

T. C.
Marmara Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Ana Bilim Dalı
İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı

**TÜRKİYE’DE TÜRKÇENİN VE İNGİLİZCENİN YABANCI DİL
OLARAK ÖĞRETİLMESİNDE VE ÖĞRENİLMESİNDE DERS KİTABININ
ROLÜ: BİR VAKA ÇALIŞMASI**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Bisera Pilica

İstanbul 2005

T. C.
Marmara Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Ana Bilim Dalı
İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı

**TÜRKİYE’DE TÜRKÇENİN VE İNGİLİZCENİN YABANCI DİL
OLARAK ÖĞRETİLMESİNDE VE ÖĞRENİLMESİNDE DERS KİTABININ
ROLÜ: BİR VAKA ÇALIŞMASI**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Bisera Pilica

Danışman:

Yard. Doç. Dr. Kamile Hamiloğlu

T. C.
Marmara Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü

**TÜRKİYE’DE TÜRKÇENİN VE İNGİLİZCENİN YABANCI DİL
OLARAK ÖĞRETİLMESİNDE VE ÖĞRENİLMESİNDE DERS KİTABININ
ROLÜ: BİR VAKA ÇALIŞMASI**

Bisera Pilica

Yard. Doç. Dr. Kamile Hamiloğlu

Yard. Doç. Dr. Derin Atay

Yard. Doç. Dr. Dilek İnal

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü İngilizce Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İstanbul 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am sincerely grateful to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Kamile Hamiloğlu for all her tolerance, encouragement, patience, guidance, support, academic advice, and the extensive assistance with which she provided me through this study and to whom I am especially indebted.

I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Derin Atay and Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilek İnal for the time they spent reading and commenting on this study.

I am deeply thankful to my parents and my family for all their support and the faith they always had in me.

Finally, I would like to thank Adnan Halilović to whom I dedicate this study and without whom this study would not have begun at all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
ABSTRACT.....	xiii
ÖZET.....	xvi
ABBREVIATIONS	xix
 CHAPTERS	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background of the Study.....	2
B. Statement of the Problem.....	4
C. Aim of the Study.....	4
D. Research Questions.....	5
E. Research Hypotheses.....	5
F. Significance of the Study.....	6
G. Limitations of the Study.....	6
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	7
A. The Exploitation of Foreign Language Coursebooks in Foreign Language Teaching Methods	7
B. The Exploitation of the Foreign Language Coursebooks in Curriculum and Syllabus Design.....	20
C. The Definition of the Foreign Language Coursebook.....	31
D. The Differences Between Native and Non – Native Foreign Language Teachers	40

E. The use of Foreign Language Coursebook by Native and Non-Native Foreign Language Teachers.....	45
F. Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language.....	48
III. METHODOLOGY.....	51
A. Subjects.....	52
B. Instruments.....	55
1. Observation.....	56
2. Interview.....	56
3. Questionnaire.....	57
C. Procedure.....	58
D. Data Collection Procedure.....	59
1. Observation.....	60
2. Interview.....	61
3. Questionnaire.....	61
D. Data Analysis Procedure.....	61
1. Observation Analysis Procedure.....	62
2. Interview Analysis Procedure.....	62
3. Questionnaire Analysis Procedure.....	63
IV. RESULTS.....	64
A. Qualitative Results.....	64
1. Observation	64
2. Interview	69
a. Learners' Interviews.....	70

b. Teachers' Interviews.....	80
B. Quantitative Results.....	89
1. Questionnaire	89
a. Learners' Questionnaire.....	91
b. Teachers' Questionnaire.....	105
V. GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS AND THE CONCLUSION	116
A. Implications for Further Research.....	120
VI. REFERENCES	121
VII. APPENDICES.....	130
Appendix A: A sample observation tapescripts of the EFL group.....	130
Appendix B: A sample observation tapescripts of the TFL group.....	141
Appendix C: Learner interviews	150
Appendix D: Teacher interviews	154
Appendix E: The material evaluation form for the EFL-TFL learners.....	158
Appendix F: The material evaluation form for the EFL-TFL teachers.....	163
Appendix G: The Explanatory Leaflet of Ankara University Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre.....	167

LIST OF TABLES

	Pages
Table 1	Distribution of the English learners according to gender and age.....52
Table 2	Distribution of the Turkish learners according to gender and age.....53
Table 3	Distribution of the English learners according to nationality, education, occupation and level of proficiency53
Table 4	Distribution of the Turkish learners according to nationality, education, occupation and level of proficiency54
Table 5	Distribution of the English language teacher's educational background and teaching experience54
Table 6	Distribution of the Turkish language teachers' educational background and teaching experience55
Table 7	Data collection procedure in the EFL and TFL language groups throughout the course60
Table 8	The time period (duration) for the coursebook implementation in the EFL and TFL classes during one class hour65
Table 9	A sample tapescript from the observation session of the EFL group.....67
Table 10	A sample tapescript from the observation session of the TFL group.....68
Table 11	Categorisation of the learners' interview questions.....71
Table 12	The responses of learners for the first interview question.....72
Table 13	The responses of learners for the second interview question.....72
Table 14	The responses of learners for the third interview question73
Table 15	The responses of learners for the fourth interview question74
Table 16	The responses of learners for the fifth interview question75
Table 17	The responses of learners for the sixth interview question.....75
Table 18	The responses of learners for the seventh interview question.....76

Table 19	The responses of learners for the eight interview question	77
Table 20	The responses of learners for the ninth interview question	77
Table 21	The responses of learners for the tenth interview question	78
Table 22	Categorisation of the teachers' interview questions.....	81
Table 23	The responds of teachers for the first interview item.....	82
Table 24	The responses of teachers for the second interview item.....	83
Table 25	The responses of teachers for the third interview item.....	84
Table 26	The responses of teachers for the forth interview item.....	85
Table 27	The responses of teachers for the fifth interview item.....	86
Table 28	The responses of teachers for the sixth interview item.....	87
Table 29	The responses of the teachers for the seventh interview item.....	88
Table 30	The results for the first questionnaire item.....	91
Table 31	The results for the second questionnaire item	91
Table 32	The results for the third questionnaire item.....	92
Table 33	The results for the forth questionnaire item.....	92
Table 34	The results for the fifth questionnaire item.....	93
Table 35	The results for the sixth questionnaire item.....	93
Table 36	The results for the seventh questionnaire item.....	94
Table 37	The results for the eight questionnaire item.....	95
Table 38	The results for the ninth questionnaire item.....	95
Table 39	The results for the tenth questionnaire item.....	96
Table 40	The results for the eleventh questionnaire item.....	96
Table 41	The results for the twelfth questionnaire item.....	97

Table 42	The results for the thirteenth questionnaire item.....	97
Table 43	The results for the fourteenth questionnaire item.....	98
Table 44	The results for the fifteenth questionnaire item.....	98
Table 45	The results for the sixteenth questionnaire item.....	99
Table 46	The results for the seventeenth questionnaire item.....	99
Table 47	The results for the eighteenth questionnaire item.....	100
Table 48	The results for the nineteenth questionnaire item.....	101
Table 49	The results for the twentieth questionnaire item.....	101
Table 50	Attitudes of the EFL and TFL learners of both English and Turkish language coursebooks	103
Table 51	The results for the first questionnaire item.....	106
Table 52	The results for the second questionnaire item	106
Table 53	The results for the third questionnaire item.....	107
Table 54	The results for the forth questionnaire item.....	107
Table 55	The results for the fifth questionnaire item.....	108
Table 56	The results for the sixth questionnaire item.....	108
Table 57	The results for the seventh questionnaire item.....	109
Table 58	The results for the eight questionnaire item.....	109
Table 59	The results for the ninth questionnaire item.....	110
Table 60	The results for the tenth questionnaire item.....	110
Table 61	The results for the eleventh questionnaire item.....	111
Table 62	The results for the twelfth questionnaire item.....	111
Table 63	The results for the thirteenth questionnaire item.....	112
Table 64	The results for the fourteenth questionnaire item.....	112

Table 65	The results for the fifteenth questionnaire item.....	113
----------	---	-----

ABSTRACT

**The Role of the Foreign Language Coursebook in Teaching and Learning
of English and Turkish as a Foreign Language
in Turkey: A Case study**

by

Bisera Pilica

The present study aims to investigate the role of English and Turkish coursebooks as a foreign language teaching and learning tool in Turkey. It is to be noted that, in this study, English is the non-native language while Turkish is the native one in Turkey. Therefore, English is considered as a foreign language to be taught to Turkish native learners and Turkish is considered as a foreign language to be taught to foreign learners in Turkey. In this case, Turkish is taken to be a foreign language, although it is the native tongue in Turkey.

This research was conducted at the Istanbul branch of TÖMER, (the Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre of Ankara University) during the 2003-2004 academic year. The study followed the learning and teaching processes of two English and Turkish classes from the 'Beginner 1' level to the 'Intermediate 1' level. Levels are determined as a result of a placement examination taken at TÖMER.

Throughout the 2003 – 2004 academic year, an observation session was held once a month in both groups six times in total. An interview was held with randomly selected learners from each group throughout the course. At the end of the course an interview was held with the teachers, as

well. Therefore it was achieved to be interviewed all learners and teachers in the end. A questionnaire was also administered to both learners and teachers at the end of the course.

The two major questions of the research are shown below:

1. What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
2. What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?

The study has six sub-questions, as indicated below:

1. To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
2. To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
3. How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey?
4. How does being a Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey?
5. What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey?
6. What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey?

The results indicated that the role of the coursebook is very significant in non-native language teaching and learning setting. The foreign language coursebook was exploited more extensively as the main aid by the learners and the non-native speaker teachers in the non-native language setting than the coursebook users who were in the native language setting. The results very clearly stated that the group of learners and non-native speaker teachers in their non-native

language setting needed their language coursebooks more than the learners and native speaker teachers in their native language setting. It was obtained in this study that non-native language teachers in the non-native language setting relied on the coursebook more than the native language teacher in their native language setting. For that reason the non-native language teachers depended on the coursebook and used it more thoroughly while the native language teachers used the coursebook as an aid. As the last finding, since there is no desired contribution from the immediate environment, considering particularly Turkey, therefore, the language coursebook was used as the main aid for both learning and teaching in the non-native language setting. Conversely, the fact of learning a foreign language in its native country offers a surplus of input from the environment and therefore the native language setting group benefited from the environment a great deal.

ÖZET

Türkiye’de Türkçenin ve İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretilmesinde ve Öğrenilmesinde Ders Kitabının Rolü: Bir Vaka Çalışması

Bisera Pilica

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye’de İngilizce ve Türkçe ders kitaplarının bir yabancı dil öğretim ve öğrenim aracı olarak rolünü araştırmaktır.

Araştırma, TÖMER (Türkçe ve Yabancı Dil Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi) İstanbul şubesinde yapılmıştır. Çalışma TÖMER’deki ‘Başlangıç Düzeyi 1’ ve ‘Orta Düzeyi 1’ gruplarında gerçekleştirilmiştir. Sınıf seviyeleri kurum tarafından yapılan yerleştirme sınavının sonuçlarına göre belirlenmektedir. Çalışma için gerekli olan veriler, İngilizce sınıfına devam eden 7, Türkçe sınıfına devam eden 6 öğrenciden elde edilmistir. 2003 -2004 akademik yılı boyunca her iki grupta ayda 1 kez olmak üzere toplam 6 kez gözlem yapılmıştır. Araştırma boyunca her iki gruptan rastgele seçilmiş öğrencilerle söyleşi gerçekleştirilmiştir. Kursun sonunda öğretmenlerle de birer söyleşi yapılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonunda tüm öğrenci ve öğretmenlerle söyleşi uygulaması gerçekleştirilmiştir. Orta düzey kurunun sonunda hem öğrencilere hem de öğretmenlere birer adet davranış anketi de uygulanmıştır.

Araştırma aşağıdaki temel sorulara cevap aramıştır:

1. Türkiye’de İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ve öğrenilmesinde İngilizce ders kitabının rolü nedir?
2. Türkiye’de ana dilin, yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ve öğrenilmesinde Türkçe ders kitabının rolü nedir?

Çalışmada iki temel sorunun yanısıra altı alt soru aşağıdaki gibi düzenlenmiştir.

1. Türkiye’de İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ve öğrenilmesinde öğretmenler ve öğrenciler ders kitaplarına ne derece bağlı-bağımlı çalışmaktadırlar?
2. Türkiye’de Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ve öğrenilmesinde öğretmenler ve öğrenciler ders kitaplarına ne derece bağlı-bağımlı çalışmaktadırlar.
3. Ana dilinin İngilizce olmaması, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten ve İngilizce ders kitabı kullanan, ana dili Türkçe olan, İngilizce öğretmenlerini nasıl etkilemektedir?
4. Ana dilinin Türkçe olması, Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten ve Türkçe ders kitabı kullanan Türkçe öğretmenlerini nasıl etkilemektedir?
5. İngilizcenin Türkiye’de yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesi ve öğrenilmesinde çevre ve yabancı dil ders kitabının arasındaki ilişkinin önemi nedir?
6. Türkçenin Türkiye’de yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesi ve öğrenilmesinde çevre ve yabancı dil ders kitabının arasındaki ilişkinin önemi nedir?

Elde edilen bulgulara göre, Türkiye’de İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde İngilizce ders kitabının ana araç olarak kullanılması nedeniyle çok etkin olduğu görüldü. Türkiye’de ana dilin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde kullanılan Türkçe ders kitabının, Türkiye’de İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde kullanılan İngilizce ders kitabına kıyasla daha az etkin olduğu görüldü.

Türkiye’de Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde, öğretmenler ve öğrencilerin ders kitaplarına Türk İngilizce öğretmenleri ve öğrencileri kadar bağımlı olmadıkları izlendi. Türkiye’de İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde, öğretmenler ve öğrencilerin ders kitaplarına, en temel araç olarak kullanılması nedeniyle ileri derecede bağımlı oldukları gözlemlendi. Araştırma, Türkiye’de Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ders kitabı-bağlam-ortam ilişkisinin de çok önemli olduğunu ortaya çıkardı. Türkiye’de İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde ders kitabı-bağlam-ortam ilişkisinin aynı derecede güçlü olmadığı gözlemi de araştırmanın diğer önemli bulguların arasındadır.

ABBREVIATIONS

LT – Language Teaching

FLT- Foreign Language Teaching

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

TFL – Turkish as a Foreign Language

ELT – English Language Teaching

L2- Second Language

ESP – English for Specific Purposes

GTM – The Grammar Translation Method

DM – The Direct Method

ALM – The Audio Lingual Method

CALL – Computer Assisted Language Learning

CLT – Communicative Language Teaching

CLL –Community Language Teaching

TPR – Total Physical Response

NFA – Notional Functional Approach

NS – Native Speaker

NNS – Non-Native Speaker

NEST - Native English Speaker Teacher

NNEST - Non-Native English Speaker Teacher

NTST - Native Turkish Speaker Teacher

TÖMER - Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre

INTRODUCTION

The most commonly found elements in second and foreign language classrooms around the globe are teachers, learners, and coursebooks (Richards, 1998). While great importance is given to all three elements, the roles of learners and learning, teachers and teaching have been the focus of a vast body of discussion and research over the years. However, far less attention has been paid to coursebooks (Grant, 1991).

Considering these facts as an initial issue, this study aims to investigate the role of the coursebook as a main aid in learning and/or teaching a foreign language in a native language teaching/learning setting and non-native language teaching/learning setting.

The study was conducted in the Istanbul branch of TÖMER (the Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre of Ankara University) in a six month period, from December 2003 to May 2004.

In the first part of the study, FLT methods are examined through the material and the coursebook perspective. Research related to the history of language teaching, curriculum design, and syllabus design is discussed as well.

In the second part of the study the subjects involved in the study, the instruments used to collect the data and the data analysis procedures employed were discussed in detail.

In the third section of the study, the research findings were presented in three main parts: In the first two parts, qualitative data results obtained from the observation and interviews were presented. In the fourth part, the results of the attitude questionnaire which provided the quantitative data for the study, was discussed in detail.

The last part of the study provided a general discussion of the results and the conclusion.

The results of this study were to determine whether the students and the teachers in a non- native language setting needed greater access to the language coursebook than learners and teachers in a native language setting.

Background of the Study

Coursebooks are one of the primary types of instructional materials that influence language teaching and learning. In other words the role of Foreign Language Teaching (FLT) coursebooks is undeniable. When starting a language course many teachers and learners expect to follow a certain coursebook with which they need to direct the teaching and learning process. As it is stated in a study by Hutchinson and Torres (1994) teachers always express their need for FLT coursebooks as these make teaching and learning easier, faster, better organized, and more convenient. According to Sheldon (1987), a FLT coursebook can be defined as a published book whose explicit aim is to assist foreign learners in improving their linguistic knowledge and communicative ability.

EFL/ESL coursebooks, for instance, have stimulated a range of reactions so far in language teaching experts. Responses often fluctuate between two extremes. One position is that they are valid, useful, and labour-saving tools. The other position holds that coursebooks can be regarded as masses of rubbish, skilfully marketed (Brumfit, 1980).

The arguments in favour of using a textbook generally reflect the following perspective:

“...a textbook is a framework which regulates and times the programs; in the eyes of learners, no textbook means no purpose; without a textbook, learners think their learning is not taken seriously; in many situations, a textbook can serve as a syllabus; a textbook provides ready-made teaching texts and learning tasks; a textbook is a cheap way of providing learning materials; a learner without a textbook is out of focus and teacher-dependent, and perhaps most important of all; for novice teachers a textbook means security, guidance, and support”.

(Ur, 1996, p. 183)

The counter-arguments include:

“...if every group of students has different needs, no textbook can be a response to all differing needs; topics in a textbook may not be relevant for and interesting to all; a textbook is confining, i.e., it inhibits teachers' creativity; a textbook of necessity sets prearranged sequence and structure that may not be realistic and situation-friendly; textbooks have their own rationale, and as such they cannot by their nature cater for a variety of levels, every type of learning styles, and every category of learning strategies that often exist in the class, and most important of all, perhaps; teachers may find themselves as mediators with no free hand and slave, in fact, to others' judgments about what is good and what is not”.

(Ur, 1996, p.195)

According to Williams (1983), any coursebook should be used judiciously, since it cannot cater equally to the requirements of every classroom setting. He gives an example of a situation when the coursebook can be a tyrant to the teacher who, in his or her preoccupation with covering the syllabus, feels constrained to teach every item in exactly the same sequence and context in which it is presented by the coursebook writer. On the other hand, Hutchinson and Torres (1994) argue that a well prepared coursebook is more than just a set of potential lesson plans, and that coursebooks survive and prosper because they are convenient way of providing structure to a learning program. They suggest that both teachers and learners see coursebooks as providing a guide that can help them teach and learn more effectively.

Given the fact that the coursebook might be defined as syllabi and save the teacher time through their useful activities, tasks, and techniques, and also usually serve as the main resource material for learning a language for learners, it is highly desired that coursebook writers pay attention to the environment in which the target language is taught.

As Dubin and Olshtain (1987) point out, the position of the particular language setting is an indication of the degree of support which the learner can find in his/her immediate environment. For the same reason, for any setting where English is not the native language, two major factors

need to be considered. Firstly, the role of English as a means for furthering one's education, and secondly, the effectiveness of the existing curriculum and teaching materials.

Statement of the Problem

As Williams (1983) points out, in situations where there is no native speaker, or at least experienced teachers, language teaching is very closely tied to the coursebook. It is ironical that those teachers who rely most heavily on the coursebook are the ones least qualified to interpret its intentions or evaluate its content and method. So it is obligatory that the coursebook provides appropriate guidance for the language teacher who is not a native speaker. The untrained or partially trained teacher who does not possess native-like control over all aspects of language should not be left in any doubt concerning the procedures proposed by the coursebook.

