci motivasyonu, yaş, yeterlik düzeyleri, dilbilgisi, kelime ve telaffuz öğretimi, ve öğrenci sınavlarını değerlendirme konularında dersi alan öğretmen adaylarını olumlu yönde hazırlarken, sınıf yönetimi, öğrenci yazılarını değerlendirme, ve dilbilgisi materyalleri hazırlamada eksiklikler olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Özel öğretim yöntemleri, program değerlendirme.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPECIAL TEACHING METHODS I COURSE IN PREPARING STUDENTS TO SPECIAL TEACHING METHODS II COURSE: A CASE STUDY

ABSTRACT

In this qualitative study, the effect of the program of Special Teaching Methods (STM) I course in preparing students to STM II course, which are both given in an English Language Teacher Training (ELTT) department at a university situated in western Turkey, was investigated using Patton's (1978) Utility Focused Evaluation (U-FE). One department administrator, two course instructors, and forty-five students participated in this study. Four main data collection instruments were used; interview with ELTT administrator, interview with ELTT course instructors, student checklist, and documents. The major findings are that although the program is effective in preparing students with defining the characteristics of learner, teacher, and the context, student motivation, age, proficiency issues, teaching grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation teaching, and assessing student tests, the program seems ineffective in applying classroom management skills, assessing student writings, and developing grammar materials.

Key Words: Special teaching methods, program evaluation.

* Okutman, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Hazırlık Bölümü,
ipek_o@ibu.edu.tr

** Prof. Dr. Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü,
daloglu@metu.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years English language is seen vitally important for its citizenry if that country wants to be active in global area. Hence, the demand for qualified and efficient English language teachers has increased and seen crucial (Burns & Richards, 2009). Although teacher education institutions or tradition has a long past, second language teacher education (SLTE) is relatively recent (Day, 1991). Before 1970s, the behaviors of effective and good teachers dominated the implementation of SLTE. In 1980s, it stated to change as teachers previous experiences gained importance in SLTE programs. Recently, context of teacher education has shaped the SLTE programs (Freeman & Johnson, 1998).

Holliday (1994) stated that SLTE programs have failed regarding preparing teachers to real life contexts; therefore, cognition of the teacher candidates and link between the classroom and actual life has gained importance. Accordingly, SLTE activities emphasized both experiential and awareness raising activities (Ellis, 1990). The first activity “involve the student teachers in actual teaching” while the second aims to enable the “understanding of the principles of second language teaching and/or the practical techniques that teachers can use in different kinds of lessons” (Ellis, 1990. p.27).

SLTE history in Turkey has undergone similar process during the history. The Higher Education Council (HEC) that is responsible for the regulations of education and research at universities was founded in 1981. After the foundation of HEC, SLTE responsibility was taken from Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and given to HEC (Gürsimsek *et al.*, 1997). With this profound decision, SLTE was standardized among all country which was seen as a positive action (Demirel, 1991; Öztürk, 2005).

SLTE is mostly focused on English today and it is designed as 4-year education (Seferoğlu, 2004). The curricula of the SLTE programs are designed and offered by HEC which is a centralized institution (Aksu *et.al.*, 2010)

Although Turkey has a slightly deep and long history in SLTE, many criticisms have been done (Tilfarlıoğlu & Öztürk, 2007; Altan, 1998). First one is about the students being not enough intellectual, the second one is about the deficiencies of the curriculum, third is the gap between the real school and the education given in the faculties, and lastly it is the lack of the evaluation of the programs (Cruickshank, 1996; Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010).

1.1. Program Evaluation

Naturalistic approaches have been used widely in program evaluation literature in recent years rather than positivistic paradigm (Lynch, 1996). However, regular planned and disciplined procedures to evaluate the SLTE programs have little literature (Peacock, 2009). As stated in Shawer (2012), a program seeks ways to achieve the external objectives of the central or local community or power whereas evaluation deals with “an information gathering and interpreting endeavor that attempts to answer a specified set of questions about a program’s performance and effectiveness” (Rossi *et al.* 1999, p. 62). “Although evaluation involves formal and informal judgments about program value, formal evaluation applies scientific procedures to the collection and analysis of information about the content, structure and outcomes of programs” (Clarke, 1999, p. 1).

Yang (2009) points out that language program evaluation concerns the increasing demand of the quality in second language education and teacher preparation domains. In Shawer (2012), it also stated that “programs exist in order to change, enrich, enhance, extend, or improve the lives of participants and, by extension, the quality of life in society as a whole,” governments and the public have the right to ascertain that programs deliver what they promise through standards- driven program evaluation (Norris, 2006, p. 577). Program evaluation provides faculties, institutions, or stakeholders what they are doing, who they are, and how effective they are (Norris, 2006). A language education program “generally consists of a slate of courses designed to prepare students for some language-related endeavor” (Lynch, 1996, p. 2).

In order to prepare the teacher candidates, several methodological courses have been offered in SLTE programs. These are Approaches and Methods course, Special Teaching Methods (STM) I and II courses, Young Learners, and Teaching Practicum courses. This study specifically investigates the effect of STM I course on STM II course. Considering the evaluation of SLTE programs, this study intended to evaluate the programs of these two courses using Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) approach proposed by Patton (1978).

1.2. Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE)

Stufflebeam (1999) summarized the program evaluation models throughout the 20th century. In the article, it is stated that several evaluation frameworks have been studied in the literature of program evaluation. Some of them are Kirkpatrick’s (1996) four-level-model, Strieven’s (1974) goal free evaluation, Hammond’s (1972) objectives-oriented evaluation, Stufflebeam’s (1969) decision-focused approach, and Patton’s (1978) Utilization-focused evaluation (U-FE). However, as the context and the aim of the study is mostly appropriate for the Patton’s (1978) U-FE, it is used to evaluate the programs of these two courses in this study.

Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) begins with the premise that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use; therefore, evaluators should facilitate the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, *from beginning to end*, will affect use. Use concerns how real people in the real world apply evaluation findings and experiences the evaluation process. Therefore, the *focus* in utilization-focused evaluation is on intended use by intended users. Since no evaluation can be value-free, utilization-focused evaluation answers the question of whose values will frame the evaluation by working with clearly identified, primary intended users who have responsibility to apply evaluation findings and implement recommendations. (Patton, 2002, p. 1)

UFE is an open ended evaluation, and it does not propose a certain model or evaluation theory. It is rather an approach that helps the researchers find a suitable, useful or practical way for evaluation (Kahan & Consulting, 2008). Moreover, it can be formative or summative, and qualitative or quantitative. This approach mainly deals with the decision making with the user on intended uses of the program (Patton, 2002). Patton (2013) pointed out seventeen steps in order to conduct a true evaluation using UFE; however, Ramirez and Broadhead (2013) listed twelve steps for following the UFE framework. These are;

- 1- Assessing Program Readiness
- 2- Assessing Evaluators' Readiness
- 3- Identifying Primary Intended Users
- 4- Situational Analysis
- 5- Identification of Primary Intended Uses
- 6- Focusing the Evaluation
- 7- Evaluation Design
- 8- Simulation of Use
- 9- Data Collection
- 10- Data Analysis
- 11- Facilitation of Use
- 12- Meta Evaluation

1.3. The Aim of the Study

The main purpose of this evaluation study is to reveal how effective the programs of the two courses (STM I &II) are. It is seemed quite crucial for both the department and the student; therefore, a detailed research is being conducted on these two courses. In this study, particularly one question is answered;

- 1- How effective is Special Teaching Methods I course in preparing students to Special Teaching Methods II course?

In order to answer this question appropriately, qualitative method has been used with the help of Patton's (1978) U-FE model. The evaluation was initiated by one English language instructor doing his PhD in ELT department (me as the primary investigator). The proposal for an evaluation that focused on STM courses emerged from evaluators concerns. As the evaluator was educated in the same department, it is perceived that there are gaps between what was provided and what was needed in order to prepare for teaching and to pursue teaching related activities. The steps indicated above in the literature review section of the current study have been followed by the evaluator and the primary intended users (PIUs) – which are the head of the department and the instructors teaching STM course. In this summative evaluation, the process of the evaluation has been negotiated with the PIUs and their decision and comments have been indicated in the evaluation of the evaluation section of the current paper. Program readiness and identification of PIUs were done by the evaluator and the head of the department. Then, situational analysis was discussed with the PIUs. After that, evaluation design was drafted with the stakeholders, and data collection was conducted by the researcher. Finally the data was analyzed by the evaluator and meta-evaluation is discussed with the PIUs.

1.4. The Importance of the Study

This study is mainly a program evaluation. Although one can easily find various types of program evaluation studies, this study deals with the special use of one commonly used program evaluation model; UFE. By using this model, the researchers may easily follow the steps of the model, and apply it to their own research subject.

2. METHOD

2.1. The Research Model

Qualitative case study model is used for a deep and detailed understanding of how Special Teaching Methods I course prepared the ELT department students to the preceding course.

2.2. Participants

The participants in the current study are 45 third -year student teachers and 3 university instructors in the department one of which is the head of the department and two are the instructors teaching STM courses. One instructor taught STM I course, and the second instructor has been teaching the STM II course. It is clear that, the two courses are given by different instructors, and it expected that these two instructors should work closely to each other in order to create a balanced and coherent course syllabuses.

The names are masked in order to enable the confidentiality. The head of the department is named Ins-Head, and the instructor of the STM I course is named Ins-1, and the instructor of the STM II course is named Ins-2. The head of the department is female and she is an Associate Professor, and has been working in the same department for ten years. The course instructors are both females and they are both Assistant Professors. Ins-1 has been working in the department for sixteen years, and Ins-2 has been working in the same department for nine years. It can be deduced that all of the instructors are experienced and know the department and the students very well.

In this study, 45 students were involved. Their age range is between 20 and 23. All of the students are day-time students. The majority of them are female (n: 35), an only 10 of them are male. Data were collected thorough qualitative data collection instruments. Questionnaires, interviews and document analysis were applied in order to triangulate the data.

2.3. The Context

Teacher training systems have undergone various changes in the history of the Turkish Republic (Bektaş & Altıok, 2006). Training teachers in Turkey is centralized after the foundation of HEC in 1981 and this council is responsible for the design, implementation, and evaluation of such programs (Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010). The last program was started to be implemented in 2007 by the HEC. The programs of English Language Teacher Training (ELTT) departments were tried to be standardized; however, some universities adds or neglects some of the courses from their departments.

The English Language Teaching (ELT) program is offered by Faculty of Educations, and takes at least four year. These programs are undergraduate programs and the graduates of these departments gets BA degree, and can continue their graduate studies in similar fields. Graduates from the program are employed in Ministry of National Education primary and secondary schools, universities or in the private sector. (Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003)

Similar to all teacher education programs in Turkey, the ELT program in this university was established by the Turkish Higher Education Council (HEC) in 1999. The current program was introduced in 2007 in this department. In the program both theoretical and

methodological courses are offered. The final year includes, but is not limited to, two school-based practicum courses run in cooperation with local Ministry of National Education schools. The courses involved in the current study are Special Teaching Methods I & II. In this department, three types of methodology courses are given. These are;

- 1- Approaches to English Language Teaching I
- 2- Approaches to English Language Teaching II
- 3- Special Teaching Methods I
- 4- Special Teaching Methods II
- 5- Teaching Language Skills I
- 6- Teaching Language Skills II

Approaches to English Language Teaching I course is given in the third and Approaches to English Language Teaching II and Special Teaching Methods I courses are given in the fourth semester of the department. Special Teaching Methods II and Teaching Language Skills I courses are given in the fifth and course is given in the sixth semester. Lastly, Teaching Language Skills II course is given in the sixth semester. The practice teaching courses are given in the last two semesters of the department. In these courses, student-teachers go to state schools and first observe, and then, starts teaching in the real classroom under supervision of both state school teachers and their supervisors form their departments. According to the department's website, the course contents are as following;

Approaches to English Language Teaching I : Basic issues and processes in ELT course design; the difference among approach, method and technique and the significance of these concepts in course design; an overview of important methods and approaches in ELT: Grammar Translation Method, Direct Method, Audio-lingual Method, Silent Way, Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, Communicative Approach, the Natural Approach.

Approaches to English Language Teaching II: Current issues and practices in ELT course design, appropriate approaches suitable to learner needs based on current distinctions such as ESL, EFL, EIL, ESP, EAP; current foreign language teaching trends such as constructivist approach, content-based instruction, task-based instruction, problem-based teaching, multiple intelligences, whole language approach and corpus-based applications of language teaching; culture and classroom second/ foreign language learning, technology use in language classrooms, and communicative and intercultural competencies for the language learner and teacher of the globalized world.

Special Teaching Methods I : Designing and conducting needs analysis on language learner needs (e.g.: situational, objective, subjective and language needs), writing objectives that reflect these needs and designing course syllabus at the macro level and micro level; an overview of different lesson stages (i.e.: Presentation, Practice and Production) and approaches to lesson planning and course design; various syllabus types and criteria for the selection of appropriate syllabus type according to the learner needs, learner age and aims of the course; standards-based teaching, proficiency descriptors, English language proficiency standards and guidelines, Common European Framework and the European Language Portfolio; and identity.

Special Teaching Methods II : Classroom-based research, teacher directed research and action research, diagnosing learners' language related needs and remedial teaching

activities; principles of learner monitoring and role of learner assessment in lesson planning; national and international professional organizations (e.g.: TESOL and INGED) and practical journals (e.g.: English Teaching Forum, ELTJ, TESLJ and TESL Reporter).

Teaching Language Skills I: Techniques and stages of teaching listening, speaking, pronunciation and vocabulary; building language awareness and teaching skills for language learners at various ages and language proficiency levels; lesson planning and techniques of the specific skills for a variety proficiency levels.

Teaching Language Skills II Techniques used in and stages of teaching reading, writing and grammar to language learners at various ages and language proficiency levels; building language awareness and teaching skills; integration of the language skills, principles of lesson planning and techniques of the specific skills for a variety proficiency levels.

2.4. Data Collection Instruments

In order to answer the evaluation question indicated in the previous section, four evaluation instruments were used regarding qualitative research paradigm. The instruments were: (a) interview with the ELTT administrator, (b) interview with the ELTT instructors who gives STM courses, (c) checklist with students, and (d) documents in order to investigate the course syllabuses. Table 1 below outlines these instruments and their major uses. After drafting the instruments, these were shared with the PIUs, and the evaluator and the PIUs worked collaboratively to improve the instruments.

Table 1.

Evaluation Instruments

<u>Instruments</u>	<u>Informants</u>	<u>Major Uses</u>
Interview	ELTT administrator	Specifying the intended outcomes of the STM I & II courses, and to reveal whether these course are effective or not.
Interview	ELTT instructors	Finding out how much effective are the programs of the course, and the effect of the STM I course on STM II course.
Checklist	Students taking STM courses	Identifying ELTT students' perception of the outcomes of STM courses.
Documents	ELTT instructors' syllabuses	finding out how much balanced and coherent the syllabuses of two STM courses.

Interview with ELTT Administrator

A semi-structured interview was conducted with the ELTT administrator, who is an associate professor in ELT field. The interview was audio recorded, and it took nearly twenty minutes. There were five questions and each question was answered in detail. The questions asked were;

- 1- What is the general aim of the STM courses?
- 2- What is the reason for giving STM I and STM II courses separately?
- 3- What is the relationship between STM courses with the other courses given in the department?
- 4- What are intended outcomes of the courses?
- 5- What is the expected contribution of STM I course to STM II course?

Interview with ELTT Instructors

With the ELTT instructors who gave the STM I course in the 2013 spring semester and STM II course given in the 2013 fall term were interviewed. The interviews were audio recorded, and then transcribed. The interviews were done in Turkish to make the instructors feel comfortable and more informative. Then, the interviews were translated into English by the evaluator and a person who is expert in English language. Different from the interview done with the ELTT administrator, nine questions were asked to the ELTT instructors. These questions were as followings;

- 1- What is the general aim of the STM courses?
- 2- What is effective teaching?
- 3- What is the reason for giving STM I and STM II courses separately?
- 4- What is the relationship between STM courses with the other courses given in the department?
- 5- What are intended outcomes of the courses?
- 6- How is the student assessment in the courses?
- 7- What do you pay attention to while preparing the course content?
- 8- How do you instruct the students?
- 9- What is the expected contribution of STM I course to STM II course?

Student Checklist

A checklist was prepared by the evaluator by looking at the course syllabuses of the two STM courses. There were twenty items in the checklist, and students were expected to answer them YES or NO. Forty-five students returned the checklists, and with the help of SPSS 15, the results were analyzed. The questions were as following;

- 1- I can define the characteristics of an effective teacher
- 2- I can define the characteristics of an effective learner
- 3- I can define the characteristics of an effective teaching context
- 4- I am careful about the intrinsic motivation of the learners
- 5- I am aware of the importance of the age issue
- 6- I am aware of the importance of learners' proficiency levels
- 7- I can apply classroom management principles in my teaching effectively
- 8- I can use the textbook (course book) effectively
- 9- I can plan an effective lesson
- 10- I can teach grammar effectively
- 11- I can teach vocabulary effectively
- 12- I can teach pronunciation effectively
- 13- I can define reflective practice
- 14- I can assess student writings effectively
- 15- I can assess student tests effectively

- 16- I can develop Grammar activities effectively
- 17- I can apply the principles of teaching grammar that I studied in SPM I in SPM II course
- 18- I can apply the principles of lesson planning that I studied in SPM I in SPM II course.
- 19- STM I course was effective in preparing me to STM II course.
- 20- STM I course helped me to understand theoretical background of classroom techniques in STM II course.