A theoretical discussion about the role and use of coursebooks in language teaching exists in literature by Maley (1998), Grant (1989), Woods (1996), Hutchinson and Torres (1994), O'Neil (1982), Tomlinson (1998), and so on, there are relatively few research studies concerning the role of coursebooks in a native and non-native language setting. This study intends to investigate the role of English and Turkish coursebooks as foreign language materials in Turkey, that is the English language coursebook is in this case a material being used in a non-native language teaching and learning setting, and the Turkish language coursebook a material used in a native language teaching and learning setting.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate whether language coursebooks used by learners and teachers in non-native language settings (English foreign language classes in Turkey) are more effective than those used by learners and teachers in native language settings (Turkish foreign language classes in Turkey).

Research Questions

This study aims to examine the following points:

1. What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
2. What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?

The study has six sub-questions, as indicated below:

1. To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
2. To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
3. How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey?
4. How does being a Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey?
5. What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey?
6. What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey?

Research Hypotheses

H 1. The role of the foreign language coursebook is more significant in a non-native language teaching and learning setting than in a native language teaching and learning setting since it is excessively used by learners and non-native speaker teachers.

H 2. A group of learners and non-native speaker teachers that learn and teach a foreign language in a non-native language setting will depend on their coursebooks more than learners and native speaker teachers that learn and teach languages in a native language setting.

H 3. Non-native language teachers in a non-native language setting will necessitate a coursebook more than native language teachers in a native language setting. For that reason, non-native language teachers will rely on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while native language teachers will use the coursebook just as a framework.

H 4. Since there is no desired contribution from the environment in a non-native language learning setting the coursebook will be used as the main aid for both learning and teaching in a non-native language setting. Conversely, the fact of learning a foreign language in a native language country offers a surplus of input from the environment.

Significance of the Study

This study attempts to reveal the role of the coursebook as a main means in the learning and teaching processes of English and Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey. Therefore, the results of this study may provide insights for teachers and learners, syllabus designers, and coursebook writers while using and designing coursebooks considering the significance of the environment in implementation.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the fact that this study was limited to 13 learners and 3 teachers in total, it is difficult to assert definitive generalizations from this study. Therefore, it is considered a case study to exemplify a situation. The study was also limited by the fact that there was an insufficient body of literature on teaching Turkish as a foreign language. And finally, although there are many studies in the field concerning the role of the coursebook, there are relatively few research studies concerning the role of the coursebook in a native and non-native language setting in a comparative manner.

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This study aims to discuss the role of the coursebook in language education in a native and a non-native language context. It is significant to mention the role of the coursebook in the light of language teaching methods. In this part of the study FLT methods are examined through the material and the coursebook. Research related to the history of language teaching, curriculum design, and syllabus design is discussed.

The Exploitation of Foreign Language Coursebooks in Foreign Language Teaching Methods

In this part of the study the historical background of FLT is examined to provide a clear framework for the rest of the study and to reveal the periods which language teaching has gone through so far. Throughout history, foreign language education has been an important practical concern. According to Richard and Rodgers (1997), it has been estimated that about 60 percent of today's world population is multilingual.

Richard and Rodgers (1997) also observe that English is the world's most studied foreign language today. Latin was a dominant language of education, commerce, religion and government in the Western world five hundred years ago. But since the sixteenth century, French, Italian, and English all gained importance as a result of political changes in Europe and Latin gradually became displaced as a language of spoken and written communication. Crystal (1997) also argues that English is rapidly assuming the position of the world's pre-eminent language.

Crystal (cited in Le McKay, 2000) asserts:

“... in inner-circle countries, where English is spoken as a native language, there are approximately 320-380 million native speakers of English. In outer-circle

countries, where English has an official role, as India and Singapore, for example, there are roughly 150-300 million second language (L2) speakers of English. And in expanding-circle countries, where English is used as a foreign language, there are perhaps as many as 100 to 1000 million learners of English. Hence, as conservative estimates there are approximately 570 million people in the world today who have a native or native-like command of English”.

(p.7)

Crystal (1997) concludes that no other language has spread around the globe so extensively making English a truly international language. Before this rapid spread of English, language teaching had already developed roots extending back to very early times. As the first western foreign language to be instructed, Latin was taught by means of what has been called the Classical Method. In this period teachers felt that reading classics was the main need of students learning Latin (Richard and Rodgers, 1997). Since the main reason of learning a foreign language was reading great works teachers of that time felt that students needed to read, translate, and memorize texts in the target language (Brown, 1995). Hence those texts constituted the first forms of the foreign language coursebook. In the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries children learned Latin in ‘grammar school’ where they were given a rigorous introduction to Latin grammar (Howatt, 1983).

Kelly (1969) and Howatt (1983) have argued that some major attempts to promote alternative approaches to language education were advocated by Rodger Ascham and Montaigne in the sixteenth century, Comenius and John Locke in the seventeenth century. They had made certain proposals for curriculum reform and changes in the way of teaching Latin.

In the eighteenth century, when modern languages began to enter the European curriculum, the same procedures that were used for teaching Latin were still in use, and coursebooks still consisted of abstract grammar rules, lists of vocabulary, and sentences for translation (Howatt,

1983). Richard and Rodgers (1997) state that, as in teaching Latin, grammar was the main thing to be taught and learned and speaking was not the goal for teaching foreign language.

Oral communication was reduced to an absolute minimum. At one time this method was called the Classical Method since it was first used in the teaching of the classical languages, Latin and Greek (Howatt, 1983). In the nineteenth century, this so called Classical Method came to be known as the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). GTM was the offspring of German scholarship, and its pioneers were Johann Seidenstucker, Karl Plotz, H. S. Ollendorf, and Johann Meidinger. GTM was previously known in the United States as the Prussian Method (Howatt, 1983). This method dominated European and foreign language teaching from the 1880s to the 1940s and it is still used in its modified version in many parts of the world. The coursebook in GTM consisted of literature texts meant to be read and translated into the native language. Grammar points are listed, rules are explained and sample sentences are given. Students are expected to apply the given rules by means of appropriate exercises. The primary skills to be developed are reading and writing. Little attention is given to speaking and listening and almost none to pronunciation according to Richard and Rodgers (1997). The GTM coursebook was, to a large extent, “nothing but a grammar book, and it was supposed to be largely universal, fitting every class possible, obviously not accounting for individual learning needs and characteristics of a given class” (Kwiecień, 2005, p. 2).

Richard and Rodgers have also stated that since the mid- and late nineteenth century GTM faced opposition in European countries. Due to increased opportunities for communication among Europeans the need for oral proficiency in any given foreign language appeared. This Reform Movement looked for new ways of teaching languages and faced controversies that last till today.

Accordingly, it may be said that ‘modern’ foreign language teaching begun in the late 1800s with Francois Gouin, a French teacher with remarkable insights and an unusual perspective for that time (Richard and Rodgers, 1997). He attempted to make second language learning resemble first language learning. He believed that language learning was facilitated through using language to accomplish events consisting of a sequence of related actions. This is how the Series Method developed. Brown (2001) asserts that the Series Method taught learners directly (without translation) and conceptually (without grammatical explanations) a series of connected sentences that are easy to perceive. Although he was a significant reformer, Gouin was overshadowed by Charles Berlitz, the German founder of the Direct Method (DM) (Brown, 2001).

A generation after Gouin’s Series Method, applied linguists established the importance of approach as was Series Method and some others that supported the way in which children learned their first language which was known as Natural Method.

The most widely known Natural Method is the Direct Method, first used by Sauveur and Maximilian Berlitz in successful commercial schools. Personally Berlitz never used the term DM and preferred to characterize it as the Berlitz Method, which he used in his schools (Howatt, 1984).

The DM enjoyed great popularity and success at the beginning of twentieth century in private schools where students were highly motivated, as stated in Richard and Rodgers (1997).

Although the DM enjoyed as Brown (2001) points out great popularity at the time, the size of the class, the number of students, and teacher background made the DM difficult to use in public schools.

Richard and Rodgers (1986) agree that the DM also had its drawbacks. These drawbacks centred on the fact that the DM demanded native teachers, or at least teachers with native like fluency

and that it greatly depended on teacher skill rather than on coursebook. Coursebooks consisted of texts which were the basis of language learning and teaching. The text was usually a short specially constructed narrative in the coursebook. Grammatical observations were derived from the texts and students were encouraged to discover the underlying principle. Much time was spent on exercises involving transpositions, substitutions, dictation, and narrative. Free compositions, questions, and answers on texts, comments on wall pictures were used as practical elements in the DM classroom.

The DM did not gain popularity in the USA as it did in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century. The Coleman Report had persuaded teachers that reading should become the focus in foreign language classrooms, and that teaching oral language skills is impractical (Richard and Rodgers, 1997). Therefore the emphasis on reading remained prominent until the World War II and suddenly oral proficient Americans were highly needed. This in turn caused a language teaching revolution. The US military provided the impetus for establishing special and intensive language courses primarily focused on oral skills (Howatt, 1984).

They came up with courses involving a great deal of oral activity, pronunciation and pattern drills and conversation practice, with almost no grammar and translation. This method was known as the Army Specialized Training Program or the Army Method (Brown, 2001). Many characteristics were borrowed from the DM and adopted into this new approach, which showed itself to be successful. In the 1950s the Army Method with all its adaptations became known as the Audiolingual Method (ALM).

As Richards and Rodgers (1997) assert “ the main aim of instructional materials in the ALM is to assist the teacher to develop mastery in the language learner” (p. 72). Tape recorders, audiovisual equipments, and a language laboratory are considered as essential. At the primary stage learners

are not exposed to the printed word while the teacher has access to the teacher's book following the structured sequence of the dialogues, drills, and other practice activities. When introduced to the students, the coursebook consists of texts of dialogues and cues needed for drills and various practical exercises. In the ALM, the instructional materials and coursebook are aimed at assisting the teacher to develop language mastery in the student. The teachers still have access to a teacher's book that contains the structured sequence of lessons to be followed and the dialogues, drills, and other practice activities.

The ALM enjoyed many years of popularity, until it was challenged by Rivers' (1964) eloquent criticism of its misconceptions and its failure to teach long term communicative proficiency. It was discovered that errors should not be avoided at all costs, that people actually do not acquire language through habit formation and that structural linguistics did not tell us everything that we needed to know about foreign language.

Hence, the age of audio-lingualism began to wane when the Chomskyan revolution in linguistics turned the attention of linguists and language teachers toward the deep structure of the language. An increasing interest in generative transformational grammar and focused attention on the rule governed nature of language and language acquisition led some language teaching programmes to promote a deductive approach rather than the inductivity of the ALM. Proponents of a cognitive code learning methodology began to inject more deductive rule learning into language classes (Brown, 2001). According to Brown (2001), cognitive code learning was an approach that emphasized a conscious awareness of rules and their applications to L2 learning. Unfortunately, innovation was short lived because rote drilling, overt attention to the rules, paradigms, intricacies, and exceptions of a language overtaxed the mental reserves of language students. In this period, various approaches, methods and techniques were developed and

adopted in order to make learning and the teaching of a foreign language easier and faster. However as Kelly (1969) states, on the bases of his thematic survey, the total corpus of ideas accessible for language teachers has not changed basically in 2000 years.

In his research, Kelly came up with conclusion that many present day practices and ideas have historical parallels. For instance, in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century there were forerunners of pattern drill in the teaching grammar. The role of dialogue, translation, composition, and reading as well as the teaching of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation was significant too. According to Kelly, what have been in constant change are the ways of building methods from them.

Therefore, as Kelly (1969) has stated, the diffusion of new ideas into the teaching profession from contributory theoretical disciplines had been relatively slow in the past.

According to Brown (2001), the 1970s were historically significant on two counts. First, research on second language learning and teaching grew from an offshoot of linguistics to a discipline in its own right. As more and more scholars focused their efforts on second language acquisition studies our knowledge of how people learn languages inside and outside classrooms developed very quickly in that period of time. Secondly, in this spirited atmosphere of pioneering research, a number of innovative methods were conceived and took on a distinctly affective nature. According to Stern (1983), at least five major trends of development can be detected as characteristics of the seventies, including these two mentioned by Brown (2001). As a third point Stern (1983) asserts the significance of human relations and individualization in the language class. Learners were seen as individuals, not as a group. There were reactions against cold and mechanical drills, drawing teachers to human values and relations in the language classroom. As a fourth powerful development in this decade Stern (1992) points out the shift to teaching

objectives, language content and curriculum design. Attempts were made to meet the varying language needs of many students in a more flexible and diversified approach to the curriculum. This new approach to the curriculum was made with the support and help of the Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe, and by international group of scholars. And finally one main feature in this decade, was the development of the term “communicative competence” which stood as a deliberate contrast to Chomsky’s linguistic competence (Stern, 1983). Beginning in 1971, a group of experts began to investigate a new way of designing language courses following a system in which learning tasks are broken into proportions or units, systematically, according to learners’ needs (Richard and Rodgers, 1997). Wilkins (1972) proposed a functional or communicative definition of language that could serve as a base for developing a communicative curriculum for language teaching. Wilkins described two types of meanings: notional categories (time, sequence, quantity, location, frequency, and so forth) and communicative function categories (requests, denials, offers, complains and so forth). This work was supported by the Council of Europe and reflected in the writings of Wilkins, Widdowson, Candlin, Brumfit, Johnson and other applied linguists. It resulted in the rapid application of their ideas by coursebook writers, its acceptance by British language teaching specialists, curriculum development centres and even by the government. This was referred to as the Communicative Approach or Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). As Stern (1983) has indicated communicative competence or communication is the key concept that has summarized the practical, theoretical and research preoccupations in educational linguistics and language pedagogy from the mid-seventies onwards. Therefore, as Richard and Rodgers (1997) point out, Communicative Language Teaching is seen as an approach that aims to make communicative

competence the goal of language teaching and to develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication.

Littlewood (1981) comments that one of the most important features of CLT lies in its systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language. Another important dimension of CLT is that it is learner centred and experience based. Learners in classroom were seen as individuals, possessing unique interests, styles, needs and goals which should be reflected in the design of methods of instructions. Brown (2001) summarizes earlier seminal works in CLT undertaken by Widdowson (1978), Breen and Candlin (1980), Savignon (1983), up to more recent teacher education coursebooks, Brown (2000), Richard-Amato (1996), Lee and Van Patten (1995), and Nunan (1991), and proposes that CLT makes use of real-life situations that necessitate communication. The teacher sets up a situation that students are likely to encounter in real life. Unlike the Audiolingual Method of language teaching, which relies on repetition and drills, the communicative approach can leave students in suspense as to the outcome of a class exercise, which will vary according to their reactions and responses. The real-life simulations change from day to day. Students' motivation to learn comes from their desire to communicate in meaningful ways about meaningful topics.

Richard and Rodgers (1986) clarify the fact that CLT considers materials as a way of influencing the quality of classroom interaction and language use, therefore materials have the primary role of promoting language use. Materials are seen as an essential component of instructional design and are often viewed as a way of influencing the quality of classroom interaction and language use. A wide variety of materials have been used to support communicative approaches to language teaching, but Richard and Rodgers (1997) refer to three kinds used in CLT and label them as text-based, task-based and realia.

Various coursebooks have been designed to support and to direct CLT. All of them include a variety of games, role plays, simulations, task based communication activities from authentic life texts, advertisements, magazines and newspapers or graphic and visual sources maps, pictures, symbols, graphs and charts.

A typical text-based coursebook in CLT consists of a theme, a task analysis for thematic development, a practice situation description, a stimulus presentation, comprehension questions and paraphrasing exercises. Task-based coursebooks consists of a variety of games, role-plays, simulations, and task-based communication activities. Since authentic materials were advocated by many proponents of CLT, coursebooks consists of language based on realia, such as passages from magazines, advertisements, and newspapers including graphic and visual sources as maps, pictures, symbols, graphs, and so on, around which communicative activities can be built (Richard and Rodgers, 1997). The purpose of a communicative coursebook as a whole is to promote communication, interaction and negotiation of meaning. Therefore, contemporary coursebooks have diverged from being pure grammar books, and have started to reflect the diversity of skills, competences (not only linguistic, but also communicative, sociolinguistic, intercultural), areas of language, range of grammar structures and vocabulary.

Developments from the 1970s to the 1980s could also be interpreted as an opposition to the “method concept” that was a major issue in that period (Stern, 1983). Nevertheless, at the same time some new methods have also aroused interest among teachers and the general public. Community Language Learning (CLL) is a classic example. In what is called the Counselling Learning Model of education, learners in the classroom are seen as a group which need a kind of therapy and counselling, not as a class as in the way that had been understood to that point. The

social dynamics of such a group are of primary importance. A supportive community lessens the anxiety caused by the educational context (Curran, 1972).

Curran's Counseling Learning Model of education was extended to language learning contexts in the form of CLL. In the group an interpersonal relationship between students are firstly established in their mother tongue and trust, seated in a circle with the counselor (teacher), on the outside of the circle. When one of the learners wishes to say something he or she says it in the native language and the counsellor translates the utterance back to the learner in the target language, which the learner then repeats. Gradually the learner becomes able to speak a word or phrase directly in the foreign language, without translation, or help from the counsellor (Brown, 2001). Like some other methods, CLL is far too restrictive for institutional language programmes. However, its basic tenets - the principles of discovery learning, student centered participation, and the development of student autonomy all remain successful in their application to language classrooms. Since a CLL course evolves out of the interactions with the community, a coursebook is not considered a necessary component. A coursebook would impose a particular body of language content on the learners, thereby impeding their growth and interaction. Materials may be developed by the teacher as the course develops, although these generally consist of little more than summaries on the blackboard or use of an overhead projector to demonstrate the linguistic features of conversations generated by students.

Other new methods of the decade were not as strictly affective as CLL. Suggestopedia, for example is a method that was derived from the Bulgarian psychologist Georgi Lozanov's (1988) contention that the human brain could process great quantities of material if given the right conditions for learning, including the state of relaxation and giving over of control to the teacher. Music is central in his method. As Lozanov (1988) asserts, baroque music with its 60 beats per

minute and its specific rhythm creates the kind of relaxed concentration that led to superlearning. According to Lozanov, during the soft playing of baroque music, one can take in tremendous quantities of material due to an increase in alpha brain waves and a decrease in blood pressure and pulse rate. Suggestopedia, used the coursebook as a direct support material (in comparison to indirect support materials such as classroom fixtures and music), and the texts as the most crucial aspects of the course were to be read, analysed and transmitted to students in a suggestive way. Grammar was contextualised in texts, and the comprehension of these was of utmost importance, with less time devoted to grammar practice and production.

As another new method, the Silent Way, like Suggestopedia, rested more on cognitive than affective arguments for its theoretical support. The nature of the Silent Way is characterized by a problem solving approach to learning. The founder of this approach Gategno (1972) believed that learners should develop independence, autonomy and responsibility. At the same time learners in a Silent Way classroom have to cooperate with each other in the process of solving language problems. The teacher is silent much of time. The Silent Way did not demand a coursebook for a course, instead, other teaching aids (a set of coloured rods, colour-coded pronunciation and vocabulary charts, a pointer, reading/writing exercises, as well as secondary materials such as books and worksheets, picture books, tapes, videotapes, films, other visuals) were employed during language lessons. The rods are used to introduce vocabulary, verbs and syntax. The teacher provides single word stimuli, or short phrases and sentences once or twice, and then students refine their understanding and pronunciation among themselves with minimal corrective feedback from the teacher. The charts introduce pronunciation models, grammatical paradigms, and the like. The Silent Way method has also been criticized, but its underlying principles are still valid (Brown, 1995).

The Total Physical Response (TPR) could be mentioned as one of the other innovative methods. James Asher (1982), the developer of this method began experimenting with this method in the 1960s, but it was another decade before it was widely discussed in professional circles. In TPR the principles of child language acquisition were important. Asher noted that children in learning their first language appear to do a lot of listening before they speak, and that their listening is accompanied by physical responses. By that time it was obvious that anxiety in the classroom was a significant obstacle to learning so Asher wished to devise a method that was as stress-free as possible where learners would not feel overly self-conscious and defensive. Like every other method mentioned, TPR has its own limitations. Although it seems to be especially effective in the beginning levels of language proficiency, it loses its distinctiveness as learners advanced in their competence (Asher, 1982). The Total Physical Response used the behaviourist stimulus-response-reinforcement pattern, but rested on the teacher respecting the learner's right to delayed production, being satisfied with comprehension demonstrated by physical actions. According to James Asher, there was no basic TPR coursebook, as it would restrict the teacher by imposing some ordering of items or ways of presenting them. Instead, the teacher was advised to decide what to teach, select and present new materials, and to collect materials and realia (such as everyday objects, pictures, slides, word charts) to construct language activities. Following these innovative ideas Krashen's (1982) theories of second language acquisition have been widely discussed but the main methodological offshoot of his views was manifested in the Natural Approach, developed by one of Krashen's colleagues, Tracy Terrell. Krashen and Terrell felt that learners would benefit from delaying production until speech 'emerges'. Learners should be as relaxed as possible in the classroom, and that a great deal of communication and acquisition should take place. The Natural Approach advocated the use of TPR activities at the beginning

level of language learning. The Natural Approach aims at the goal of basic personal communication skills, that is everyday language situations, conversations, shopping, listening to the radio, and so on. The initial task of the teacher is to provide comprehensible input that is spoken language, understandable to the learner or just a little beyond the learner's level. Learners need not say anything during this 'silent period' until they feel ready to do so (Brown, 2001). The Natural Approach did not treat the coursebook as a grammar book only, but rather as a resource containing both text-based materials (texts and recordings), task-based materials (particular procedures – tasks, simulations, role-plays, etc.) and realia (pieces of authentic materials, newspaper headlines, articles, advertisements, pictures or cartoons).

As observed from the related literature the purpose of a communicative coursebook as a whole is not to convey the feeling of authenticity but rather to promote communication, interaction and negotiation of meaning, therefore, the contemporary coursebooks have gone away from being pure grammar books, and have started to reflect the diversity of skills, competences (not only linguistic, but also communicative, sociolinguistic, intercultural), areas of language, range of grammar structures and vocabulary.

The Exploitation of the Foreign Language Coursebooks in Curriculum and Syllabus Design

With the communicative revolution, a new curriculum idea emerged in the 1970s and the prominence of communicative curriculum was highlighted. Traditionally, the term curriculum is taken to refer to a statement or statements of intention, the 'what should be' of a course or study. On the other hand, Nunan (1988) prefers to interpret curriculum in terms of what teachers actually do, that is 'what is' rather than 'what should be'. Nunan uses 'curriculum' to refer to all aspects of planning, implementing, evaluating and managing in an educational program. Dubin

and Olshtain (1986) define curriculum as a broad description of general goals by indicating an overall educational and cultural philosophy which applies across subjects together with a theoretical orientation to language and language learning with the respect to the subject matter at hand. Egan (1978) in Clouston (1996) notes that curriculum concentrates on two essential questions in educational practice: ‘what is taught, and how is taught’. It is seen that a F-N curriculum is a statement that specifies learning objectives, the selection and sequencing of linguistic data and a way to evaluate the set objectives. It contains a broad description of general goals, which reflect an overall educational-cultural philosophy (Ersoz, 1990).

According to Clouston's (1996) study, curriculum in its narrow sense also refers to a programme of study. Stern (1992) on the other hand defines it as

“...a comprehensive, explicit or implicit plan of language teaching which organizes into a more or less coherent whole the goals, content, strategies, techniques and materials, as well as the timing, sequential arrangements, social organization and evaluative procedures of a course or program or of a set of courses or programmes”.

(p. 20)

Johnson (1989), defined the word curriculum is in its broadest sense including all the relevant decision making processes of all the participants. Policy documents, syllabuses, teacher-training programmes, teaching materials and resources, and teaching and learning acts are all observable and describable products of this decision making processes. The participants that have the primary roles in curriculum development are: policy makers, needs analysts, methodologists, materials writers, teacher trainers, teachers and learners. According to Johnson, there are three sets of constraints on curriculum decision making. The first one is policy, the second consists of pragmatic considerations – time and resource, human and material. The third concerns of the participants in the curriculum process, and the way in which they interact. It is clear that any curriculum design must take adequate account of these constraints or fail to achieve its aims.

For Johnson (1989), the term policy is used to refer to “any broad statement of aims, whether at the level of a national curriculum, or as a good idea a teacher or learner may put forward for the classroom” (p. 2). Firstly, the idea must exist, and must be operationally defined. Secondly, resources must be prepared, and presented in order to be followed by learning acts. According to this, there are four stages in policy implementation: curriculum planning, ends-means specification, programme implementation and classroom implementation. In curriculum planning policy makers are responding to needs and determining the overall aims of the curriculum. Policy makers are different people in different educational contexts, and according to context, the policy is stated more or less formally. There is also an inherent danger of mismatch between the policy maker and the learning outcomes which the implemented curriculum is capable of achieving. Policy statements, however, are not formulated to meet the requirements of the curriculum development (Johnson, 1989).

As Johnson states, since policy statements are directives not specifications, policy is defined through ends and means specification. Ends specification should provide an exact characterisation of the target proficiency. Means specification should prescribe the method by which the target proficiency will be achieved. If the specifications in the syllabus are inadequate, the curriculum becomes potentially less coherent, and actually more difficult to evaluate, since criteria would have to be inferred. Johnson mentions that another approach in ends specification is a more cognitive one and has extended the traditional notion of language learning as mastery of the grammatical system to a broader conception of communicative competence. In means specification, the communicative revolution in language teaching has enriched the repertoire of techniques available to language teachers and material writers, being influenced by first and second acquisition theory and numerous classroom observation studies

(Dubin and Olshtain, 1987). The programme implementation stage is about teaching and learning resources, and the preparation of teachers to ensure that these resources are used effectively. As Johnson (1989) claims, the corpus of the curriculum is provided by teaching and learning materials. In this case, the role of the material writer is of critical importance, in that they should be closely associated with the process of ends and means specification, but should also have considerable freedom in actual implementation. However, even in the most highly developed materials projects, commercial or other, the principles governing selection, grading, organisation and presentation of contents are rarely stated in explicit and operational terms. Johnson indicates that if the materials writer provides the body of the curriculum, teacher training should be the spirit. However, the teacher-trainer forms the bridge between the syllabus committee and the classroom, engaging in ongoing curriculum development with materials writers.

The most important and final stage in the curriculum development process is classroom implementation for the reason that learning acts determine curriculum outcomes. According to Johnson a major cause of mismatch in implementing a language programme is a difference in proficiency levels of learners and material. So, material writers have to accept ends specification as their target or their material will not be used. Johnson also mentions that in the classroom implementation teaching and learning acts are of significant importance. In the case where the official curriculum differs from a teacher's beliefs, an alternative curriculum occurs which is usually unsatisfactory. In this case, successful teaching depends upon teacher confidence and responses automatised by experience. Learner acts are also likely to be consistent with the official curriculum. Even if the learners are motivated and responsible their decisions may still render the curriculum incoherent.

Johnson concerned to direct the attention towards the fact that decisions made or not made in the curriculum planning stage may cause numerous mismatches within the curriculum. Achieving and maintaining coherence requires the active engagement and co-operation of all participants throughout the life of the curriculum. If the constraints on decision making are formally stated and explicit, and if the decision-making processes are effectively monitored, the products of the decision making process are more likely to meet the needs of the coherent curriculum. In the process decision making any participant can be given the right to present these products (a policy document, a syllabus, a set of teaching materials, teacher-training programme and teaching and learner acts) is usually reserved for designated specialists. They are in charge of the product and each product is the major policy constraint on the next stage that is evaluation, in decision making (Johnson, 1989).

As Hargreaves, in Johnson (1989) suggests, evaluation is not a stage in itself, it is a result of a further set of the decisions built into curriculum planning and implemented at each of the subsequent stages of development. Evaluation findings are not expected to be replicable in or generalisable to their educational contexts, and their validity is determined primarily by the effectiveness of the decisions which flow from them. On the other hand, curriculum research findings must be generalisable or must lead towards research which could give generalisable results. Its validity depends crucially upon its replicability in other contexts, and its validity is judged in terms of theoretical rather than practical criteria.

As a conclusion, Johnson states that at each curriculum development stage, there are decisions relating to the processes or management of decision making and the product of decision making. The explicit aim of the decision making process as a whole is to achieve coherent curriculum development, maintenance and renewal.

With the development of communicative language teaching, a prevailing point of view attested by its widespread use in book titles, conference papers, and lectures has emerged. For programme designers the need to plan for communicative goals calls for the adoption of a point of view that is distinctly different from the traditional one.

Dubin and Olshtain (1987) state that the communicative curriculum draws from three major areas: a view of the nature of language as seen by the field of sociolinguistics, a cognitively based view of language learning, and a humanistic approach in education. Sociolinguistics deals explicitly with languages in ways that have far-reaching significance for their teaching and learning, particularly the question of: “What language do we teach?” This is why sociolinguistics plays a vital role in influencing the specification of content in a communicative syllabus. In a cognitively based view of language learning, course planning should centre on learner needs, with awareness of their different learning styles. For curriculum planning and material development, the emphasis is to design tasks that will allow learners to experience a variety of cognitive activities. In this way both teachers and learners will become aware of individual learning styles (Dubin and Olshtain 1987).

Dubin and Olshtain describe a ‘humanistic curriculum’ and they assert that a primary goal of a humanistic curriculum is to foster a sharing of control, negotiation between teachers and students, and shared responsibility by co-participants. It stresses thinking, feelings, and action, while also attempting to relate subject matter to learners’ basic needs and lives with self as a legitimate object of learning. The deepest goal or purpose of a humanistic curriculum is to develop the whole person within a human society.

Communicative goals have strongly influenced changes in three dimensions of the curriculum or syllabus which are discussed further on in this study. An important forerunner of what is now

called communicative language learning was the Notional-Functional Approach. The Functional-Notional (F-N) Approach began to grow in popularity in the United Kingdom during the 1970s, along with communicative language learning. A F-N Approach to language learning places a major emphasis on the communicative purpose of speech act, such as introducing people to each other, inviting someone to their home, directing someone to do or not to do something, briefly, on functions of language. As Howatt (1984) asserts, the first signs of F-N approach appeared in 1972 with Wilkins' Council of Europe paper and were reinforced by the appearance of the Threshold Level in 1975.

In the F-N Approach grammar points were attended to only in order to explain various forms used to accomplish certain functions. But the functions involve organizing elements of a foreign language curriculum (Brown, 1993). Van Ek and Alexander (1975) divided notions in the F-N Approach as general and specific. Abstract concepts, such as space, time, quantity, quality, and existence are general notions. Contexts or situations as personal identification, health, education, shopping, and so on are specific notions. The functional part of the F-N Syllabus corresponds to what is defined as language functions around which curricula are organized (Brown, 1993). In the F-N curriculum, priorities for teaching communicative expressions, structures, topics, and notions are determined primarily by the communication act the learners need to, or wish to express. According to Nunan (1988) curriculum planning can be seen as the systematic attempt by both educationalists and teachers to specify and study planned intervention into the educational enterprise. In this way, it can be said that curriculum is the product of this systematic attempt which lead us in making course designs. Stern (1984) points out that the teaching of a course is very often guided by the syllabus in question. There have been numerous definitions of the term one offered by Jeremy Harmer (1991) is that a syllabus is some kind of organisation of

what is to be learned, the listing of things that need to be covered in class and mastered by students. Another definition proposed by McDonough and Shaw (1993) is that a syllabus is the overall organising principle for what is to be learnt and taught. The syllabus combines the approach, design and procedure level of the language teaching method. It may be schematic, including only short and brief lists of structures or functions around which learning is to be organised, or may be enlarged with topics, subject matter of activities, tasks, texts or vocabulary lists.

Since courses and syllabuses are generally perceived to be two different things, partly it must be admitted by habitual collocation the two terms are not however always used indistinguishably. A 'course' might be taken to mean a real series of lessons, while a 'syllabus' can be taken to be something rather more abstract, with fewer details relating to the exhaustive conduct of individual lessons (Skelton and Willis, 2000).

In designing a language course there are a number of factors to be taken into consideration and certain steps to follow. In order to design a course the course designer has to find answers to some important questions like: Who are the learners? Who are the teachers? Why is the programme necessary? Where will the programme be implemented? (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986). This kind of information can give the course designer some idea of how the course should be organised. However, this information cannot give the whole picture of the course in question without reference to needs analysis (Pekkan, 1997). Needs assessment (analysis / fact finding stage), is main systematic design of curriculum including also a number of separate elements: goals and objectives, testing, materials, teaching and program evaluation. Generally, needs analysis, refers to activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that is to meet the learner needs of a particular group of learners

(Brown, 1995). In other words, the various activities, named ‘approaches’ mentioned previously are different expressions of the same wish to figure out what learners actually need to learn.

With determined and interpreted needs analysis course designers have to set the goals and objectives of the course. Goals can be represented as general statements of the intended outcomes of a language program, and comprise what the course planners believe to be attainable at the end of that program. After the determination of goals, the objectives may be set. Objectives are specific statements that describe the particular knowledge, and/or skill that the learner will be expected to know or perform at the end of the program (Pekkan, 1997). The next step involved in designing a language course is deciding what is going to be taught in the course and deciding about the content of a course syllabus.

Dubin and Olshtain (1987) define syllabus as a more detailed and operational statement of teaching and learning elements which translates the philosophy of the curriculum into a series of planned steps leading towards more narrowly defined objectives at each level. Therefore, a syllabus is regarded as the content of a course or the subject matter to be covered. It covers the selection and ordering of linguistic data. In other words, the syllabus provides information about what should be studied and how that particular content should be selected and sequenced. It must have a starting point – where the students actually are, and an end point which must be where the students will be at the end of the course. Dubin and Olshtain (1987) point out that since a syllabus is considered to be only a means of achieving the goals of a curriculum, different syllabi can draw from one curriculum.

Brown (1995) has determined some information about different types of syllabuses in terms of content.

Structural: Grammatical and phonological structures are the organizing principles sequenced from easy to difficult or frequent to less frequent.

Situational: Situations such as: at the bank, at the supermarket, at a restaurant, and so on. form the organizing principle – sequenced by the likelihood students will encounter them (structural sequence may be in background).

Topical: Topics and themes such as health, food, clothing, etc. form the organizing principle - sequenced by the likelihood students will encounter them (structural sequence may be in background).

Functional: Functions such as identifying, reporting, correcting, describing etc. are the organizing principle – sequenced by some sense of chronology or usefulness of each function (structural and situational sequence may be in background).

Notional: Conceptual categories called notions such as duration, quantity, location, etc. are the basis of organization - sequenced by some sense of chronology or usefulness of each notion (structural and situational sequence may be in background).

Skill Based: Skills such as listening for gist, listening for main ideas, scanning a reading passage for specific information, etc. serve as the basis for organization - sequenced by some sense of chronology or usefulness of each skill (structural and situational sequence may be in background).

Task Based: Task or activity based categories such as drawing maps, following instructions, following directions, etc. serve as the basis for organization - sequenced by some sense of chronology or usefulness of notions (structural and situational sequence may be in background).

(p. 7)

Mixed Syllabus: when there is a mixture of two or more types of syllabuses together into what looks like a different type of syllabus (for instance mixture of situational and topical syllabuses).

(p. 12)

Layered Syllabus: when secondary or tertiary syllabuses in layers operate underneath the primary syllabus (for instance when underneath the overall situational syllabus- structural syllabus organise the material within and between lessons.

(p. 13)

Another dimension of syllabus design is synthetic – analytic dimension. Wilkins (1976) first drew attention to this syllabus distinction. Nunan (1988) indicates that in designing a syllabus with the synthetic approach, language has to be broken into its grammatical structures so that different parts of language can be taught separately by a step-by-step procedure where the learner is exposed to a limited sample of language at a time. The learner will build up a language by adding the units that have been presented in pieces. In a synthetic syllabus, each unit of learning

deals with some particular aspect of grammatical structure and is identified with a grammatical label. Grammatical syllabus is an example of synthetic approach to syllabus design.

Analytic approach, on the other hand, views language as a whole. A much greater variety of linguistic structures is presented from the beginning. There is no attempt to carefully control the communicative aspects of language. Both the situational syllabus and communicative syllabus are examples of an analytic approach to syllabus design. The argument for the situational syllabus is that language is used in a social context and cannot be fully isolated from that context (Nunan, 1988).

A syllabus also requires some kind of organization or format in a shape which is best suited to the objective of the course. Five possible formats are briefly discussed in Dubin and Olshtain (1987):

The linear format: traditionally adopted format for discrete element content, (grammar / structures). The order in which items are presented are determined by linguistic and pedagogical principles. Determined sequence must be maintained in its original format – changing the original order, or skipping some units cannot be done without upsetting the careful grading embedded in the sequence.

(p.51)

The modular format: ideal for courses with thematic or situational language content with a skills orientation. It is often used for a program in which the aim is maximum flexibility in the materials to be used.

(p.53)

The cyclical format: enables teachers and learners to work with the same subject matter more than once, but each time a particular one reappears, it is at a more complex or difficult level. The main concept in this format is that new subject matter should be reintroduced in different manifestations at various times in the course.

(p.55)

The matrix format: offers maximum flexibility to teachers and learners to select topics from a table of contents in a random order. The matrix shape is well suited to situational content.

(p.58)

The storyline format: maintains coherence and ensures thematic continuity by presenting language in a form of a story.

(p.61)

Brown (1995) declares that despite the extensive literature on syllabuses, there is a little empirical evidence that any particular type of syllabus works better than any other, and agrees with Dubin and Olshtain (1987), that in carefully considering the various approaches to syllabus design, course designers may reach the conclusion that a number of different ones are needed and are best combined in an eclectic manner in order to achieve positive results.

It should be noted here that nowadays a syllabus is only or often presented in the form of a coursebook to be used. Whether or not the course is tied to a particular coursebook, as Harmer (1999) concludes its syllabus will generally have a list of language items at its core. The assumption being made here is that these language items will be new for the students and should therefore be introduced to them in the order of the syllabus.

The Definition of the Foreign Language Coursebook

Since the end of the 1970s, there has been a revolutionary movement to delegate learners as the centre of language education rather than teachers. According to this approach, learners have more eminence than the other components of education i.e. more than teachers, materials, curriculum, methods, or evaluation. As a matter of fact, curriculum, materials, teaching methods, and evaluation are to be designed for learners and their needs. It is generally the teacher's responsibility to lead and organize whether all of the elements of the learning process work well for learners and to adapt them if they do not.

Kitao (1997) supports the idea that learners should be the centre of instruction and learning. He states that materials also influence the content and the procedures of learning. Choices of deductive versus inductive learning, the role of memorization, the use of creativity and problem solving, production versus reception, are all influenced by the material.

According to Nunan (1988) materials are essential elements within the curriculum. At their best they provide concrete models of desirable classroom practice, they act as curriculum models, and they fulfil a teacher development role. Littlejohn and Windeatt (1989) argue that materials have a hidden curriculum that includes attitudes toward knowledge, toward teaching and learning, toward the role and relationship of the teacher and student, and values and attitudes related to gender, society, and so on. Materials have an underlying instructional philosophy, approach, method, and content, including both linguistic and cultural information. Choices made in writing coursebooks are based on beliefs that the writers have about what language is and how it should be taught (Kitao, 1997).