Documents

As documents, the two syllabuses of STM courses were investigated in detail. The aim of the investigation and study of the syllabuses were to look if there is a cohesion between the two courses, how much do they fit each other, and how effective the STM I course syllable in preparing students to STM II course. In the course syllabuses, the learning outcomes, the course books used during the implementation of the program, and the weekly schedule were analyzed.

2.5. Data Collection Procedures and Analysis

As the STM I course was given in the spring term of 2012-2013 academic year, first the syllabus of that course was asked from the course instructor. Then, the STM course which was given in 2013-2014 academic year fall term was asked from the course instructor. After a detailed study on syllabuses, student checklist and interview questions were prepared. After the preparation of the instruments, first the interview with the ELTT administrator was conducted. Then, the interview with the ELTT instructors were done, finally, checklists were distributed to the students. As this is a qualitative study, interpretation was used in order to come to conclusion by the evaluator.

As Lynch (1996) points out depending on the evaluation goals, the specific evaluation context, and the type of qualitative design chosen for the evaluation, a more or less structured interview format will be required. Also Patton (1980) discusses three types of qualitative interview formats: the informal conversational interview, the interview guide, and the standardized open-ended interview. In the current study the standardized open-ended interview was used. As Lynch (1996) states the advantage to the standardized open-ended interview is its efficiency. For the semi-structured interviews, wording and sequence of questions were determined in advance. As part of the semi-structured interviews, the open-ended questions provided a number of advantages: they were flexible, and they resulted in unexpected answers (Cohen, Manion, & Marison, 2007). The interview protocol included open-ended questions that focused on descriptive, experience, behavior, and background dimensions (Spradley, 1979). The interviews were conducted in Turkish, the mother tongue of the participants. This provided comfort and eased participants' self-expression. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. The corpus was then translated into English. The other data gathering tool was documents which are the two syllabuses of the two STM courses. Also, student checklist was used in order to understand the students' perception of the course content and their own understanding of their course outcomes.

3. RESULTS

In this section of the current study, the results gathered by four research instruments will be given. First, the results of the interview with ELTT administrator, then the results of the ELTT instructors, after that the results of the student checklist, and finally the results of the documents (syllabuses) will be given in detail.

3.1. The Results of the Interview with ELTT Administrator

The ELTT administrator indicates that the general aim of these courses are specifying the general educational topic into the ELT field like lesson planning, classroom management, learner characteristics, and teacher characteristics. It is indicated that, these courses have already been taught in all educational departments; however, the specific needs of the ELT field are studied in these courses. For example, she says that lesson planning is taught in all departments, but each department has its own unique and specific one.

Furthermore, the reason for giving STM I and STM II courses are said to be the overload of the course content. ELTT administrator supports that there are too many content in these courses, and these subjects need to be internalized. At the same time, it is pointed out that the course is totally four hours a week – two hours theory and two hours practical knowledge, so the students have the chance to practice what they learn in the theoretical sessions.

About the relationship of the STM courses with the other courses given in the department, it is stated that currently, there are pedagogic courses in the department such as educational psychology and classroom management. It is supported that, these STM courses are seen as a step to the other courses in the department.

According to the ELTT administrator, the intended outcomes of these courses are making a lesson plan, knowing learner differences, knowing the good language teacher, and knowing different types of classroom management. She states that these two courses are preparation courses for practicum courses.

Finally, for the most important question in the interview about the contribution of STM I to STM II is that the courses need to be seen as a whole. The reason that they are given separately is that the course content is too heavy and loaded. It is stated that although these two courses are independent from each other, STM I gives more basic knowledge.

3.2. The Results of the Interview with ELTT Instructors **Instructor-1**

About the general aim of STM I course, Ins-1 states that STM I course tries to give students the basic knowledge of classroom management skills, motivation, and interaction. Ins-1 points out that effective teaching is knowing the teaching process, and individual differences. It is stated that, the reason for giving STM I and STM II courses separately is the course load. It is meant that STM I is theoretical, and STM II gives more practical knowledge. Ins-1 asserts that the relationship of these courses with the other courses in the department is that students reflect their knowledge that they got from other methodological courses to STM courses; therefore it is interrelated. According to Ins-1, the intended course outcomes are writing course objectives, and making lesson plans. For STM I course one midterm, one final, and a demo lesson is done for assessment. She states that books are taken into consideration while preparing the course content. Ins-1

states that she gives students some materials to be read outside the class before the class time, and it is expected that all students read them. In the class, there are lots of question and answer sessions. Lastly, she points out that, STM I is a theoretical course, and students are expected to transmit their knowledge to STM II course.