In the past, absolute language teaching materials that have been used in the teaching - learning process consisted of a grammar reference and practice book or a dictionary, but in today's world a rich variety of materials are in service. The basic and most frequently used language teaching materials can be categorized as: the coursebook, the supplementary materials, teacher's book, workbook, or exercise book, and the supporting material, pictures, flashcards, posters, charts, tapes, videos, and so on. Devices, such as an Over Head Projector (OHP), slides, video and audio tape recorders, video cameras, and computers, also support instruction/learning.

Allwright (1981) characterizes the lesson as an interaction among three elements of teacher, learners and material. What this interaction produces are opportunities to learn. Brown (1995) defined course materials as any systematic description of the techniques and exercises to be used

in classroom teaching. This definition is broad enough to include lesson plans and leave enough space for books, packets of audio visual aids, games, or any of the other numerous types of the activities that are exploited in the language classroom. As Edge (1998) acknowledges, since the fact that materials exist in order to support learning and teaching, they should be designed to suit the people and the processes involved.

The most obvious and most common form of material support for language instructions comes through coursebook (Brown, 1995). The coursebook is an almost universal element of teaching (Hutchinson and Hutchinson, 1993). Sheldon (1987) also points out in a collection of essays that the coursebook is very much the centre of the published material orbit. According to Tomlinson (1998) coursebooks provide core materials in one book and usually include work on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, functions and the skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. Many have peripheral supporting material such as cassettes, video packages, workbooks, teacher's books and, on rare occasions, Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) programmes. Since the 1980s learner variables have attracted a lot of attention in the research literature (Ellis, 1994; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991; in Masuhara, 1998) and have influenced pedagogy (Nunan, 1988; in Masuhara 1998). The coursebook seems to reflect this change and their blurbs today often emphasise that their product is designed to satisfy learners' needs and interests. Nevertheless, the sheer number and variety of coursebooks means that it is very difficult to make accurate generalisations about them. Grant (1987) suggests two very broad categories of coursebooks: traditional coursebooks and communicative coursebooks.

He states that it is not always very easy to place a particular coursebook firmly within either of these categories, as there is a continuum from one category to another. The traditional coursebook tries to get students to learn the language as a system. Once they have learned the

system it is hoped that they are then equipped to use the language for their own purposes in any way they think fit. These traditional textbooks are still being published today (Grant, 1987).

The following list consists of characteristics that traditional coursebooks have:

- They tend to emphasise the forms or patterns, of language (the grammar) more than the communicative functions of language.
- They tend to focus on reading and writing activities rather than listening and speaking activities.
- They often make use of a great deal of L1.
- They emphasise the importance of accuracy.
- They tend to focus rather narrowly on a syllabus and examinations.
- They are often attractive to some teachers, because they seem easy to use, and are highly examination cantered.

(Grant, 1989, p.13)

The great advantages of these books are that they are very easy to use for teachers. The main constraint with this type of coursebooks are that students work through them sometimes for years and they may know the system of grammar however while still being incapable of using the language.

On the other side, communicative coursebooks strive to clarify this problem by creating opportunities for the students to use the language in the classroom. Communicative coursebooks vary a great deal but broadly they have the following characteristics:

- They emphasise the communicative functions of language not just forms.
- They try to reflect the students' needs and interests.
- They emphasise the skills in using the language not just the forms of language and they are therefore activity-based.
- They usually have a good balance among the four language skills, but may emphasise listening and speaking more than a traditional coursebook does.
- They tend to be very specific in their definition of aims.
- Both content and methods reflect the authentic language of everyday life.
- They encourage work in groups and pairs and therefore make heavier demands on teachers' organisational abilities.
- They emphasise fluency not just accuracy.

(Grant, 1989, p.14)

Grant (1989) argues that while the perfect coursebook does not exist, the best book available for every teaching situation surely does. Such a book should match at least three conditions: It should suit the needs, interests and abilities of the student, and it should suit the teacher. On the other hand the coursebook must meet the needs of the public educational system and fulfil the requirements of the set formal curriculum.

The reasons for exploiting coursebooks in the language teaching classroom are many and some of them could be exemplified as follows: They are generally written by experienced and well-qualified people (Cunningsworth, 1984). They are carefully tested in pilot studies (Ersoz, 1990). They relieve the teacher from the pain and pressure of designing or adapting materials for each and every class (Hutchinson & Hutchinson, 1994). They guarantee a degree of consistency in courses that are taught by a number of different teachers who bring into classrooms different professional skills and personality traits (Judy, 1981, in Pekkan, 1997). When published in a series, they ensure some continuity between grade levels (Judy, 1981, in Pekkan, 1997). They help teachers to make the best use of time in the classroom, and help teachers to avoid unintended repetition or neglect of essential language patterns (Darian, 2001). They bring the real world into the essentially artificial classroom situation, give students a general picture of what has been studied and what will be studied, they provide a solid resource for students, and contribute to learner independence (gives the opportunity to review, look ahead, and learn on their own) (Woodward, 2001).

Ersöz (1990) asserts that such books do have their drawbacks:

- They are written for mass sales.
- Their targets are average groups of learners.
- They rarely meet all the expectations of the school and the teachers.
- They rarely answer all the needs of a particular group of learners or address their interests.

(p.7)

Due to the aforementioned issues the teacher needs to find a way of adapting, adjusting, or even developing materials when required between what the coursebook offers and what the programme and learners need. Harmer (1991) confirms the idea that a coursebook rarely has the perfect balance that the teacher is looking for and that teachers have to work out the best ways to use their coursebooks.

Brown (1995) considers three strategies of coursebook exploitation: adopting, developing, and adapting materials. On the basis of programme goals and objectives the teacher must address the essential questions of what the content will be and how it will be sequenced. Adopting involves deciding on the types of materials that need to be evaluated, locating as many different sets of those types as possible, evaluating them, putting them to use, and reviewing them on an ongoing basis.

Developing materials involves developing, teaching, and evaluating materials. Adapting materials includes all of the steps necessary in adopting them but must additionally incorporate phases that allow for analysing what is worth keeping in materials such as filling gaps from other sources, and reorganizing all of this to fit the program in question. Adaptation is defined by Tomlinson (1998) as making changes in order to improve or make it more suitable for a particular type of learner by reducing, adding, omitting, modifying and supplementing.

Ellis (1997) points out that teachers are often faced with the task of choosing what teaching materials, that is, coursebooks to use. In effect they are required to carry out a predictive evaluation of the materials available to them in order to determine which are best suited to their purposes. Once they have used these materials they may feel the need to undertake a further evaluation to determine whether the materials have 'worked' for them. This constitutes a

retrospective evaluation. This kind of evaluation provides the teacher with information which can be used to determine whether it is worthwhile using the materials again, which activities are acceptable and which are not, and how to modify the materials to make them more effective for future use. A retrospective evaluation also serves as a means of ‘testing’ the validity of a predictive evaluation, and may point to ways in which the predictive instruments can be improved for future use (Ellis, 1997). Daoud and Celce Murcia (1978) in Pekkan (1997) suggest that before a teacher begins to select potentially appropriate materials for the learners certain information should be gathered. For instance, background information of the students such as age range, proficiency level in that foreign language, sex distribution (what percentage of M/F?), level of general education, background language(s) (homogeneous, heterogeneous), reasons for studying that language. Then some information about the course syllabus is to be gathered, about the skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing), language areas (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation), the use to which the language material will be put (e.g. how much of the vocabulary will be used for recognition or for both recognition and production purposes), and on the relative attention given to mechanics (penmanship, spelling, punctuation).

It is also to be noted that institutional data must be taken into account while designing a course syllabus. Such data will include “typical class size, time: years and/or hours per week allocated to the study of foreign language, type of physical environment (for instance classroom size, flexibility of the seating arrangement, blackboard space, audiovisual equipment), preferred dialect of English (British/American/other), the institutional or national objectives for English instruction, nature and form of any required internal/external English language examination” (Pekkan, 1997, p. 34).

If coursebook evaluation is in question and where there is no opportunity to talk to people who have actually used the material, and where piloting is not possible, as for example setting up a completely new teaching programme then a detailed analysis of the material is the best way of becoming familiar with it (Cunningsworth, 1995).

The last two decades have seen important changes in the field of materials development. Littlejohn (1998) points out that published teaching materials have lately become more pervasive and more complex. Foreign language teaching publishing has developed into an international multi-million dollar industry, with UK and the US publishers represented in many countries around the world. The need to cater to international markets has given rise to the concept of the 'global coursebook,' which can be used by students at a particular level and age group anywhere in the world. As the new coursebooks reach farther across the globe, they also reach deeper into the classroom in terms of the way they influence instruction (Ranalli, 2003). Littlejohn (1998) also notes that in previous years coursebooks contained mainly readings perhaps with some questions and sentences to translate. Nowadays materials frequently offer complete 'packages' for language learning and teaching with precise indications of the work that teachers and students are to do together. The extent to which materials now effectively structure classroom time has thus increased considerably (Littlejohn, 1998). Ansary and Babaii (2001) have stated that, in general, foreign language coursebooks have generated a range of reactions. However, at the same time a widespread dissatisfaction persists with published materials. Tomlinson (1998) attributes this to the fact that they are often regarded as suspect both in terms of their language models and their methodology. Sheldon (1988) also notes that teachers often regard them as the 'tainted end-product of an author's or a publisher's desire for a quick profit' (p. 239).

Edge and Wharton (1998) have declared that on teacher training courses coursebooks are often treated as artefacts which need to be deconstructed and debunked. This long-running debate over the role and value of published teaching materials still continues.

Critics like Allwright (1982) have pointed out the risks of imposing a one-size-fits-all solution as coursebooks attempt to do, on problems that are by nature very local and very complex. Swan (1992), has noted how books sometimes take important decisions regarding the 'whats' and 'hows' of teaching out of the hands of teachers who, having been absolved of responsibility, then sit back and simply operate the system.

Littlejohn's (1998) idea of materials as 'pedagogic device' gives the impression that materials provide structure and raw material for the educational process, rather than direct it. While the type of book that currently dominates the market is seen as too inflexible, Maley (1998) points out that alternatives do exist, and he and many others have called for materials which give teachers choices and options. Hutchinson and Torres (1994) have pointed out the teacher-development potential of coursebooks and asserted that they are often a significant, if not primary, agent of change in language teaching.

They also claim that the 'coursebook not only survives, it thrives for the reason they satisfy certain needs' (p. 325). The main evidence for this lies in the number of coursebooks produced and the fact that each new generation of books is more comprehensive and more structured than the previous, and yet coursebooks survive because they remain the most convenient basis on which to mould the unpredictable interaction which is necessary to classroom language learning (O'Neill 1982).

The Differences Between Native and Non – Native Foreign Language Teachers

With the increasing impetus of foreign language teaching all over the world a significant interrogation on ‘native and non-native’ language teachers has emerged. Today, in most of the non-English-speaking countries there is a clear-cut division between non-native and native English speaking teachers which could be observed in other foreign language education contexts. The native speaker (NS) has traditionally played a key role not only in language teaching but also in language teaching methodology and research. According to Freudenstein (1991), the NS should become the standard foreign-language teacher due to the fact that they know best what is important in language teaching – i.e. what constitutes active and creative language use in everyday communication.

The Oxford Companion to the English Language (McArthur, 1992) defines a NS as

“a person who has spoken a certain language since early childhood, who has subconscious knowledge of rules, intuitive grasp of meanings, ability to communicate within social settings, range of language skills and creativity of language use; identification with a language community; the ability to produce fluent discourse, to know differences between their own speech and that of the ‘standard’ form of the language, ‘to interpret and translate into the L1 of which she or he is a native speaker’”.

(p. 230)

The term NS is also defined by Davies (1991) in six ways:

The native speaker acquires the L1 of which s/he is a native speaker in childhood,

The native speaker has intuitions (in terms of acceptability and productiveness) about his/her idiolectal grammar.

The native speaker has intuitions about those features of the Standard Language grammar which are distinct from his/her idiolectal grammar.

The native speaker has a unique capacity to produce fluent spontaneous discourse, which exhibits pauses mainly at clause boundaries (the 'one clause at a time' facility) and which is facilitated by a huge memory stock of complete lexical

items (Pawley and Syder, 1983). In both production and comprehension the native speaker exhibits a wide range of communicative competence,

The native speaker has a unique capacity to write creatively (and this includes, of course, literature at all levels from jokes to epics, metaphor to novels)

The native speaker has a unique capacity to interpret and translate into the LI of which s/he is a native speaker. Disagreements about the deployment of an individual's capacity are likely to stem from a dispute about the Standard Language.

(p. 4)

Lee (2005) listed the knowledge of NS based on findings and studies by scholars in the fields of Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, and Foreign Language Teaching, indicating that native speakers have an internalized knowledge of: appropriate use of idiomatic expressions (Coulmas, 1981; Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Phillipson, 1996), correctness of language form (Coulmas, 1981; Davies, 1991; Phillipson 1996) natural pronunciation (Coulmas, 1981; Medgyes, 1992, 1994), cultural context (Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Phillipson, 1996) including 'response cries' (Goffman, 1978, in Coulmas, 1981), swear words, and interjections, above average sized vocabulary, collocations and other phraseological items (Coulmas, 1981; Medgyes, 1992, 1994), metaphors (Coulmas, 1981), frozen syntax, such as binomials or bi-verbials (Coulmas, 1981), and nonverbal cultural features (Coulmas, 1981; Davies, 1991) (p. 5). Davies (1991) mentions that NS occupies an inquisitive position in applied linguistics. The term 'native speaker' is widely used as a criterion for knowledge of a language and as an important criterion for employment. Ferguson (1983) points out that a special place is given to the NS as the only genuine and reliable source of language data. Stern (1983) puts it plainly: "The native speaker's 'competence' or 'proficiency' or 'knowledge of the language' is a necessary point of reference for the second language proficiency concept used in language teaching" (p. 341). Harmer (1991) also claims that students need to get an idea of how the new language is used

from NSs. In Trujillo's, Viri's, and Figueira's (2002) study intense responses to the questionnaire administered to 600 pre-service teachers put forward the importance of increasing number of NSs in language classrooms. Among the most constant responses on this theme were incorporating traditional life with the world outside their own communities, the need for teachers who will teach their own culture, and as the most significant point, 'teachers who will teach native things should be native' (p. 2). Research shows that within this system, the NS is viewed as the most essential link between the aspects of community and the process of education (Pavel, 1999). However, there is the fact that today 80 % of English language teaching professionals worldwide are non-native speakers (NNS) (Canagarajah, 1999). Recent studies (Medgyes, 1992; Phillipson, 1992; Tang, 1997; Braine, 1999; Cook, 1999; Bakhtin, 1981; Crowley, 1989; Kramsch, 1997; Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998; Le McKay, 2003; Rampton, 1990) show that NNS teachers try to define their place in the role of English educators in an unbalanced society where the teaching of English is traditionally allocated to NSs more than ever. Non-native English speaker teachers (NNEST) challenge the assumption that NNESTs has a questionable cultural and linguistic identity and professional dependability. They argue that English proficiency is not the sole factor that determines the quality of the teacher. As Liu (1999) mentions identifying an individual as an NEST or NNEST is very difficult if not impossible task. He points out that at some times being labeled as an NEST is advantageous, and at other times being labeled as an NNEST may be advantageous too. Medgyes (1992), for instance, points out six factors in which NNS teachers have an advantage over NS teachers:

Only non-NESTs (non-native-speaking EFL teachers) can serve as imitable models of the successful learner of English.

Non-NESTs can teach learning strategies more effectively.

Non-NESTs can provide learners with more information about the English language.

Non-NESTs are more able to anticipate language difficulties.

Non-NESTs can be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their learners.

Only non-NESTs can benefit from sharing the learner's mother tongue.

(pp. 346-347)

Most of these studies seem to seek ways for NNEST teachers to survive with their limited language proficiency. Even Medgyes admits that "a NEST would by definition be superior to his or her non-native colleague" (1992, p. 346), in this respect. Lazaraton (2003) states that the NNEST issue has taken centre stage in the past decade as one of the important concerns facing the language teaching profession. Canavarajah (1999) proposes that non-native speaker teachers bring irrefutable pedagogical and linguistic strengths to the profession. Canavarajah also mentions that all languages and dialects are of equal status, accents and pronunciation are only surface features of ones' language competence, and that a language can have several variants, in this case world Englishes. Therefore, the superiority of the native speaker is a fallacy. Kramsch (1993) and Cook (1999) stress another important point, that is, non-native teachers and students might be intimidated by the native-speaker norm to a certain degree. Since the target of identity with the native speaker is unachievable in the vast majority of cases, if at all, it has inevitably produced dissatisfaction among researchers, teachers and students. The target of foreign language learners ought to be people who can use two languages effectively, perhaps in some areas like natives, perhaps not. The native speaker comparison may be appealing and convenient but is useful only up to the point at which it starts to deny the special nature of people who know more than one language (Cook, 1999). Conversely, students may feel overwhelmed by native speaker teachers who have achieved a perfection that is out of their reach. This is the main

reason why students may prefer the fallible non-native speaker teacher who presents a more achievable model (Kramsch, 1993).

Canavarajah (1999) opposes the argument that native teachers make good teachers. On the contrary, she mentions that recent studies have shown that non-native teachers because of their second language learning experiences prove to be sensitive and responsive to the affective, linguistic, and academic needs of their students. Also the NNEST's second language experiences fosters the development of a high level of metalinguistic awareness that lends well to sound teaching strategies. Machado (1997) proposes that the reason for much of the criticism that the NEST receives is due to the fact that native teachers in an EFL setting many times are not 'real' teachers but merely native speakers of the target language. Many of them have little or no training in teaching. Therefore, they might have problems in explaining some features of the English language. Furthermore, teaching methodology might be something completely new to them. Activities such as planning a unit or a lesson, or establishing teaching objectives might prove to be a complicated task, and expressions such as 'learning strategies' or 'communicative competence' might be totally unfamiliar to them (Canavarajah, 1999).

It should be indicated that, in the present study both native Turkish speaker teachers (NTSTs) and NNEST are proficient and trained teachers (of both the English and Turkish language). Moreover, native speaker teachers are Turkish native teachers in Turkey, and are proficient in the language and culture they teach, while the NNEST is Turkish, teaching English as a foreign language in Turkey consequently has all the attributes of the NNEST.

The use of Foreign Language Coursebook by Native and Non-Native Foreign Language Teachers

Concerning language use, Gill and Rebrova (2001) state that there are only a trivial number or no NNESTs that can compete with NESTs. They claim that the knowledge of NNESTs very often comes from books rather than direct contact with genuine sources, as a result an insecurity occurrence in NNESTs may be seen.

Allwright (1990) argues that materials are to teach students to learn, that they should be resource books for ideas and activities for instruction/learning, and that they should give teachers ground for an action for what they do. However, the attitudes of language teachers are as important as the application of language teaching materials. In this regard, it is inspiring to see how materials influence both language teachers' and learners' viewpoints. The coursebook plays an important role in language teaching, particularly in the EFL classroom where it provides the primary if not the only form of linguistic input (Kim & Hall, 2002). Jumaily (2005) points out that without a coursebook everything would be much more complicated in a FL classroom. Jumaily states that a coursebook is looked upon as a necessary vehicle for foreign language acquisition whose validity and significance are seldom refuted and that they have the role of partnership with the teacher, especially they are great helpers for inexperienced teachers. According to Cunningsworth (1995) a coursebook has multiple roles in foreign language teaching and can serve as:

- a resource for presentation material (spoken & written),
- a source of activities for learner practice and communicative interaction,
- a reference source for learners on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and so on.
- a source of stimulation and ideas for classroom language activities,

a syllabus (where they reflect learning objectives which have already been determined),

a source for self-directed learning or self-access work,

a supporter for less experienced teachers who have yet to gain in confidence.