Instructor-2

According to Ins-2, the aim of STM II course is to introduce the activities that need to be used in teaching profession. She states that teaching, lesson planning, planning activities, assessment process, giving feedback are the skills given at STM II course. She describes effective teaching as implementation, changeability, and adaptability of the teacher. She states that there are some necessities of teacher and effective means whether these prospective teachers can find their own ways, implement, adapt or change themselves according to student needs and specific contexts. She states that the reason for dividing the course as 1 and 2 is the course load, and it is stated that STM I is more theoretical, and STM II is more practical. Furthermore, she states that the relationship between these courses and the other courses in the department is so important that they are linked to each other. As for the intended outcomes, she supports that students need to prepare themselves to use different methods in different settings. They need to develop their own teaching strategies. She indicates that memorization cannot be done in these courses; practicing and discussion are seen vital in these courses. She states that process assessment is done. In STM II course, there is one midterm and one final exam. There is also video discussion sessions, and reflection writing. She paid attention to the important points of the profession before preparing the course content. She looked at the content of the STM I course. She included what STM I course teacher did not include in the program. Ins-2 sets the activities first, and gives the theory herself. Then, they do brainstorming all together. They do theoretical work in the first two hours and practice in the second two hours. She thinks that STM I and STM II courses need to be given by the same teacher.

3.3. The Results of the Student Checklist

According to the results given in the frequency table in Appendix A, all the students can define the characteristics of an effective teacher and learner, and aware of the importance of the age factor. 84, 4% (n=38) of the students state that they can define the characteristics of an effective teaching context. On the other hand, 97,7% (n=44) of the students are careful about the intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, 93,3% (n=42) students are aware of the importance of learner proficiency levels. According to checklist, 64,4% (n=29) of the students can apply classroom management principles effectively, define reflective practice, assess student writings, develop grammar activities, and apply the principles of teaching grammar. 60% (n=27) of the students can use the course book effectively, and can plan an effective lesson plan. According to the students, 73,3% (n=23) of them can teach grammar effectively. 71,1% (n=32) of the students can teach vocabulary and pronunciation effectively, and apply the principles of lesson planning that they studied in STM I course and STM II course. Most importantly, only 57,7% (n=26) of the students state that STM I course was effective in preparing them to STM II course. Furthermore, 66,6% (n=30) point out that STM I course helped them to understand theoretical background of the classroom techniques in STM II course.

3.4. The Results of the Documents

According the STM I course syllabus, the aim of the STM I course is to provide a theoretical background to classroom techniques and to give an opportunity to practice these techniques. Classroom interaction, classroom management, lesson planning, teaching language and pronunciation will be focused. There are two course books used in the STM I course. One is from Brown (2007), “Teaching by Principles: An Active Approach to Language Pedagogy”, and the other one is by Harmer (1998) “How to Teach English”. Weekly, Ins-1 teaches the characteristics of the teacher and learner, principles of foreign language learning, intrinsic motivation, teaching across age and proficiency levels, interactive teaching, classroom management, techniques and materials in using a textbook, lesson planning, teaching grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. The assessment of the students is done by three items; one mid-term, one final exam, and a demo teaching.

According to STM II course syllabus, prospective teachers will be able to identify and define current methods and strategies for teaching English, develop effective classroom activities, create useful, instructional lesson plans, assess usefulness of classroom activities, produce a portfolio for future teaching practices. Two course books are required. These are Harmer, (2007), “The Practice of English Language Teaching”, and Ur, (1999) “A Course for English Language Teaching”. Weekly, Ins-2 teaches reflective practice, characteristics of learners, teachers, and context, lesson planning, learning assessment, writing tests and marking them, giving feedback, teaching grammar, developing grammar activities, and teaching grammar.

3.5. Discussion and Conclusion

Four research instruments; interview with ELTT administrator, interviews with ELTT course instructors, student checklist, and documents are used in order to come to conclusion on how STM I course is effective in preparing students to STM II course. The relationship and connection of the interview results with student checklist and documents is investigated in detail, and instead of a few points, the program of STM I is interpreted as effective in preparing students to STM II course. First, the strong points, and then the weaknesses will be discussed.

The director of the department and course instructors all indicate that the aim of the STM courses is to teach lesson planning, classroom management, characteristics of the learner and teacher, assessment processes, and giving effective feedback. They seem to have a consensus on the content of the two courses. Also, the program (course syllabus) emphasizes all these in weekly schedule. When we look at the results of the student checklists, defining learner, teacher and context characteristics seemed to be learned perfectly. Therefore, there is a consistent result in teaching these items.

For student motivation, Ins-head and Ins-1 state that motivation is an important issue, and % 97, 7 (n=44) students think that they are careful about student motivation of the learners. As motivation is covered in STM I course, it seems effective in preparing students to STM II course perfectly. Moreover, as a subject of STM I course, students are quite well in defining and applying specific methods regarding age issue. According to students checklist results, 100 % (n=45) of the students are aware of the importance of the age. As a result, STM I seem effective regarding age in preparing students in STM II course. A similar thing occurs is the proficiency levels of the students. It can also be

concluded that STM I course is effective in preparing students in STM II course regarding proficiency issue. Moreover, all the instructors state that teaching specific language skills are important in their own specific field, and the importance of sub-skills (teaching grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary) are indicated in the course syllabuses. While grammar teaching is taught both in STM I and STM II, vocabulary and pronunciation teaching are taught only in STM II course. According to student checklist, these skills are learned by 72 % of the students in average. Therefore, it can be said that STM I is effective and successful in preparing students to STM II course in this respect. The findings about the positive sides of these two courses in language classes corroborate with the evaluation research findings in the literature (Salihoglu, 2012; Coşkun and Daloğlu, 2010; Seferoğlu, 2006) Another finding about increasing the proficiency levels of the students taking STM courses is supported by other researchers in the field (Godley et.al., 2015; Medgeyes, 1999; Richards, 1998).

However, although the instructors stated the importance of classroom management, only 64,4 % (n=29) of the students indicated that they are able to apply classroom management skills effectively. It can be interpreted that, as classroom management skill are taught only in STM I course, it does not seem that much effective (see Table 2). Moreover, lesson planning is taught in both of the courses, and all the instructors emphasized the importance of it; however, when we look at the results of student checklist, 72 % (n=33) of the students are able to make an effective lesson plan. Even though lesson planning is taught both in STM I and STM II, it does not seem to be effective.