(p. 7)

Accordingly, the coursebook is devoted to helping both teachers and learners, in a sense, to be at their service but not to be their master. According to Cook (1999), the coursebook is the central feature of much teaching, controlling at least some of the language that is presented in the classroom. Therefore, a description of the language underlying coursebooks should not be implicitly native-based, even if it often reflects the idealised normative view of language of the teaching tradition rather than actual description. Cook sees the coursebook as a device that influences large amounts of language teaching, proposing that in fact, a single coursebook can influence thousands of classrooms and consequently millions of learners. Cook persists in criticising current coursebooks in terms of their objectives, stating that coursebooks should be constructed around L2 rather than an L1 target.

Therefore, as asserted by Williams (1983), a coursebook should provide an appropriate guidance for the language teacher who is not a native speaker. A teacher who does not possess native-like control over all aspects of the language should not be left in any doubt concerning the procedures proposed by the coursebook.

Williams (1983) proposed seven principles derived from guidance for non-native teachers with general, linguistic/pedagogical, and technical criteria.

According to Williams the ESL/EFL coursebook should:

give introductory guidance on the presentation of language items and skills (general),

suggest aids for the teaching of pronunciation: e.g. phonetic system (speech),

offer meaningful situations and a variety of techniques for teaching structural units (grammar),

distinguish the different purposes and skills involved in the teaching of vocabulary (vocabulary),

provide guidance on the initial presentation of passages for reading comprehension (reading),

demonstrate the various devices for controlling and guiding content and expression in composition exercises (writing), and

contain appropriate pictures, diagrams, tables, and so forth (technical).

(p.254)

Since time and exposure are limited in a language class, the coursebook should lead the teaching and learning process. Accordingly, there is a need to determine if there is a difference between the native and non-native speaker teachers in terms of their access to the coursebook will be investigated.

Bettinelli (2003) compared native speaker language teachers with non-native speaker language teachers in language teaching and concluded that native speaker teachers are less strict with coursebooks, are secure in their command of the language, use real language, favour flexible approaches, focus on oral skills/fluency, are more tolerant of errors, and have higher expectations. While non-native speaker language teachers use a single coursebook from top to bottom, feel insecure about their command of the language, use bookish language, prefer guided approaches, focus on grammar / formal registers, and set more tests.

According to Pulverness (2003), the foreign language context is always far more demanding for teachers and students than the native or even second language context. So, the objective is likely to be native like fluency, or at least sufficient understanding and sensitivity to operate

comfortably in the target community. However, as Oka (2003) points out, when observing an ordinary EFL classroom with a non-native teacher, it is obvious that English is scarcely used, except when using the coursebook. Similarly, Raux and Maxine (2004) mention the fact that when the taught language is not the teacher's native language, their utterances might fall out of the standard native model, seriously degrading the recognition, accuracy and overall system performance.

Despite a large number of studies about the role of the coursebook and native and non-native speaker teacher, not much attention has been given to native or non-native teacher's usage of coursebook materials.

It is assumed that non-native speaker teachers are the ones that need a coursebook more in an EFL setting in order to help them bring the real world into the essentially artificial classroom situation so that they can relate the language items they are teaching to actual usage. For this reason, Caputa (2000) declare that coursebook writers' intentions should be interpretable by the non-native teachers and students, so that teachers and learners can relate the language used to its purpose in the social context.

Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language

Since there is insufficient literature on the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language the following section is based on contributions from the international symposium on the 'Teaching Turkish as a Second or a Foreign Language in Europe' carried out in 2001, as a contribution to the European Year of Languages.

As Akdo (2001) pointed out, the programme of 'Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language to Turkish Children Abroad' designed by the Ministry of National Education is practiced in many European countries and a significant store of knowledge has been acquired as a result of the

Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language activities carried out by the University of Ankara over the last seventeen years. This programme has filled significant gaps with regard to regular practice of educational activities. However, Akdo states that the implementation of this programme shows that teaching Turkish as a second language and as a foreign language require different principles, different methods, different priorities and approaches. The language teaching practices in TÖMER, Ankara university, provide a concrete example for this assertion. In time, the Turkish programme administered for students coming from Central Asia since 1992 inevitably became different from the programme administered for learners who did not speak any of the Turkic languages as their mother tongues.

Moreover, Akdo observes that the practice-oriented studies being carried out with regard to teaching Turkish to different groups by TÖMER since 1984 had made great contributions to the programme for teaching Turkish as a foreign language that was prepared by the Ministry of National Education. The aforementioned programme for teaching Turkish as a foreign language expresses a significant need for non-native teachers who have already started or who will start teaching Turkish at their schools (Akdo, 2001).

Akdo also mentioned that

“TÖMER due to various reasons, encountered the biggest problem in teaching Turkish to foreigners. Until this time, as TÖMER tried to meet the demands of various European educational institutions as far as their institutional relations allowed. However, the relevant governmental institutions, particularly the Ministry of National Education must make these relations gain an official identity”.

(p. 23)

Akdo also pointed out that, in Turkey the instructors teaching Turkish as a foreign language do not receive any special training at undergraduate level.

“...Several universities are carrying out graduate programmes with regard to studies in this field and these studies are generally conducted on a theoretical basis. Yet today, the advanced level of technology renders it necessary to acknowledge foreign language teaching as a laboratory activity, to devise appropriate tools and instruments and to equip foreign language instructors in accordance with the requirements of the job they perform. The practices in TÖMER give an essential data on the qualities that must be borne by instructors who will teach Turkish as a foreign language. Under the light of these data, an instructor training program has been started recently at TÖMER. The goal is to acquaint the teacher candidates attending the relevant undergraduate programme with information on how to teach Turkish as a foreign language, that is, in a more technical way, to try and provide them with the opportunity to look at Turkish from the standpoint of a foreigner and teach them to analyze Turkish language by means of this standpoint”.

(p. 24)

Akdo indicated that TÖMER have been executing a similar study together with the Ministry of National Education for the last few years. The teachers appointed to Turkish schools abroad by the Ministry of National Education participate in the courses administered by TÖMER, though for a fairly short period, and thus start their work after acquiring an idea on the methods, tools, instruments and programmes used in TÖMER. Akdo added the following:

“Currently, there are Turcology departments in various universities in many countries around the world. In these departments, education is carried out in the mother tongue of the country and the students face significant problems in learning the modern Turkish. Students graduating from Turcology departments sometimes teach Turkish to their citizens. One of the important compounds of constructing a teaching system that is suitable for today’s conditions is the teaching materials. Being able to instruct a language as a foreign language is closely related to the availability of instruction tools and instruments that include perfect information about the language in question. This relation requires the transfer of the modern language studies, particularly the applied linguistics studies, and their results to educational environments”.

(p. 25)

METHODOLOGY

The major emphases of this study are to determine the role of the foreign language coursebooks and the degree that they influence teaching and learning foreign languages in native and non-native language settings in Turkey. In order to explore these issues, this study has addressed two major questions of the research:

1. What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
2. What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?

The six sub-questions indicated below, are also examined:

1. To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
2. To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?
3. How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey?
4. How does being a Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey?
5. What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey?
6. What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey?

In this part of the study the subjects analysed in the study, the instruments used to collect data and the data analysis procedures employed are discussed in detail.

Subjects

The subjects in this study comprised two groups of language learners and their language teachers from TÖMER, Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre of Ankara University. One of the groups was formed by learners of English as a foreign language in Turkey and consisted of 7 adult Turkish native speakers. The other group consisted of 6 adult learners of Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey coming from various countries. The subjects who consisted both of learners and teachers were observed during the classes, were interviewed, and provided with a questionnaire. Both of the groups who received English instruction or Turkish instruction had 10 hours of language classes every week.

At the beginning of the course, when this study was initiated, learners in both groups had negligible or minimal knowledge of the target language. In both groups the participants had different personal and professional profiles.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the English learners according to gender and age.

Table 1

Distribution of the English Learners According to Gender and Age

Total number of English learners	Gender		Age	
	male	female	minimum	maximum
	3	4	19	35
N= 7				

Note. N: # of learners

The English group had 7 learners in total and 3 of them were male while 4 were female. The minimum range for age was 19 and the maximum range was 35.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the Turkish learners according to gender and age.

Table 2

Distribution of the Turkish Learners According to Gender and Age

Total number of Turkish Learners	Gender		Age	
	male	female	minimum	maximum
	3	3	18	55
N= 6				

Note. N: # of learners

The Turkish group had 6 learners in total and 3 of them were male while 3 were female. The minimum range for age was 18 and the maximum range was 55.

The English group comprised learners of the same nationality (Turkish) of various occupations and different educational backgrounds as indicated in Table 3.

Table 3

Distribution of the English Learners According to Nationality, Education, Occupation and Level of Proficiency

Total number of English learners	Nationality		Education			Occupation		Level of proficiency
	Turkish	Other	Lycee	BA	MA	Student	Working	Beginner
	7	0	4	3	0	2	5	7
N= 7								

Note. N: # of learners

As can be seen, the group of the English language learners consisted of Turkish native speakers. 3 of them had graduated from university and 4 were graduated from high school. The occupations of the group members differed and included 2 students and 5 working people. All learners were at the beginner level of English.

The Turkish group comprised learners of different nationalities, of various occupations and different educational backgrounds as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4

Distribution of the Turkish Learners According to Nationality, Education, Occupation, and Level

Total number of Turkish Learners N= 6	Nationality		Education			Occupation		Level of proficiency beginner
	Turkish	Other	Lycee	BA	MA	Student	Working	
	0	6	1	3	2	3	3	6

Note. N: # of learners

The Turkish group consisted of learners from several different countries, 1 from Colombia, 1 from Israel, 1 from South Korea, 1 from France, 1 from Russia and 1 from the USA. One of the participants graduated from high school, 3 of them graduated from university and 2 of them held MA degrees. The occupations of the Turkish group differed as well and comprised 3 students and 3 working people. All learners were at the beginner level of Turkish.

The English teacher who took part in this study was the only teacher that instructed English language group throughout the study. Table 5 illustrates the English language teacher's educational background and teaching experience.

Table 5

English language teacher's educational background and teaching experience

Total number of English teachers N= 1	Educational background		Teaching experience (years)	
	BA + MA	PhD	0 - 10	10 - 20
	1	-	1	-

Note. N: # of teachers

The English language class had a male teacher who held a BA in ELT and was completing his MA thesis in social sciences. At the time when this study was conducted the English teacher had 3 years of teaching experience.

The Turkish language class had two female teachers who participated in this study throughout the course. One of the TFL teachers graduated from Turkish language teaching department while another held her PhD degree in Turkish language teaching as well .

Table 6 shows the distribution of the Turkish language teachers' educational background and teaching experience.

Table 6

Distribution of the Turkish language teachers' educational background and teaching experience

Total number of Turkish teachers	Educational background		Teaching Experience (years)	
	BA	MA + PhD	0-10	10-20
N=2	1	1	1	1

Note. N: # of teachers

As shown in Table 6, two Turkish language teachers had different educational backgrounds and years of teaching experience. For the first three months of the course the teacher with 3 years of teaching experience along with learners participated in the study. Then for the last three months a teacher with 15 years of teaching experience continued teaching in the Turkish language class.

Instruments

The use of multiple methods called 'triangulation' (Webb et al., 1966, Smith 1975, and Denzin 1978) is exploited in this study in order to improve the accuracy of researcher's judgement by collecting different kinds of data on the same phenomenon. 'Triangulation' is broadly defined by Denzin (1978) as "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon"

(p. 17). As stated by Jick (1979) as far as multiple and independent measures reach the same conclusions results provide more certain portrayal of the leadership phenomenon. Therefore, one quantitative and two qualitative research instruments were applied to collect the data in this research study.

Observation

For the first part of the study as a qualitative instrument the observation technique was used and applied in order to gain more empirical data. The observation technique was conducted once a month in both English and Turkish language classes, throughout a six-month period. There were six observation sessions which lasted for one class hour (50 minutes) each time and they were conducted six times in both groups throughout the course (See Appendices A and B). The main point considered during the observation was how Turkish and English groups differed in the total time of using the coursebook during the class hour. During the observation sessions recordings were made minute by minute and then these recordings were transcribed word by word by the researcher.

Interview

In order to develop a view of how two different groups of teachers and learners regard the coursebook in general in both native and non-native language settings, unstructured exploratory face-to-face interviews were applied as one of the two qualitative research types in this study. As Oppenheim (1992) suggests, exploratory interviews contain in-depth interviews, free-style interviews and group interviews. In this research study the notion of in-depth and free-style interviews were applicable because the deeper the interview data can offer to this research study in a free-style, non-forcing atmosphere, the more possible it will be that this research study can motivate and stimulate further investigations from miscellaneous research studies in the area at a

later time (p. 65). In addition, as McDonough & McDonough (1997) state, less structured interviews are more in touch with the social world, being able to tap into everyday reality, they are clearly quite well suited to teacher research and to the ways in which teachers interact with learners, colleagues and others in their working environment, but the interviewer needs a well-developed feeling for context and some understanding of the concerns of interviewees as a starting point. Operating unstructured, exploratory, face-to-face interviews can be a very good instrument for this research study to not only support and collaborate with the questionnaire, but also gather real data, in particular from language teachers, in a sociocultural way (McDonough & McDonough, 1997).

Once a month the researcher interviewed randomly selected learners from both Turkish and English groups. The teachers as well were interviewed at the end of the course. All interview questions administered to both learners and teachers were open-ended (See Appendices C and D). Interviews consisted of some basic questions about language learning via a language coursebook.

Questionnaire

In order to receive teachers' and learners' attitudes towards the coursebooks in use a questionnaire as a quantitative research instrument was employed in the study by the researcher at the end of the course. A Material Evaluation Form for the learners and for the teachers was adapted from Jeremy Harmer (1991).

Attitude Questionnaire aimed to determine how learners and teachers in the Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre of Ankara University evaluated the coursebook they had used. The questionnaire for learners (See appendix E) consisted of 20 questions eliciting coursebook evaluation targeting effective elements in a coursebook.

The questionnaire for teachers (See Appendix F) consisted of 15 questions eliciting the personal opinions of teachers evaluating the coursebook in use.

The questionnaires asked participants to evaluate their coursebooks by indicating the degree to which they agreed with questionnaire items using 3 point Likert – type scale labelled as follows: (1) - not at all, (2)- some, and (3)- a great deal.

The rationale of applying these three instruments rather than using merely one quantitative instrument or only one or two qualitative instruments is that “surveys base themselves on the real world focus on empirical data more than theory and can produce data in a short time and the result can be obtained in a short time unlike ethnography” (Dencombe, 1998, p. 27-28). Dencombe suggests “...the face-to-face contact offers some immediate means of validating the data. The researcher can sense if she is being given false information in the face-to-face context in a way that is not possible with questionnaires” (pp. 8-9). In this research study, the benefit of using unstructured, exploratory, face-to-face interviews offers an opportunity support the insufficiency of the quantitative data gathered by way of the questionnaire.

It is to be noted that the purpose of the observation was to gain a more accurate and deeper understanding of students’ and teachers’ values, structures and conflicts from their observed actions in addition to their statements obtained from the questionnaires and interviews.

Procedure

The present study was conducted during the 2003-2004 academic year at the Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre of Ankara University in Istanbul.

This study followed the track of learning and teaching processes of two English and Turkish (as foreign languages) classes from the ‘Beginner 1’ to the ‘Intermediate 2’ level in this institution.

Throughout the 2003 – 2004 academic year an observation session was held once a month for an hour in both groups, six times in total. Moreover, interviews were held with randomly selected learners from each group throughout the course. Until the end of the course each learner was interviewed at least once throughout the study. At the end of the course an interview was held with the teachers as well. A questionnaire was also administered to both groups of learners who were 13 in total, and the teachers who were 3 in total at the end of the course.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher started to collect the data from the beginning of the English and Turkish language courses in December, in the 2003-2004 academic year. No special or specific treatment was employed by the researcher or the teachers. The English and Turkish instruction involved studying topics and units which were present in the coursebook. The coursebook used in the English classes was the *New Headway* by Liz and John Soars. The coursebook used in Turkish classes was the *Hitit* written by the 30 members of the TÖMER staff (See Appendix G). Both groups followed a certain programme and syllabus which was prepared by the course designers of the Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Centre of Ankara University in Ankara. Once a month, the researcher observed each group (Turkish and English) and interviewed the students from both groups. The students and the teachers were interviewed as well and given a questionnaire at the end of the six-month course.

Table 7 shows the data gathering procedure in both language groups throughout the course.

Table7

Data Collection Procedure in the EFL and TFL Language Groups Throughout the Course

Month	Group	
	English	Turkish
Month 1	Observation (students–teachers), 1 class hour (50 mins) Interview (students);	
Month 2	Observation (students–teachers), 1 class hour (50 mins) Interview (students);	
Month 3	Observation (students–teachers), 1 class hour (50 mins) Interview (students);	
Month 4	Observation (students–teachers), 1 class hour (50 mins) Interview (students);	
Month 5	Observation (students–teachers), 1 class hour (50 mins) Interview (students);	
Month 6	Observation (students–teachers), 1 class hour (50 mins) Interview (students-teachers), Questionnaire (students-teachers);	

Observation

The observation technique was used and applied for one class hour once a month during the six month period of the study in order to gain more empirical data.

There were six observation sessions which lasted for one class hour (50 minutes) each time and they were conducted six times in both groups throughout the course.

Interview

Unstructured exploratory face-to-face interviews were applied as one of the two qualitative research types in this study. Randomly selected learners from both groups were interviewed throughout the six-month course. During the first two months two interviews with 1 interview question were held with the students. In the following four months interviews with 2 questions were held with the learners of both groups on a monthly basis. Ten interview questions were administered to students throughout the course in total. Interviews consisted of some basic questions about language learning via a language coursebook. At the end of the course an interview with each teacher was conducted as well. The interview for teachers consisted of 7 questions, related to the coursebook efficiency and usefulness. At the end of the course all learners and teachers were interviewed.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire as a quantitative research instrument was employed in the study by the researcher at the end of the course. They were administered when the course was over. It was given to all of the learners and teachers.

Data Analysis Procedure

As a result of operating three types of research instruments in this research study, three kinds of data were gathered from the collection. Later on in the following sections, the results are presented by way of quantitative and qualitative descriptions in order to achieve the major objectives of this research study.

Observation Analysis Procedure

As a means to analyse the data from the observation the “Pattern Coding” suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) was used in this study. The researcher reduced and transformed transcripts from the observations. It was mainly on determining the amount of time of coursebook implementation. Both groups were observed and the observation sessions were transcribed. The amount of time involved in exploiting the coursebook and not exploiting the coursebook was determined by recording the time periods and measuring them. Then these results were compared to display which group spent more significant time on coursebook exploitation. Since the only item to be considered was that of ‘time’ only one code as time (tm) was formed. Due to this reason, no computerised analysis was needed to interpret the data.

Interview Analysis Procedure

To analyse open-ended interview questions the researcher transformed transcripts from interviews. Throughout the study, interviews were held, recorded, and transcribed. There was no need to place the data in a very small number of sets and themes in order to form patterns of answers since there were a very limited number of subjects which were 13 in total. Due to this fact, all of the responses of the subjects were used as transcripts in the presentation of data. Therefore no sample transcripts were drawn. All of them were used and displayed instead. After the transcription, a categorisation procedure was formulated. Three categories were formed both for teachers’ and learners’ questions. Category one was formed to examine the learners’ attitude towards the contribution of the coursebook to their foreign language learning, and it consisted of five questions. Category two was designed to observe the learner’s views on the other sources affecting their foreign language learning, and it consisted of two questions. Category three was designed to reveal the learners’ ideas on the contribution of the environment to their foreign

language learning and it consisted of three questions. Similarly, category one for teachers was formed to examine the teachers' attitude towards the contribution of the coursebook to their foreign language learning, and it consisted of four questions. Category two was designed to observe teachers' dependence on the foreign language coursebook and it consisted of two questions. Category three consisted of one question examining teachers' attitudes about being native or non native speaker of a foreign language. As a final step, according to each categorisation the present data were evaluated and interpreted as Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest.

Questionnaire Analysis Procedure

An Attitude Questionnaire for the learners consisting of questions measuring learners' attitude toward the coursebook in use was administered and then the evaluations were calculated by means of the 'Mann - Whitney U test'.

The Attitude Questionnaire for the teachers consisted of questions measuring teachers' views on the coursebook in use as well. The 'Mann Whitney U test' analysis for teachers' results of a questionnaire were not performed since there was insufficient number of language teachers in the study. For that reason, only descriptive analyses are displayed and interpreted.

RESULTS

In this section of the study, the research findings are presented in three main parts: In the first two parts, the qualitative data results obtained from the observation and interviews are presented. In the last part, the results of the attitude questionnaire which provided the quantitative data for the study are discussed in detail.

Qualitative Results

As previously mentioned two qualitative data instruments were used in this study. For the first part of the study, as a qualitative instrument, the observation technique was conducted once a month in both English and Turkish language classes, throughout a six-month period. As the second qualitative instrument, exploratory face-to-face interviews were conducted once a month in both English and Turkish language classes throughout a six-month period.

Observation

The results obtained from the observation provided support for answering the major research questions: “What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 1)” and “What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 2)” and sub-questions number one, two, three, and four: “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 1)”, “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 2)”, “How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey? (Question 3)”, and “How does being a

Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey? (Question 4)’’.

The only code used through the observation instrument was the amount of time involved in exploiting the coursebook and not exploiting the coursebook in both groups. No sub-categories were involved.

Considering the fact that each class lasted for 50 minutes in both groups, it was observed and measured that in the English language class the coursebook was the main learning and teaching tool used throughout the language course. The learners in the Turkish language class used the coursebook as well but in the sense that it was a source for syllabus application.

Table 8

The time period (duration) for the coursebook implementation in the EFL and TFL classes during one class hour (50) minutes

<i>The time the coursebook is implemented in EFL and TFL classes during one class hour (50 minutes)</i>			
	<i>Class hour</i>	<i>EFL tm</i>	<i>TFL tm</i>
<i>1st observation</i>	(50 mins)	45 mins	15 mins
<i>2nd observation</i>	(50 mins)	45 mins	20 mins
<i>3rd observation</i>	(50 mins)	45 mins	13 mins
<i>4th observation</i>	(50 mins)	45 mins	18 mins
<i>5th observation</i>	(50 mins)	45 mins	25 mins
<i>6th observation</i>	(50 mins)	45 mins	30 mins
<i>Total tm:</i>	(300 mins)	270	121

Note. The codes used: EFL tm- the time the coursebook was used in EFL class; TFL tm- the time the coursebook was used in TFL class; Total tm- the total time (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

As Table 8 illustrates, throughout the six observed classes, out of 100 % the EFL group used the coursebook for 90 %, of the class hour while the TFL group made use of the coursebook for 37.8 % of the lesson. Therefore the time that the group of non-native language learners exploited the coursebook was considerably more than in the group of native language learners. Examples of timing (of exploiting the coursebook) in both classes are indicated below.

EFL class (the EFL coursebook exploited for 45 minutes in total, throughout one class hour)

19: 05 Class begins, T hands out homework papers and chats with Ss for couple of minutes

4th minute - T and Ss work on Vocabulary activity from the workbook

10th minute - checking homework (workbook)

24th minute - fill in the blanks, activity (workbook)

28th minute - answering the questions from the text (workbook)

33rd minute - negative short forms - activity (workbook)

37th minute - answering the questions from the workbook, communicative activity

45th minute - filling in the blanks (coursebook)

TFL class (the TFL coursebook exploited for 20 minutes in total, throughout one class hour)

5th minute - T hands out homework papers to the Ss

7th minute - T and Ss start doing exercise from the coursebook

23rd minute - T and Ss start chatting in target language

30th minute - T and Ss start doing exercise from the extra material brought in the class by the teacher

46th minute T and Ss start doing exercise from the coursebook till the end of the class

In brief, the responses on the major questions one and two were obtained by the observation analysis. Accordingly, these results provided a support for H 1.

H1. The role of the foreign language coursebook is more significant in a non-native language teaching and learning setting than in a native language teaching and learning setting since it is excessively used by learners and non-native teachers. (In this case, the Turkish teachers of English will use the coursebook for a longer period of time in a class hour more than the native Turkish teachers of Turkish.)

As mentioned previously, the coursebook was used by the learners and the teachers in the non-native language setting more than by the learners and teachers in the native language setting. Therefore, the English coursebook became the main aid for the learning and teaching process in the non-native language setting.

The analysis of the observation transcripts also indicated that the way the non-native speaker teachers used the coursebook was generally different from those who were native speakers in the sense that native speaker teachers had a tendency to transfer the information to their learners without using a coursebook most of the time. Furthermore, they did not follow each and every line of the coursebook. Native speaker teachers also felt free to give any other extra information not being strictly tied to the coursebook. As a result, by the means of observation instrument the responses on the first and second, third and fourth sub-questions are provided as well. The examples are given in Table 9 and Table 10.

Table 9

A sample tapescript from the observation session of the EFL group

T: Where are they? Look at the picture on page 75. Page 75, open it...
 S1: (Murmur) Shop... where? Supermarket?
 T: Shop? Margaret is in the shop.. ' How is Mrs. McSporran? She is busy in the shop...' but they are not in the shop. We don't know.. Do we know..? Maybe Mrs. Craig .. Mrs. Craig's...
 S2: house...
 T: House, maybe ... we don't know.. OK, what is Seumas job here? What is his job here?
 S1: He is the postman..
 T: He is a postman here. Two letters he says.. two letters.. OK.. Number three...Who are the people?

 T: Now friends... this listening exercise is about... clothing,... men, hmm, don't like shopping, so they...huh?
 S3: Chewing gum... Ne?[What?]
 T: Chewing gum? Boşver... [Never mind] Look at he picture... look at the picture, how many men are there?
 S3: (murmur)

Note. The codes used: S1- student one; S2- Student two; S3- student three; T- teacher

Table 10

A sample tapescript from the observation session of the TFL group

S1: Filmin sonunu hiç beğenmedim. [I didn't like the end of the movie.]
 T: Filmin sonu... Filmin sonunu hiç beğenmedim... Üzüldün mü yoksa? Üzmek ne? Birini üzme? Üzmek ne Olga? [The end of the movie.. I didn't like the end of the movie.. Did it make you sad? What is sad? Make someone feel sad? What is make someone feel sad? Olga?]
 S2: Otobüs bekliyorum... Otobüs gelmiyor... beni üzüyor mu? [I'm waiting for the bus...The bus doesn't show up.. does it make me sad?]
 (laughter)
 T: Aaa... Sen çok duygusalsın, çok hassassın demek. Otobüs gelmiyor, ve o çok... aaa... üzüyor... ağlıyor musun peki? Bakın üzölmek, ben üzüüyorum, mutsuz olmak, üzülmek, ama üzme var bir de... üzülmek, üzme. Ben üzüüyorum, ağlıyorum, çok mutsuz oluyorum, ama üzme, ben Benen'e çok kötü şeyler söylüyorum, ha, Benen seni hiç sevmiyorum, senden nefret ediyorum, hiç çalışmıyorsun, çabuk git buradan diyorum...[Oh, so you are very emotional. The bus doesn't show up, and she, oh, feels sad. Well, are you crying too? Look, feel sad, I'm sad, I'm unhappy, feeling sad, but makeing someone feel sad, being sad, making someone feel sad. I'm sad, I'm crying, I feel so unhappy, but making someone feel sad, for instance I'm telling Benen bad things, Benen, I don't like you at all, I hate you, you don't study at all, I'm telling her to get out of here now..] (laughter)
 T: ...ve Benen çok üzüüyor, ama ben Benen'i üzüyorum. Ben üzüyorum seni Benen, ama Benen üzüüyor... [In this case Benen is sad, but I make Benen feel sad. I'm making you feel sad Benen, But Benen feels sad.]
 S3: Temizlikci kadın geçen hafta evi temizledi ama biz her yeri yine kirllettik. [Last week the cleaning women cleaned our house, but we messed up the place again.]
 S3: Tekrar, tekrar?...[Again,again?]
 T: Tekrar... tekrar...[Again,again]
 Ss: (murmur)
 T: Temizlikci kadın geçen hafta evi temizledi ama biz her yeri yine... kirllettik. Şöyle bir şey söylüyoruz biz, Türkiye'de mesela, Olga benim evime geliyor, akşam yemeği yiyoruz Olga'yla birlikte, ve ben Olga'ya diyorum ki, Olga yine gel, yine bekleriz, yine bekleriz. Bu çok söyledğimiz bir cümle, yine bekleriz, yani yine - tekrar, pratikte bunu çok söylüyoruz. [Last week the cleaning women cleaned our house, but we messed up the place again. In Turkish we use to say, for example, Olga is coming to my house, we are eating dinner together, and I'm telling 'Olga come again, come again. We use this phrase a lot in practice.]

Note. The codes used: S1- student one; S2- Student two; S3- student three; T- teacher

As shown in Table 9 and Table 10, only the native speaker teachers gave the learners a chance to depart from the main subject from time to time, and moreover, helped the learners to involve themselves in independent thinking that would stimulate some questions to acquire additional knowledge.

The non-native speaker teacher, in contrast, preferred to activate the learners' thinking process, and transferred information to them specifically on the subject so that he did not leave the main path when the question was posed. He rather strictly followed the plan of the coursebook. Thus,

the responses on the research sub-questions one, two, three, and four are provided by the observation analysis results. Accordingly, the findings provided support for H 2 and H 3.

H2. A group of learners and non-native speaker teachers that learn and teach foreign languages in a non-native language setting depend on the coursebooks more than learners and native speaker teachers that learn and teach languages in a native language setting. (In this case English language learners and English non-native speaker teachers depend on the coursebooks more than Turkish language learners and Turkish native speaker teachers in Turkey.)

H 3. Non-native language teachers in a non-native language setting necessitate a coursebook more than native language teachers in a native language setting. For that reason, non-native language teachers rely on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while native language teachers use the coursebook just as a principle. (In this case non-native EFL teacher in Turkey necessitates a coursebook more than the native TFL teacher in Turkey. For that reason, the non-native EFL language teachers relay on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while the native TFL language teachers use the coursebook just as a principle).

Interview

The aim of the interviews was to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of teachers and learners whether there had been any discrepancies between the EFL and TFL groups in terms of exploiting their coursebook. Interview provided answers for the main research questions: “What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 1)” and “What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 2)” and sub-questions number one, two, three, four, five and six: “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 1)”, “To

what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 2)”, “How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey? (Question 3)”, “How does being a Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey? (Question 4)”, “What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey? (Question 5)” and “What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey? (Question 6)”.

Six interviews in total were applied to the learners of both groups throughout the research. During the first two months two interviews with 1 question for each month were applied to the students. In the following four months interviews with 2 questions for each month were applied to the learners of both groups. Ten interview questions were administered to learners throughout the course in total (To see chronological order of the interview questions applied, see Appendices C and D). A 7 item interview was applied to the teachers at the end of the course as well. Interviews were applied in order to supply collaborative confirmation of the quantitative data from the questionnaire and the qualitative data from the observation. Each interview was applied to one, two, three or learners. Interview questions were administered to all of the three teachers. At the end of the course, all learners and teachers were interviewed.

Learners' Interviews

In order to have a better access to the obtained data the researcher generated the categories according to the interview questions. The results are provided in matrix tables.

Since there were only 13 learners from the both groups in total, the answers of all participants involved in the study were transcribed and the processed information is systematically analysed and interpreted in the next section. Due to the limited number of subjects it was possible to display all data in the study. Therefore all data are present in the form of matrix tables as in Tables 12-29. To be able to display the results of the responses of the learners categorisation was made. Three categories were formed and each category included different questions. The categories, as well as learners' interview questions are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

Categorisation of the learners' interview questions

Category I	<i>The point of view of the EFL and TFL learners about the contribution of the coursebook to the teaching/learning process.</i>
Interview questions "coursebook exploitation"	1. Can you study English- Turkish without exploiting your coursebook? 2. How important is your coursebook for you while learning a foreign language? 3. Which learning tool have you used the most for learning English-Turkish throughout the course? 4. Do you still use the coursebook intensively as you did at the beginning of the course? 5. What would the main tool be without which you would not be able to achieve the same in this course?
Category II	<i>The point of view of the EFL and TFL learners about the contribution of the other sources than the coursebook.</i>
Interview questions "other sources"	6. Can you study English- Turkish from any other source than your coursebook? 7. Have you used any other tools than the coursebook for learning English-Turkish throughout the course?
Category III	<i>The point of view of the EFL and TFL learners about the contribution of the environment to learning.</i>
Interview questions "the role of the environment"	8. Have you got any English- Turkish speaking friends in your immediate environment? 9. Where do you learn more from: your environment or your coursebook? 10. How much help have you received from your environment in learning English – Turkish?

Category I: The point of view of the EFL and TFL learners about the contribution of the coursebook to the teaching/learning process.

The first interview question in this categorization is shown in Table 12.

Table 12

The responses of the learners for the first interview question

<i>Q1: Can you study English- Turkish without exploiting your coursebook?</i>	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Çalışmıyorum...[No, I can't] S2- Yok...[No] S3- Hayır...[N]	S1- No S2- I learn from my environment a great deal, too...
N=3	N=2

Note. N: # of learners

The interviewees of the EFL group indicated that their primary learning source was the coursebook. The two interviewees from the TFL group gave different responses. One learner indicated that he could not learn the target language without the coursebook while the other learner viewed the environment as a possible source for learning as well.

The second interview question in this category aimed to distinguish the importance of the coursebook according to learners' views. Learners' responses to the second interview question are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

The responses of the learners for the second interview question

<i>Q2: How important is your coursebook for you while learning a foreign language?</i>	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Bence çok önemli..yoksa İngilizce'yi nasıl öğrenebiliriz başka türlü? [I think it is very important, otherwise we couldn't learn English?] S2- Ders kitabı önemli, ama aynı zamanda, televizyon da olmalı, daha farklı materyaller de olmalı...[Coursebook is important, but there should be TV, and other different materials as well.] S3-Tekrar yapmak için, soru çözmek, iyi oluyor...[It is good to do exercises, to revise.]	S1- I'm just moving to a new flat so I hope that there will be in flat more Turkish than now, I need practice more than I need coursebook here... S2-At the beginning of the course çok önemli [very important].. di... şimdi konuşmak, yani [now speaking, ...er...] pratik daha önemli [practise is more important.]
N=3	N=2

Note. N: # of learners

The purpose of the second interview question was to distinguish the importance of the coursebook according to the views of the learners. The EFL learners pointed out that they considered the coursebook to be a very useful tool for learning a foreign language indicating the same for a variety of valuable reasons. The coursebook was very important to the EFL learners since it was the main tool for learning inside and outside the school. According to them an insufficient environmental output made the coursebook more significant. Conversely the learners in the TFL group mentioned practice and the environmental output as major sources for learning. The third interview item in this category was applied to the learners of both groups in the sixth month of the course and was intended to find out the personal views of the learners. They were asked to self report whether they learned more from their coursebooks or their immediate environment.

The learners' responses are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

The responses of the learners for the third interview question

Q3: Which learning tool have you used the most for learning English-Turkish throughout the course?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Okulda ders kitabını, evde de gramer kitabı, genel olarak. [Generally I use my coursebook at school and my workbook at home.] S2- Coursebook-u kullandım [I used coursebook]	S1- İlk başta kitaptan çalışarak, sonra arkadaşlarımla konuşarak, yani...er... pratik yaparak en çok Türkçe öğrendim...[At the beginning I studied from my coursebook, then speaking with my friends... er... doing practice I learnt Turkish] S2- Genellikle insanlarla pratik yaparak, ve başta, başında kitaptan çalışarak Türkçe öğrendim. [Generally I spoke to people, and at the beginning I studied from my coursebook.]
N=2	N=2

Note. N: # of learners

The third interview question aimed to determine which learning source the learners of both groups used the most throughout the course. As shown in Table 14, both interviewees from the EFL group named the coursebook as the main aid for learning the foreign language throughout the course. On the other hand, two TFL interviewees indicated practice and environment as the major sources for learning a foreign language, pointing out that they used their coursebook at the beginning of the course as the main aid for learning.

The fourth interview question in this category aimed to discover whether the learners were still using their coursebooks as they used to at the beginning of the course. Table 15 demonstrates the responses for the fourth question.

Table 15

The responses of the learners for the forth interview question

Q4: Do you still use the coursebook intensively as you did at the beginning of the course?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Okuma konularında, ders kitabına genelde ihtiyacımız var ama, gramer olarak artık okadar ihtiyacımız yok, ama yine de evet...[We still need coursebook for reading passages, but for learning grammar we don't need it as we did before, but still, in general, we need it] S2- Evet, her açıdan yönlendirmesi için ders kitabına ihtiyacımız var. [Yes we still need the coursebook, It shows us the path to learning.]	S1- İlk başında kitabı çok kullandım, ama şimdi daha çok konuşarak öğreniyorum. Çünkü bence bir dil öğrenmek için konuşmak en iyi yoldur. [At the beginning of the course I used the coursebook very much, but now, practice makes me learn better. Because speaking is the best way to learn a language.] S2-Hayır, hayır, şimdi çevreden daha çok öğreniyorum.... [No, no, now I learn more from my environment.]
N=2	N=2

Note. N: # of learners

The responses of the learners from the EFL group indicated that they still needed the coursebook, practically until the end of the course, while the TFL group categorically indicated that the environment was the main source needed for learning a foreign language.

The fifth item in this category aimed to identify which tool was vital for success in learning a foreign language in both groups. The responses for the fifth item are shown in the Table 16.

Table 16

The responses of the learners for the fifth interview question

Q5: What would the main tool be without which you would not be able to achieve the same in this course?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- En başında düşünülürse, bir kitap, bir ders kitabı, o olmasaydı zaten başlangıçta öğrenme de olmazdı. [Firstly, a coursebook, otherwise we couldn't learn anything] S2- Ders kitabım. [My coursebook]	S1- Mmm, en çok çevre olmasaydı, bu kadar iyi Türkçe öğrenemezdim. [Without this environment, I wouldn't be able to learn Turkish this much at the first place.] S2-Başka bir ülkede Türkçe öğrenseydim, bu kadar örne... öğrenemezdim. [If I had just tried to learn Turkish in some other country, I wouldn't have been able to achieve the same.]
N=2	N=2

Note. N: # of learners

As indicated in Table 16, the EFL group still emphasized the importance of the coursebook whilst the learners of the TFL group indicated the environment as the main source for learning a foreign language.

Category II: The point of view of the EFL and TFL learners about the contribution of the other sources than the coursebook.

The first interview question in this category applied to the learners of both groups aimed to discover whether they could use any other materials than the coursebook as a primary source.

The responses are indicated in Table 17.

Table 17

The responses of the learners for the sixth interview question

Q6: Can you study English- Turkish from any other source than your coursebook?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Çalışmıyorum... Extra çalışabileceğimiz hiç bir şey yok...kitaba bağlıyız...[No, I can't, we don't have any other extra materials to study with.. We are tied to our coursebooks.] S2- Yok...[No] S3- Yardımcı kitapları da kullanıyorum workbook, gramer book. [I use some supplementary materials as well, such as workbook, grammar book.]	S1- I continually study from the book. S2- I have some friends, and I try to learn from them... S3-Television izliyorum [I watch TV], and I listen to music, Türkçe [Turkish] of course.. I learn from them a bit too...
N=3	N=3

Note. N: # of learners

As shown in Table 17, the EFL interviewees specified the coursebook and its supplementary materials as the only and main material in use. On the other hand, two of the three TFL interviewees pointed out that they had other available sources for learning Turkish, though one TFL interviewee indicated the coursebook to be the main tool for learning.