The other weakness of these two courses is the use of textbook. Although this subject is covered in both courses according to the documents, only 73,3% (33) of the students indicate that they are able to use course book effectively. According to the interview results of the course instructors, effective means changeability, adaptability, and implementation of the course materials to the specific context. Using course book effectively does not seem successful in both of the programs of STM courses. Furthermore, reflective teaching, assessing student writings and developing grammar activities do not seem successful regarding the results of the student checklist. Only 64,4 % (n=29) students indicate that they are good at applying those skills in their classroom. As the instructors and the administrator state in their interview that STM courses need to give both theoretical and practical knowledge for their students' future profession, these areas need to be improved in both STM I and STM II course programs. Similar findings can be found about the reflective teaching in Eröz-Tuğa (2012). Erozan (2005) states that more practical and content based knowledge should be given in STLE department and the finding of this study has relevancy regarding these issues.

The most important statements in the student checklist were the last two questions. As all the instructors stated that STM I course is separate from STM II course, but STM I course should give some underlying principles and theoretical background the STM II course, students do not approve the same statement. 57% (n=26) of the students think that STM I course was effective in preparing them to STM II course, and 66% (n=30) of them think that STM I course helped them to understand the theoretical background of classroom techniques in STM II course. As indicated above in the interview results, all the instructors stated that there needs to be a relationship with all pedagogical and methods courses. However, students in practice, do not think the same way.

In conclusion, according to results of the ELTT administrator and ELTT instructors, the student checklist and documents, STM I is effective in preparing students in defining the characteristics of learner, teacher, and context. Moreover, it is successful in preparing students to STM II course regarding student motivation, age, and proficiency issue, teaching grammar effectively, vocabulary and pronunciation teaching, and assessing student tests. On the other hand, the weaknesses of the program seem to be applying classroom management methods, using course book, lesson planning, reflective teaching, assessing student writing, and developing grammar materials. All in all, although the STM I course prepares students in STM II regarding some theoretical basic knowledge, the consistency and coherence needs to be developed between the programs of the two courses.

The above findings of the study help us to make several suggestions for designing the method courses and for the improvement of the SLTE programs. These suggestion based on the finding discussed above can be; (a) STM II courses can be redesigned to put more emphasis on classroom management, lesson planning, use of textbook, reflective teaching, assessing students writings, and grammar teaching, (b) the link between these two courses can be made stronger by sharing the course contents, (c) both courses can add more micro-teaching sessions, (d) student reflections on each week can be asked and evaluated by the course instructor, (e) research for inefficient parts of the courses can be done with the students, and the students may be encouraged to participate in the evaluation of the courses in the end of the semester.

3.6. The Evaluation of Evaluation

As UFE is a popular and effective way of program evaluation, it is used in the current study by following its steps. First, the readiness of the program is discussed with the PIUs who are the course instructors and the head of the department. As the courses came to an end, it is thought that the program of STM I course is ready to be evaluated. Then, the PIUs as indicated above are identified by the evaluator and the head of the department. With the help of the administrator, the situational analysis has been conducted. Then, the PIUs and the evaluator discussed the evaluation design, and data collection is finished in a week with the help of course instructors and the head of the department. Lastly, after discussing the results of the evaluation study, meta-evaluation is done at the end of the process.

The strengths of the study is the use of UFE in an ELTT department. The UFE seems one of the most useful frameworks in conducting a cooperative and collaborative program evaluation. Secondly, the data collection instruments are quite effective in the current study. As there are four instruments – interview with ELTT administrator, interviews with ELTT instructors, student checklist, and documents- they were beneficial enough to come to a conclusion. Finally, as the UFE gives clear steps in evaluating the program, the evaluation design was organized and systematic. One weakness of the current evaluation study is that, one more evaluation instrument may have been used. More specifically, a focus group interview might have been conducted to students who took both STM I and STM II courses. All in all, the evaluation of STM I and STM II courses using UFE is an effective and efficient study.

REFERENCES

- Altan, M. Z. (1998). A call for change and pedagogy: A critical analysis of teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Education*, 33(4), 407-417.
- Aksu, M., Demir, C. E., Daloglu, A., Yildirim, S., & Kiraz, E. (2010). Who are the future teachers in Turkey? Characteristics of entering student teachers. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(1), 91-101.
- Bektaş-Altiok, G. R. (2006). *Türkiye’de ilköğretim okullarında etkili yabancı dil öğretimi: tarihsel gelişim ve açılımları*. Unpublished master’s dissertation, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Burns, A. & Richards, J. (2009). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Clarke, A. (1999). *Evaluation Research: An Introduction to Principles, Methods and Practice*. Sage, London
- Coskun, A., & Daloglu, A. (2010). Evaluating an English language teacher education program through Peacock’s model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 2.
- Cruickshank, D.R. (1996). *Preparing America's Teachers* (Bloomington, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation).
- Çakıroğlu, E., & Çakıroğlu, J. (2003). Reflections on teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(2), 253-264.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. (sixth eds). London, New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Day, R.R. (1991). *Models and the knowledge base of second language teacher education*. East Lansing, MI: National center for Research on Teacher learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 359)
- Demirel, Ö. (1991). Türkiye’de yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirmede karşılaşılan güçlükler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(6).
- Ellis, R. (1990). Activities and procedures for teacher preparation. In J. C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp.26-36). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Erozan, F. A. T. O. Ş. (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*.
- Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2012). Reflective feedback sessions using video recordings. *ELT journal*, ccs081.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *Tesol Quarterly*, 32(3), 397-417.
- Godley, A. J., Reaser, J., & Moore, K. G. (2015). Pre-service English language arts teachers’ development of critical language awareness for teaching. *Linguistics and Education*, 32, 41-54.
- Gürşimşek, I., Kaptan, F. & Erkan, S. (1997). General view of teacher education policies of Turkey. *Paper presented at the 49th AACTE Annual Meeting*, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Hammond, R. L. (1972). *Evaluation at the local level*. (mimeograph). Tucson, AZ:EPIC Evaluation Center.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kahan, B., & Consulting, Kael. (2008). *Excerpts from Review of Evaluation Framework*. Saskatchewan Ministry of Education

- Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level model. *Training & Development*, 50(1), 54-57.
- Lynch, B. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 177-195.
- Norris, J.M. (2006). The why (and how) of assessing student learning outcomes in college foreign language programs. *Mod. Lang. J.* **90**, 576-583
- Öztürk, C. (2005). Türkiye'de dünden bugüne öğretmen yetiştiren kurumlar. *İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları*.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Sage publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). Utilization-focused evaluation (U-FE) checklist. *Evaluation Checklist Project*.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programs. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278.
- Ramirez, R., Brodhead, D. (2013) Utilization Focused Evaluation : A primer for evaluators. Southbound Sdn. Bhd.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rossi, P., Freeman, H., & Lipsey, M. (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. 6th edn. Sage, Thousand Oaks
- Salihoğlu, U. M. Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education: "The Turkish Case" Aday İngilizce Öğretmeni Eğitimi: Türkiye Örneği.
- Scriven, M. (1974). Evaluation perspectives and procedures. In W. J. Popham (Ed.), *Evaluation in education: Current applications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Seferoğlu, S.S. (1996) Exploring elementary school teachers' perceptions of Professional development: the Turkish case. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, New York.
- Seferoğlu, S. S. (2004). Öğretmen yeterlilikleri ve mesleki gelişim. *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim*, 58, 40-45.
- Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education program in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(4), 369-378.
- Shawer, S. F. (2012). Accreditation and standards-driven program evaluation: implications for program quality assurance and stakeholder professional development. *Quality & Quantity*, 1-31.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1999). Evaluation plans and operations checklist. *Kalamazoo, Michigan: Evaluation Checklist Project, The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, c1999. DE, 13*.
- Tılfarhoğlu, F. Y., & Öztürk, A. R. (2007). An analysis of ELT teachers' perceptions of some problems concerning the implementation of English language teaching curricula in elementary schools. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*, 3, 202-217.
- Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Yang, W. (2009). Evaluation of teacher induction practices in a US university English language program: Towards useful evaluation. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1), 77-98.

GENİŞ ÖZET

1. Giriş

Günümüzde çok basit bir gerçek vardır, o da eğer bir ülke vatandaşlarının küresel ekonomiye aktif bir şekilde katılmak istiyorsa, sosyal ve ekonomik gelişmenin sağladığı bilgiye erişim isteniyorsa, İngilizce bilmek hayati derecede önemlidir. Bu yüzden, yeterliğe sahip İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştirmek ve mesleki gelişimlerinin desteklemek önem kazanmıştır (Burns ve Richards, 2009). Holliday (1994) öğretmen yetiştirmenin sınıf içi gerçeklikleri açısından başarısız olduğunu belirtmiştir. Bunu sonucunda, öğretmen eğitiminde öğretmen bilişi ve teori ve uygulama arasındaki bağlara odaklanılan değişim başlamıştır. Coşkun ve Daloğlu (2010) öğretmenlerin hizmet öncesi eğitimlerinin pek fazla araştırılmadığını belirtmişlerdir. Seferoğlu (2006), öğretmen eğitiminde metot ve öğretim uygulananlarının tekrar gözden geçirildiğini aktarmıştır. Bunların paralelinde, bu tip programlarda, program değerlendirme önem kazanmıştır. Program değerlendirmede, önemli bir nokta ise sonuç odaklı gelişim ve değişimdir (Stake, 2011). Bu bağlamda, programın amaçları ve çıktıları, program değerlendirmede önem kazanmıştır (Shawer, 2011). Bu çalışmada, İngilizce Öğretmenliği programında bulunan Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri I (ÖÖY-I) ve Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri II (ÖÖY-II) derslerini değerlendirmek için Patton'un (1978) Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE, Fayda-Odaklı Değerlendirme) modeli kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışma nitel bir çalışma olarak düzenlenmiştir. Bu çalışma Doktora eğitimini İngiliz Dili Eğitimi yapan bir araştırmacı tarafından yapılmıştır. Ramirez ve Broadhead 'e göre (2013) U-FE'nin kullanımında 12 nokta ya dikkat edilmesi gerektiği belirtilmiştir. Bunlar aşağıdaki gibidir:

- 1- Program hazır bulunuşu değerlendirmesi
- 2- Değerlendiricilerin Hazır bulunuşu değerlendirme
- 3- Birincil kullanıcıları belirleme
- 4- Durumsal analiz
- 5- Birincil kullanım alanlarını belirleme
- 6- Değerlendirmeye odaklanma
- 7- Değerlendirme dizaynı
- 8- Kullanım simülasyonu
- 9- Veri toplama
- 10- Veri analizi
- 11- Kullanımı kolaylaştırma
- 12- Değerlendirmenin değerlendirilmesi