The second item in this category attempted to discover whether the learners used any other tools for learning a foreign language. The results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

The responses of the learners for the seventh interview question

Q7: Have you used any tools other than the coursebook for learning English-Turkish throughout the course?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Çok fazla ortam olmadı. Ders kitabı dediğim gibi birincisi, ikincisi yardımcı gramer kitapları, ve belki yabancı televizyon kanalları, internet, ama onlar da çok az... [There was not a suitable environment. As I already indicated my coursebook, than some other supplementary materials, foreign TV programmes, the internet, although not so much.] S2- Hayır kullanamadım. [No I didn't use.]	S1- Tabii kullandım. En çok TV izleyerek, gazete okuyarak insanlarla konuşmak. Daha iyi Türkçe öğreniyorum. [Sure I did. Watching TV, reading newspapers, talking to people... I learn Turkish better] S2- Gazete okuyorum, Türkçe müzik dinliyorum, ve Türk kızlarla konuşuyorum [I read newspapers, listen to Turkish music, and talk to Turkish girls!]
N=2	N=2

Note. N: # of learners

As indicated in Table 18, the EFL learners stated that they did not have any tools other than the coursebook with which to study systematically. Conversely, the learners of the TFL group stated that they used some other tools from their environment.

Category III: The point of view of the EFL and TFL learners about the contribution of the environment to learning.

The first interview question applied in this category is shown in Table 19.

Table 19

The responses of the learners of the eighth interview question

Q8: Have you got any English- Turkish speaking friends in your immediate environment?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- İngilizce konuşabileceğim arkadaşım var, Türk kendisi ama İngilizce iyi bilir, fakat, kendisiyle de az görüşebiliyorum... zaten şu anda pek konuşamıyorum. [I do have English speaking friends, my friend is actually Turkish, but speaks English very well, though, I don't see my friend so often, and I can't speak English well at the moment...] S2- Maalesef yok... [Unfortunately, there is not.] N=2	S1- My wife and my wife's friends. S2- No... S3- Yes, but all of them speak in English with me... But sometimes they say some words in Turkish... S4- I do have some Turkish friends... N=4

Note. N: # of learners

This interview question aimed to find out if both groups received the opportunity to practice their target language or not. As shown in Table 19, two EFL interviewees indicated that they had rather no chance to use their target language. On the other hand, three of four TFL interviewees indicated that they had Turkish native friends, and therefore had a greater chance to practice the target language.

The second interview question in this category which was applied to the learners of both groups asked the learners to self report whether they had learned more from their coursebooks or from their immediate environment. The responses are shown in Table 20.

Table 20

The responses of the learners of the ninth interview question

Q9: Where do you learn more from: your environment or your coursebook?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Ders kitabından...[From the coursebook.] S2- Coursebook'tan, workbooktan... sınıf dışında zor öğreniriz...[There is not much opportunity for learning outside the class] N=2	S1- From my environment! S2- I'm learning from book, usually. I'm like this.. that's my style. S3- Environment! İnsanlardan [From the people], TV, radyodan... N=3

Note. N: # of learners

According to the EFL interviewees the coursebook was a more important tool than the environment for learning English in Turkey. The same situation occurred in the TFL group with one interviewee while two other interviewees identified the environment as a main source for learning.

The third item in this categorisation aimed to see whether the learners used any other tools for learning a foreign language. The responses for the third item are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

The responses of the learners of the tenth interview question

Q10: How much help have you received from your environment in learning English – Turkish?	
EFL group	TFL group
S1- Türkiye’de İngilizce öğrenmek için, çevredeki koşullar çok fazla yardımcı değil, konuşacak biri olması gerekiyor. [There is no environmental input for English in Turkey, there should be someone to speak to outside the classroom.] S2- Pek yardımcı olmadı. [Not so helpful.] N=2	S1-Başka bir ülke, ülkede Türkçe öğrenseydim, bu kadar örne... öğrenemezdim. [If I were learning Turkish in some other country than Turkey I wouldn’t have been able to learn Turkish this much.] S2- Çok...[Very much.] N=2

Note. N: # of learners

Two EFL interviewees pointed out that they had no desired environmental input. In opposition, the learners of the TFL group indicated that they had received the required environmental input and that they had used it intensively for learning a foreign language.

Accordingly, the impact that the coursebook had on the learners of the EFL group was supported throughout the course by the interview responses received from the same group. As can be observed, the learners of the EFL group drew attention to the significance of the coursebook in their immediate, non-native setting. The learners of the TFL group designated the importance of

the coursebook as well, though, indicating the environment as the foremost source for learning in their native language setting.

In brief, the findings attained through the responses of the learners' interviews pointed out that the group of the English language learners had no other noticeable input than the coursebook and as a result they depended more on the coursebook than the Turkish language learners.

Thus, results obtained from the learner interviews provided support for answering the major research questions: one and two, and sub-questions number one, two, five, and six. As a result, the findings provided support for H 1, H 2, and H 4.

H1. The role of the foreign language coursebook is more significant in a non-native language teaching and learning setting than in a native language teaching and learning setting since it is excessively used by learners and non-native teachers. (In this case, the Turkish teachers of English will use the coursebook for a longer period of time in a class hour more than the native Turkish teachers of Turkish.)

H2. A group of learners and non-native speaker teachers that learn and teach foreign languages in a non-native language setting depend on the coursebooks more than learners and native speaker teachers that learn and teach languages in a native language setting. (In this case English language learners and non-native speaker teachers of English depend on the coursebooks more than language learners and Turkish native speaker teachers of Turkish in Turkey.)

Due to insufficient environmental output, the EFL group indicated the necessity for the language coursebooks as the main available learning and teaching tool, while the learners of the TFL group indicated that they had received the required environmental output and that they had a comprehensive opportunity to use it intensively for learning a foreign language.

H 4: *There is no desired contribution from the environment in a non-native language learning setting. Therefore, the coursebook is used as the main aid for both learning and teaching in a non-native language setting. Conversely, the fact of learning a foreign language in a native language country offers a surplus of input from the environment. (In this case the EFL group had no desired contribution from the environment. Therefore, the coursebook is used as the main aid for both learning and teaching by the EFL group in Turkey. Conversely, the TFL group participants used a surplus of input from the environment intensively for learning a foreign language.)*

Teacher interviews

In this part of the study, in order to receive the attitudes and perceptions on the coursebook exploitation, dependence on the coursebook and being native or non-native the answers of all participant teachers involved in the study were transcribed and the processed information is systematically analysed and interpreted. Since there were only 3 teachers from the both groups in total all data are displayed instead of using samples. As previously indicated three categories were formed and each category included different questions. The categories, as well as teachers' interview questions are displayed in Table 22.

Table 22

Categorisation of the teachers' interview questions

Category I	<i>The point of view of the EFL and TFL teachers about the contribution of the coursebook to the teaching/learning process.</i>
Interview questions “coursebook exploitation”	1. What is the main aid for you and your students in teaching / learning a foreign language? 2. Do you think it is necessary to use a coursebook or not? Why, why not? 3. Is the coursebook you used suitable as a self-study material? 4. Is there a teacher's book and does it provides detailed information on the language items to be taught?
Category II	<i>The point of view of the EFL and TFL teachers about their dependence on the language coursebook.</i>
Interview questions “dependence on the coursebook”	5. Do you use your coursebook all the time in the class? If not, when do you use it? 6. Can you imagine one week of systematic teaching without using the coursebook? How would it be?
Category III	<i>The point of view of the EFL and TFL teachers of being native or non- native speaker of a foreign language.</i>
Interview questions “native versus non-native”	7. Is there a teacher's book and does it provides detailed information on the language items to be taught?

As mentioned previously, a 7-item interview was applied to the teachers at the end of the course. Interviews were applied both as the collaborative confirmation of the students' interview results and to determine whether there were any differences in the attitudes of native versus non-native teachers toward a coursebook in a native versus non-native language learning/teaching setting.

Category I: The point of view of the EFL and TFL teachers about the contribution of the coursebook to the learning and teaching process.

The first item in this category aimed to determine teachers' views regarding the main tool for learning a foreign language. Table 23 indicates the responses for the first interview questions of the EFL and TFL teachers.

Table 23

The responses of the teachers of the first interview item

Q1: What is the main aid for you and your students in teaching / learning a foreign language?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Bizim yoğun bir programımız olduğu için kitaplar çok önemli, çünkü planlı bir şekilde öğretebilmek için kitaplar gerçekten önemli, bunun dışında yapabileceğimiz konuşma aktiviteleri de çok önemli, ama en önemlisi kitap. [Since our teaching programme is very intensive coursebooks are very important for us. Next to the coursebook speaking activities are important too.. but before all, the coursebook...]	- Bence en önemli araç kitaptır, öğretmenin kendisi, üçüncü olarak ta öğrenciler. [I think that the most important aid for teaching/learning is the coursebook, than the teacher, and the learner him/herself.] - İnsan ...kitaplar da çok önemli onlar için, bizim kullandığımız kitaplar, dışardan da... eğer okuldan sonra eve gittiklerinde ne yaptıklarıysa bizim kitaplarımızda ödevlerini yazıyorlar, mesela, o da önemli bir araç... [The people in the immediate environment, the coursebook is very important to them too, the books that we use, and others too. If they revise what they learned at school through their homework, than the coursebook is important.]
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

As indicated in Table 23, the EFL teacher pointed out that the main aid in the learning process for his learners was the coursebook. The other important issue was the communicative activities conducted during the class hours. Both TFL teachers confirmed this idea but they also indicated the people in the immediate environment as a very important matter in the learning process.

The second question in this category aimed to determine the importance of the language coursebooks according to teachers' views. The results are displayed in Table 24.

Table 24

The responses of the teachers of the second interview item

Q2: Do you think it is necessary to use a coursebook or not? Why, why not?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Kitap kullanmak çok gerekli, çünkü belli bir program içinde öğretmemiz gerekiyor, ders kitabı o programı sunuyor bu yüzden diyebiliriz. [It is necessary, because we follow a certain programme and the coursebook provides this program to us.]	- Evet, bence çok önemli, çünkü, öğrencilerin konuyu takip etmesi için ve kendilerinin de evde bağımsız çalışma yapabilmeleri için mutlaka ders kitabı olmalı. [Yes, I think that the coursebook is very important for the reason that learners have to follow the subject taught in the class, and to study at home, that's why the coursebook should be used) - Çünkü bir yöntem belirlemek zorundasın öğrenciye, bir yabancı dil öğretirken, o yöntemi kitabında uygulamak zorundasın, teknikler uygulamak zorundasın, dolayısıyla bir sistem içerisinde öğretmek zorundasın, onu da ancak yazılı bir kaynaktan oluşturabilirsin, o da, bu nedenle, bence ders kitabı çok gerekli, ayrıca öğrencinin sadece dinleyerek, sadece görerek değil, aynı zamanda okuyarak da bir şeyleri öğrenmesi gerekiyor, dolayısıyla kitap, bize göre en temel araçlardan biri zaten. (The coursebook is important because you have to specify a method for the learners when you teach a foreign language, you have to apply that method and the techniques, required by the coursebook, and the best way to teach is using this written source, that is why the coursebook should be used in the class. Besides, learners do not learn the language only by listening or seeing, they also need to read in order to learn, that is why we consider the coursebook as one of the most important aids for learning.
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

Both EFL and TFL teachers agreed that the coursebook was a very useful tool for following a pre-arranged programme and system in use. Further to this point, one of the TFL teachers pointed out that the coursebook was also important as the available tool for students' self study as well.

The third interview question and its results in this category are displayed in Table 25.

Table 25

The responses of the teachers for the third interview item

Q3: Is the coursebook you used suitable as a self-study material?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Ders kitabı uygun değil, yalnız çalışma kitabı uygundur, tabii ki. Zaten öğrendikleri her konuyu, pratik olarak orada tekrar ediyorlar. Ama ders kitabında tek başına öğrenci çalışarak yapamaz diye düşünüyorum. Tek başlarına şu şekilde yapılacak alıştırmaları zaten yukarıda ne şekilde yapılması gerektiğini öğrenciye veriyor, bunu uygulayabilirse öğrenci tabi ki yapabilir, ama genelde seviyesinin üstünde olduğu için, onu anlamakta zorluk çekebilir, zaten biz söylemedikçe onlar da dikkat etmiyorlar. [The coursebook is not suitable for self-study, but the workbook is. Actually they are supposed to do each topic in their workbook. On the other hand I believe that learners are not able to work from their coursebooks on their own. If the student is able to understand given instructions there is not a problem than, but the case is that the topics are usually beyond their level, so they may have some problems in understanding, anyhow, if we don't tell them to do learners don't bother doing anything by themselves.]	- Alıştırmalar ve okuma parçaları öğrencilerin yalnız çalışması açısından uygun, ama gramerleri mutlaka bir, yönlendiren biriyle, bir öğretmenle, çalışmaları gerekirdi. [Exercises and reading passages are suitable for self-study, but they certainly necessitate someone, a teacher to work with.] - Çok kolay değil öğrencilerin kitabı tek başına kullanabilmeleri. Bir öğretmene ihtiyaç duyacakları kesin, çünkü kitapta dil bilgisi yapıları da var. O dil bilgisi yapılarını öğrenciye anlatacak biri lazım. Dolayısıyla yanında mutlaka birine ihtiyaç duyuluyor. [It is not very easy for learners to use the coursebook on their own. They will surely need a teacher because there are grammar issues in the coursebook as well. There should be someone to explain this grammar points to students. Therefore they will need someone to assist their learning.]
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

The EFL teacher pointed out that the coursebook was not suitable for self-study for his learners while the workbook was. The TFL teachers were of the same opinion indicating that there should have been someone to explain and simplify the more complex and complicated points for learners in order to facilitate their learning.

The last question in this category is displayed in Table 26.

Table 26

The responses of the teachers for the fourth interview item

Q4: Is there a teacher's book and does it provides detailed information on the language items to be taught?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Öğretmen kitabı var, gayet açıklayıcı, yalnız alıştırma olarak öğretmen kitabı olarak bize fazla materyal sunmuyor... Açıklama olarak, neyi ne şekilde yapılacağı konusunda, yeterli diyebiliriz ama, alıştırma çok fazla sunmuyor. [There is a teachers' book, and it is quite clear, just there is not sufficient amount of the exercises available. It is sufficient in terms of instructions but insufficient in terms of exercise variety.]	- Hayır öğretmen kitabımız yok, hayır...[No we don't have teachers' book...] - Yok. [No.]
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

The responses on the fourth interview item in the first category illustrated that the EFL teacher made use of the teachers' book, and he only criticized the insufficient number of the exercises in the book. On the other hand, the TFL teachers had no teachers' book at all, and obviously they seemed to have no problems in maintaining the lesson.

Category II: The point of view of the EFL and TFL teachers about their dependence on the language coursebook.

The first interview question in this category aimed to discover whether the teachers used the coursebook all the time in the class or not. The responses are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

The responses of the teachers for the fifth interview item

Q5: Do you use your coursebook all the time in the class? If not, when do you use it?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Ders kitabını her zaman kullanmak zorundayız, buranın sistemiyle ilgili biraz, ama arada bir kullanmadığımız oluyor, ama çoğunlukla ders kitabı kullanıyoruz. [We have to use the coursebook all the time, it is required by school policy, but there are times when we don't use it, but generally we use the coursebook.]	- Her zaman kullanıyoruz, derslerimizin gidişatı böyle çünkü... Kendimiz sık sık ek materyaller de kullanıyoruz.[We use it all the time, our program demands so. But we often use some other materials too.] -Her an değil, hayır, zaten kitabımız da ona göre ayarlanmış bir kitap. Örneğin konuşma konusunu elbette kitaptan alabilirsiniz, ama dışardan da yararlanabilirsiniz. Kendi kendine de bir konuşma konusunu belirleyebilirsin, her an kitapla ders yapamazsın.[Not every moment, no, besides our coursebook isn't designed that way. For instance, you can use a topic from a speaking exercise, from the coursebooks or you can choose any other topic. It is impossible to use the coursebook all the time.]
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

As shown in Table 27, the EFL teacher stated that he was obliged to use the coursebook all the time while one of the TFL teachers, who was at the same time the head of the TFL department, declared that there were times when they did not use the coursebook and they had to employ some other materials in the class hour as well. The other TFL teacher agreed with the views of both the EFL and TFL teachers.

The second question in this category aimed to discover how dependent the teachers are on their language coursebooks. The results are displayed in Table 28.

Table 28

The responses of the teachers for the sixth interview item

Q6: Can you imagine one week of systematic teaching without using the coursebook? How would it be?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Aslında düşünemem, düşünürsem de, kabüs olurdu. [Actually I can't and if I imagine it would be like a night mare for me.]	- Bunu yapanlar var, tamam, olabilir, öğretmenlerin kendi planlarıyla ve işte dışardan getireceği ek materyallerle olur, ama bence sağlıklı olmaz. [There are people who do this, with their own program and other extra material it can be managed, but I wouldn't consider it as good.] -Evet, evet düşünebilirim, ama böyle düşünebilirim. Şu ana kadar edindiğim deneyimlerle şöyle düşünüyorum. Tamamen onunla ilgili. Ama kitabın faydasını çok gördüğüm için, kesinlikle kitapla birlikte ders yapmayı tercih ederim. [Yes I can imagine this, but relying on my teaching experience. It is all about that. Still since I know the advantage of using the coursebook I certainly prefer to teach with one.]
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

As a response for the sixth question, one of the TFL teachers mentioned that she could manage to teach a class without a coursebook, based on having a necessary knowledge about the target language, its culture, having needed teaching experience, and at the same time being native teacher of the target language. The other TFL teacher, with three years of teaching experience preferred using the coursebook in the class. The non-native EFL teacher stated that teaching without a coursebook in the non-native language setting would be a nightmare for him.

Category III: The point of view of the EFL and TFL teachers of being native or non- native speaker of a foreign language.

The first question in this category aimed to determine teachers' personal views about how the coursebook they used is appropriate for native and non-native speaker teachers. The responses are displayed in Table 29.

Table 29

The responses of the teachers for the seventh interview item

Q7: Is the coursebook that you used suitable for native and/or non-native speaker teachers?	
EFL teacher	TFL teachers
- Aslında ikisi de uygun diye düşünüyorum çünkü, ben mesela, kendi ana dilimi kullanan öğretmen olarak kullanıyorum, bir de bir arkadaşım var, o da yine native speaker, o da kullanıyor ve gayet rahat olduğunu söylüyor... Uygunudur. [I think that it is suitable, for example I as a non-native speaker use it, and I have a friend who is a native speaker, he uses it too and considers it as suitable as well. It is suitable.]	- Kitap hem yabancı hem de Türk öğretmenlerin öğretebilmesi için uygun, ama bence ana dil konuşucusu olmayan bir öğretmenin bu dili öğretmesi ne kadar uygundur o konuda her zaman kafamda bir soru işareti var, ama genel olarak kitap uygun...[The coursebook is suitable for both native and non-native speaker teachers, but I have always wondered how suitable it is for non-native speaker teachers' teaching, but generally the coursebook is suitable...] -Eğer öğretmen yeterince eğitim aldıysa Türkçe konusunda elbete yeterli. Çünkü içerisinde yeni bir terminoloji var, bu terminolojiyi öğretmenin çok iyi biliyor olması lazım. [If the non-native speaker teacher got sufficient education in Turkish, sure it is suitable. There is a new terminology in this coursebook and the teacher needs to know it very well in order to teach the same.]
N=1	N=2

Note. N: # of teachers

Table 29 reflects the responses of the seventh interview question for the EFL and TFL teachers. According to teachers' answers both 'New Headway' and 'Hitit' coursebooks are suitable for native and non-native speaker teachers. As for 'Hitit', the TFL teachers regarded it suitable as long as teachers who use it possess control over the target language.