2. Yöntem

Bu çalışmada nitel vaka çalışması ÖÖY-I dersinin, öğrencileri ÖÖY-II dersine ne ölçüde hazırladığını incelemek için kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın katılımcıları, bu dersleri alan 45 öğrenci, bir bölüm başkanı ve bu dersi veren iki öğretim elemanıdır. Bir öğretim elemanı ÖÖY-I dersini verirken, diğer öğretim elemanı ÖÖY-II dersini vermektedir. İki dersi veren öğretim elemanları farklı olduğunda, bu iki öğretim elemanının birbirleriyle yakın çalışma içerisinde olması gerektiği açıktır. Bu çalışmaya katılan 45 öğrencinin yaşları 20-23 arasındadır ve bütün öğrenciler gündüz öğretimidir. Öğrencilerin çoğunluğu bayanken (n=35), sadece 10 tanesi erkek öğrencidir. Bu çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak anketler, mülakatlar ve dokümanlar kullanılmıştır. Dört ana veri

toplama aracı kullanılmıştır. Bunlar; (a) İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü Bölüm Başkanıyla Mülakat, (b) ÖÖY derini veren öğretim elemanlarıyla mülakat, (c) öğrenci kontrol listesi, (d) ders içeriklerinin incelemek için kullanılan dokümanlar. Öncelikle ÖÖY-I dersinin, sonrasında se ÖÖY-II dersinin içerik analizi yapılmış, ardından, öğrenci kontrol listesi ve görüşme soruları hazırlanmıştır. Görüşmeler yapıldıktan sonar, öğrencilere kontrol listesi dağıtılmıştır.

3. Sonuçlar, Bulgular ve Tartışma

Bölüm başkanı ve dersi veren öğretim elemanları, ÖÖY derslerinin amaçlarının öğrencilere ders planı hazırlama, sınıf yönetimi, öğrenci ve öğretmen özellikleri, ölçme süreçleri ve geri dönüt verme konuları öğretmek olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Bölüm başkanı ve öğretim elemanları, dersin içeriği konusunda hemfikirdir. Ayrıca her iki dersin programı da içeriğinde bu konuları belirtmiştir. Öğrenci kontrol listesine bakıldığında, öğrenci, öğretmen ve bağlam özelliklerini çok iyi öğrendiklerini görülmüştür. Böylece tutarlı bir sonuç elde edilmiştir.

Öğrenci motivasyonu hakkında ise, öğretim elemanları motivasyonun önemli olduğunu belirtmiştir ve öğrencilerin %97 si (n=44) öğrenci motivasyonuna önem verdiklerinin belirtmişlerdir. Öğrenci motivasyonu konusu ÖÖY-I dersinin konusu olduğu için, bu dersin öğrencileri diğer derse çok iyi hazırladığı görülmektedir. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin tümü (n=45) ÖÖY-I derinde bulunan yaş konusunu da yeteri kadar iyi anladıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Benzer bir durum öğrencileri yeterlik düzeyleri hakkında da ortaya çıkmıştır. Sonuçlar, ÖÖY-I dersinin, dil yeterlikleri konusunda öğrencileri ÖÖY-II dersine etkili bir şekilde hazırladığı görülmektedir.

Ayrıca, bütün öğretim elemanları kendi alanlarında, özel dil yeteneklerini öğretmenin önemine vurgu yapmışlardır ve programlarında dilbilgisi, telaffuz ve kelime öğretimi konularının bulunduğu görülmektedir. Dilbilgisi öğretimi hem ÖÖY-I hem de ÖÖY-II dersinde işlenirken, kelime ve telaffuz öğretimi konuları sadece ÖÖY-II dersinde öğretilmektedir. Öğrenci kontrol listesine bakıldığında ise öğrencileri %72 sinin bu konuları kavradığı görülmektedir. Öğretim elemanları sınıf yönetimi konusunun önemine vurgu yaparken, öğrencileri sadece %64,4 'u (n=29) sınıf yönetimi konusunda kendileri yetkin görmektedirler. Böylece, sınıf yönetimi konusu sadece ÖÖY-I dersinde gösterildiği için, öğrenciler için bunun yeterli olmadığı yorumu yapılabilir. Dahası, ders planı hazırlama her iki derste de öğretilmiş ve öğretim elemanları bu konunun önemine vurgu yapmışlardır. Ancak, öğrenci kontrol listesi sonuçlarına bakıldığında öğrencilerin sadece %73,3'ünün (n=33) etkili bir ders planı yapabildiğini göstermiştir. Ders planı hazırlamanın hem ÖÖY-I hem de ÖÖY-II derslerinde işlendiği göz önüne alınırsa, bu konuda bir eksikliği olduğu anlaşılmaktadır.

Program değerlendirme sonucunda orta çıkan bir diğer eksiklik ise ders kitabı kullanımı hakkındadır. Her iki destede ders kitabı kullanımı konusu işlenmesine rağmen, öğrencilerin %73'ü (n= 33) ders kitabının etkili bir şekilde kullanabildiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Öğretim elemanları mülakatı sonuçlarına göre, etkili sözcüğü ders materyallerine uyum sağlayabilme, materyalleri değiştirebilme ve farklı ortamlarda bu materyalleri kullanabilme anlamına gelmektedir. Bunlar göz önüne alındığında, ders kitabının etkili bir biçimde kullanımı öğrencilerin eksik kaldıkları bir yön olarak yorumlanabilir. Ayrıca, yansıtıcı öğretim, öğrenci yazılarını değerlendirme, ve dilbilgisi faaliyetlerinin geliştirilmesi, öğrenci kontrol listesine göre öğrenciler tarafında etkili

kullanılmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Öğrencileri %64,4 ü (n=29) bu konuları sınıf içerisinde etkili bir şekilde kullanabildiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Öğretim elemanları mülakatı sonuçlarına göre, öğretim elemanları bu konularda ÖÖY derslerinin içeriğinin farklılaştırılması gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Öğrenci kontrol listesinde bulunan en önemli soruların son iki soru olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Öğretim elemanları ÖÖY-I dersinin ÖÖY-II dersinden farklı olduğunu ve bu dersin ilkinin öğrencileri ikincisine hazırlamada teori altyapısını kazandırması gerektiği savunurken, öğrenciler bu dersin birbirlerinin devamı olduklarını belirtmiş ve öğrencilerin %66'sı ÖÖY-I dersinin kendilerini ÖÖY-II dersine hazırlamada etkili olduğunu belirtmişlerdir..