Therefore as indicated, the responses of the teachers to the interview questions provided the answers for the main research questions one and two, and sub-questions number one, two, three, and four.

As a result, H 1, H 2, and H 3 are supported by the interview responses of the EFL and TFL teachers.

H1. The role of the foreign language coursebook is more significant in a non-native language teaching and learning setting than in a native language teaching and learning setting since it is excessively used by learners and non-native teachers. (In this case, the Turkish teachers of

English will use the coursebook for a longer period of time in a class hour more than the native Turkish teachers of Turkish.)

H2. A group of learners and non-native speaker teachers that learn and teach foreign languages in a non-native language setting depend on the coursebooks more than learners and native speaker teachers that learn and teach languages in a native language setting. (In this case English language learners and non-native speaker teachers of English depend on the coursebooks more than language learners and Turkish native speaker teachers of Turkish in Turkey.)

H 3. Non-native language teachers in a non-native language setting necessitate a coursebook more than native language teachers in a native language setting. For that reason, non-native language teachers rely on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while native language teachers use the coursebook just as a principle. (In this case non-native EFL teacher in Turkey necessitates a coursebook more than the native TFL teacher in Turkey. For that reason, the non-native EFL language teachers relay on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while the native TFL language teachers use the coursebook just as a principle).

Quantitative results

As mentioned before, a questionnaire was employed in the study by the researcher at the end of the course as a quantitative research instrument.

Questionnaire

The aim of the Material Evaluation Form for the EFL and TFL learners consisted of questions measuring learners' attitudes toward their coursebook in use.

As previously mentioned, the questionnaires asked participants to evaluate their coursebooks by indicating the degree to which they agreed with questionnaire items using a 3 point Likert – type scale labelled as follows: (1) - not at all, (2) - some, and (3) - a great deal.

The results of the students' and teachers' questionnaire provided responses to the main research questions: “What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 1)” and “What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 2)” as well as for sub-questions number one, two, three, four, five, and six: “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 1)”, “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey? (Question 2)”, “How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey? (Question 3)”, “How does being a Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey? (Question 4)”, “What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey? (Question 5)”, and “What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey? (Question 6)”.

Learners' questionnaire

In this part of the study descriptive analyses of students' questionnaire results are displayed and interpreted, then the 'Mann Whitney U test' analyses of learners' results of a questionnaire are presented.

Question 1 in the questionnaire aimed to determine students' views on their coursebook in use, as is shown in Table 30.

Table 30

The results for the first questionnaire item

Q1: Is the layout and design of your coursebook appropriate and attractive?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	0	4	3
TFL group	0	3	3
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As illustrated in Table 30, 57 % of the EFL group population indicated the second scale while 43 % indicated the third scale. 50 % of the TFL group population indicated the second scale while the other 50 % indicated the third scale. As a result, both groups agreed that the layout and design of the coursebook in use was appropriate and attractive.

Table 31

The results for the second questionnaire item

Q2: Are the instructions in your coursebook clear?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	2	1	4
TFL group	0	2	4
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As shown in Table 31, the learners of the EFL group had various opinions on the second question. 28 % indicated the first scale, 14 % indicated the second scale, and 57 % of the EFL group population indicated the third scale. 33 % of the TFL group population indicated the second scale, and 66 % indicated the third scale. In this way majority of the both groups agreed that the instructions in the coursebooks were clear.

Table 32

The results for the third questionnaire item

Q3: Does your coursebook provide a balance of appropriate activities?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	1	4	2
TFL group	0	2	4
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Table 32 presented the results of the third questionnaire item displaying that 14 % of the EFL group indicated the first scale, 57 % indicated the second scale, and 28 % indicated the third item. On the other hand, 33 % of the TFL group population indicated the second scale and 66.6 % indicated the third scale. Therefore, the majority of both groups agreed that the coursebooks provided a balance of appropriate activities.

Table 33

The results for the fourth questionnaire item

Q4: Does your coursebook have an appropriate balance of language skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing)?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	2	2	3
TFL group	0	3	3
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Table 33 displayed the answers for the fourth questionnaire item where 28.5 % of the EFL group population indicated the first scale, 28.5 % indicated the second scale, and 42 % indicated the third scale. 50 % of the TFL group population indicated the second scale while the other 50 % indicated the third scale. Again both groups were of the same opinion that the coursebooks had an appropriate balance of required skills.

Table 34

The results for the fifth questionnaire item

Q5: Does your coursebook support accuracy?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	0	1	6
TFL group	0	2	4
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Table 34 exhibited results of the fifth questionnaire item where 14.5 % of the EFL group indicated the second scale while 85.5 % indicated the third scale. On the same question item 33.3 % of the TFL group population indicated the second scale while the other 66.6 % indicated the third scale. Both groups agreed that the coursebooks they used supported language accuracy.

Table 35

The results for the sixth questionnaire item

Q6: Does your coursebook support fluency?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	2	4	1
TFL group	0	6	0
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

The question where the vast majority of the students had the same opinion was displayed in the Table 35.

28.5 % marked the first scale, 57.5 % marked the second scale, and 14 % of the EFL group marked the third scale. 100 % of the TFL group population marked the second scale. As a conclusion, a significant majority of both groups found that the coursebooks supported fluency to some degree, but in the sense of neither being too much nor too little.

Table 36

The results for the seventh questionnaire item

Q7: Is the target language introduced in motivating and realistic contexts in your coursebook?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	0	3	4
TFL group	0	3	3
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

The seventh questionnaire item exhibited in Table 36, presented the results of both groups revealing that 42.8 % marked the second scale, and 57 % of the EFL group population marked the third scale. Similarly, 50 % of the TFL group indicated the second scale and the other 50 % indicated the third scale. As can be observed, the majority of both groups indicated that the target language in the coursebooks was introduced in motivating and realistic contexts.

Table 37

The results for the eight questionnaire item

Q8: Does your coursebook have adequate supportive materials such as workbooks, audio/video cassettes, CDs, flashcards...etc?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	1	2	4
TFL group	0	1	5
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Table 37 showed the results of the eight questionnaire item indicating that 14 % of the EFL group marked the first scale, 28.5 % marked the second scale, and 57 % marked the third scale. Similarly, 16.6 % of the TFL group population marked the second scale and 83 % marked the third scale of the eight question. As a result, it can be stated that a clear majority considered the coursebooks as possessing adequate supportive materials.

Table 38

The results for the ninth questionnaire item

Q9: Is your coursebook suitable for self- study mode?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	4	3	0
TFL group	0	4	2
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Table 38 indicated the answers on the ninth questionnaire item. As presented, 57 % of the EFL group population indicated the first scale, and the other 42.8 % indicated the second scale. 66.6 % of the TFL group population indicated the second scale, and the other 33.3 % indicated the third scale. As a result, the participants of the both groups had various opinions about the coursebook in terms of suitability for self study. Nevertheless, the majority of the EFL learners

considered the coursebook as unsuitable for use in a self-study mode and the majority of the TFL group concluded that the coursebook was suitable for self study to some degree.

Table 39

The results for the tenth questionnaire item

Q10: Is the subject and content matters in your coursebook interesting and relevant to you?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	3	3	1
TFL group	0	4	2
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As presented in Table 39, 42.8 % of the EFL group population indicated the first scale, 42.8 % indicated the second, and 14 % indicated the third scale. For the same question 66.6 % of the TFL learners indicated the second scale, and the other 33.3 % indicated the third scale. Accordingly, the majority of both groups considered the coursebook to be interesting and relevant.

Table 40

The results for the eleventh questionnaire item

Q11: Is your coursebook an important aid for learning a foreign language?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL group	0	2	5
TFL group	0	2	4
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

The questionnaire answers for the eleventh question are indicated in Table 40. According to the displayed results 28.5 % of the EFL group marked the second scale, and 71.4 % marked the third scale. In a similar manner 33.3 % of the TFL group population marked the second scale while

66.6 % marked the third scale. Therefore, it can be stated that a vast majority of both groups indicated that the coursebook was an important aid for learning a foreign language.

Table 41

The results for the twelfth questionnaire item

Q12: Does your coursebook provide necessary information about target language culture?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	2	4	1
TFL group	0	4	2
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Another important point considered in the questionnaire for students was reflected in the form of the twelfth question demonstrated together with the results in Table 41.

28.5 % of the EFL group participants marked the first scale, 57 % marked the second scale, and 14 % marked the third scale. 66.6 % of the TFL group population marked the second scale, and the 33.3 % marked the third scale. As a result, learners from the both groups identified the coursebook as supportive to some degree in terms of providing necessary information about the target language culture.

Table 42

The results for the thirteenth questionnaire item

Q13: Does your coursebook provide necessary information about social roles in target language culture?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	0	5	2
TFL group	0	4	2
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

Table 42 demonstrated the thirteenth question and its result. 71.4 % of the EFL group participants marked the second scale, and the other 28.5 % marked the third scale. Similarly, 66.6 % of the TFL group participants indicated the second scale, and the other 33.3 % indicated the third scale. Again, the majority of the students from both groups agreed that the coursebooks provided necessary information about social roles in target language culture to some degree.

Table 43

The results of the fourteenth questionnaire item for students

Q14: To what extent has your reading skill been improved as a result of using this coursebook?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	0	3	4
TFL group	0	1	5
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As shown in Table 43, 42.8 % of the EFL group participants marked the second scale, the other 57 % marked the third scale. On the other hand, 16.6 % of TFL group participants marked the second scale while 83.3 % marked the third scale. As a result, the majority of participants in both groups indicated that the coursebooks assisted them in improving their reading skill throughout the language course.

Table 44

The results for the fifteenth questionnaire item

Q15: To what extent has your vocabulary range increased as a result of using this coursebook?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	0	2	5
TFL group	0	2	4
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As displayed in Table 44, 28.5 % of the EFL group participants marked the second scale while the rest of 71.4 % marked the third scale. Similarly, 33.3 % of the TFL group participants marked the second scale, and the other 66.6 % marked the third scale. As a result, the majority conceded that the coursebooks helped their vocabulary range increase during their course.

Table 45

The results for the sixteenth questionnaire item

Q16: To what extent has your writing skill increased as a result of using this coursebook?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	0	3	4
TFL group	0	1	5
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As shown in Table 45, 42.8 % of the EFL group participants pointed out the second scale, and 57 % pointed out the third scale as their answer to the sixteenth question in the questionnaire. For the same question 16.6 % of the TFL group participants pointed out the second scale, and 83.3 % pointed out the third scale as their answer to the same question. Consequently, the majority indicated that their writing skill increased as a result of using their coursebooks throughout the course.

Table 46

The results for the seventeenth questionnaire item

Q17: To what extent has your listening ability increased as a result of using this coursebook?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	1	3	3
TFL group	3	2	1
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As to the question of whether learners' listening ability increased as a result of using the coursebooks throughout the course, Table 46 reveals that 14 % of the EFL group participants marked the first scale, 42.8 % marked the second scale and 42.8 % marked the third scale. Conversely, 50 % of the TFL group population marked the first scale, 33.3 % marked the second scale, and 16.6 % marked the third scale. Consequently, the EFL learners found the coursebook in use very helpful, though the majority of the TFL learners gave an opposing answer.

Table 47

The results for the eighteenth questionnaire item

Q18: To what extent has your comprehension skill increased as a result of using this coursebook?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	1	3	3
TFL group	2	3	1
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As pointed out in Table 47, 14 % of the EFL group population indicated the first scale, 42.8 % indicated the second scale and 42.8 % indicated the third scale. In opposition, 33.3 % of the TFL group population indicated the first scale, 50 % indicated the second scale, and 16.6 % indicated the third scale. As a result, the majority of EFL learners indicated that they used the advantage of their coursebook in order to extend their comprehension skill. Conversely, the majority of TFL learners indicated that they used their coursebooks on a somewhat to negligible range.

Table 48

The results for the nineteenth questionnaire item

Q19: How often you had a chance to use language presented in your coursebook (in your daily life)?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	5	2	0
TFL group	0	1	5
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

As displayed in Table 48, 71.4 % of the EFL group participants marked the first scale, and 28.5 % marked the second scale. On the other hand, 16.6 % of the TFL group participants marked the second scale, and 83.3 % marked the third scale. Therefore, according to the results obtained from the questionnaire the EFL learners indicated that they had no noteworthy chance to use the language presented in their coursebook in their daily life. In contrast, the TFL group had the advantage of using the language presented in their coursebook a great deal.

Table 49

The results for the twentieth questionnaire item

Q20: Could you have achieved the same in this course if you had not used this coursebook?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL group	6	1	0
TFL group	1	1	4
TN	13		

Note. TN: # of learners in total

The most significant questionnaire item is displayed in Table 49. 85.7 % of the EFL group population indicated the first scale, and 14.3 % indicated the second scale. On the contrary, 14 % of the TFL group participants indicated the first scale, 14 % indicated the second scale, and 66 %

indicated the third scale. According to the responses of the majority of the EFL group, learners could not achieve the same success if the coursebook had not been used. On the contrary, the majority of the TFL group learners stated that they could have achieved the same if they had not used the coursebook.

To summarise, the questionnaire results indicated that the EFL group learners evaluated the Attitude Questionnaire in the following order: out of 100 % they rated scale one for 25.5 %, scale two for 39.5 %, and scale three for 38 %. Looking at the percentage in total the most frequent scales marked were those of scale two and the scale three. Therefore, according to the 3-point Likert scale the EFL group learners considered the coursebook as appropriate for them.

Equally, the TFL learners evaluated the Material Evaluation Form in the following order: out of 100 % they rated scale one for 5 %, scale two for 43 % and finally, scale three for 52 %. Evidently, according to the 3-point Likert scale the TFL group learners considered the coursebook appropriate for them to a great extent.

In the following section the results of an Attitude Questionnaire given to the learners of the both EFL and TFL language groups were presented on the question basis and organised under thematic subtitles. The 'Mann-Whitney U test' analysis employed in this study aimed to reveal the differences between two independent groups on a continuous measure in order to distinguish whether the ranks of the two groups differ significantly (Pallant, 2003).

The 'Mann-Whitney U test' program reports the p-value based on the z approximation. Since the sample sizes for both groups are 13 in total, the point that should be looked up in the output is a significance level which is given as Asymp.Sig (2 tailed). If the probability value (p) is not less than or equal to .05 the result is not significant.

Table 50 reveals the results of the attitudes of the EFL and TFL learners toward English and Turkish language coursebooks.

Table 50

Attitudes of the EFL and TFL learners of both English and Turkish language coursebooks

<i>Questions</i>	<i>TN of students</i>	<i>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) [p]</i>
<i>Q1</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.805</i>
<i>Q2</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.511</i>
<i>Q3</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.153</i>
<i>Q4</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.485</i>
<i>Q5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.435</i>
<i>Q6</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>1.000</i>
<i>Q7</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.805</i>
<i>Q8</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.291</i>
<i>Q9</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.018</i>
<i>Q10</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.116</i>
<i>Q11</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.859</i>
<i>Q12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.189</i>
<i>Q13</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.859</i>
<i>Q14</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.327</i>
<i>Q15</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.859</i>
<i>Q16</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.151</i>
<i>Q17</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.173</i>
<i>Q18</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.282</i>
<i>Q19</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.002</i>
<i>Q20</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>.009</i>

Note: p=.050 or p<.050 the result is significant

According to the Mann-Whitney U test analysis the results of questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in responses between the two groups.

The main divergences between the two groups specified through the questionnaire results were distinguished in questions 9, 19, and 20.

In the ninth question the EFL learners specified that they did not consider the coursebook suitable for self-study whilst the TFL language learners pointed out the opposite. The reason for the differing result of this question can be the English learners' insufficient environmental input causing at the same time a lack of confidence.

Another question that differed in answers between the two groups occurred in the nineteenth question. The TFL language learners pointed out that they had a chance to use language presented in their coursebooks quite often whereas English language learners indicated the reverse.

The last question with a significantly differing result was the twentieth question. The EFL learners indicated that they would not be able to achieve the same in this course if they had not used the coursebook. In contrast to the EFL group the TFL group responded that they certainly would be able to achieve the same if they had not used the coursebook.

Therefore, the attitudes toward English and Turkish language coursebooks between the EFL and TFL learners' questionnaire results provided answers to the main research questions, as well as for sub-questions number one, two, five, and six. Accordingly, H 1, H 2, and H 4 are supported by the learners' questionnaire results.

H1. The role of the foreign language coursebook is more significant in a non-native language teaching and learning setting than in a native language teaching and learning setting since it is

excessively used by learners and non-native teachers. (In this case, the Turkish teachers of English will use the coursebook for a longer period of time in a class hour more than the native Turkish teachers of Turkish.)

H2. A group of learners and non-native speaker teachers that learn and teach foreign languages in a non-native language setting depend on the coursebooks more than learners and native speaker teachers that learn and teach languages in a native language setting. (In this case English language learners and non-native speaker teachers of English depend on the coursebooks more than language learners and Turkish native speaker teachers of Turkish in Turkey.)

H 4: There is no desired contribution from the environment in a non-native language learning setting. Therefore, the coursebook is used as the main aid for both learning and teaching in a non-native language setting. Conversely, the fact of learning a foreign language in a native language country offers a surplus of input from the environment. (In this case the EFL group had no desired contribution from the environment. Therefore, the coursebook is used as the main aid for both learning and teaching by the EFL group in Turkey. Conversely, the TFL group participants used a surplus of input from the environment intensively for learning a foreign language.)

Teachers' questionnaire

The 'Mann Whitney U test' analyses for teachers' results of a questionnaire were not performed since there was insufficient number of language teachers in the study. For that reason, only descriptive analyses are displayed and interpreted. The aim of an Attitude Questionnaire for teachers consisted of questions measuring teachers' views toward the coursebook in use between EFL and TFL group teachers.

Table 51 displays the results for the first questionnaire item.

Table 51

The results for the first questionnaire item

<i>Q1: Is the layout and design of the coursebook you used appropriate for your students?</i>			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
<i>EFL teacher</i>	0	1	0
<i>TFL teachers</i>	0	1	1
<i>TN</i>	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

As presented in Table 51, the EFL and TFL teachers evaluated the first question according to their personal views. The EFL teacher considered the layout and design of the coursebook as appropriate to some degree for his learners. The TFL teachers' responses fluctuated between appropriate to some degree and appropriate for a great deal for their learners. As can be observed teachers from both groups evaluated the coursebooks in a similar manner.

Table 52

The results for the second questionnaire item

<i>Q2: Does the coursebook you used provide a balance of activities that is appropriate for your students?</i>			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
<i>EFL teacher</i>	0	0	1
<i>TFL teachers</i>	0	1	1
<i>TN</i>	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

Table 52 aimed to reveal the views of the teachers on the second question. The EFL teacher indicated that the coursebook provides a balance of activities that were appropriate for his

learners. Similarly, the TFL teachers considered the coursebook as a tool that provides a balance of activities appropriate for their learners, as well.

Table 53

The result for the third questionnaire item

Q3: Does the coursebook you used provide enough comprehensible input for your students?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
<i>EFL teacher</i>	1	0	0
<i>TFL teachers</i>	0	0	2
<i>TN</i>	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

Table 53 represented the answers for the third questionnaire item for teachers. The EFL teacher pointed out that the coursebook does not provided enough comprehensible input for his learners. Both TFL teachers on the other hand stated that the coursebook they used provided enough comprehensible input for their learners.

Table 54

The results for the forth questionnaire item

Q4: Is there a sufficient amount of communicative output in the coursebook you used?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
<i>EFL teacher</i>	1	0	0
<i>TFL teachers</i>	0	1	1
<i>TN</i>	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

Table 54 aimed to reveal teachers' answers for the fourth question. The EFL teacher signalled that the coursebook his learners used provided an insufficient amount of communicative output.

Conversely, the TFL teachers indicated that the coursebook their learners used provides a sufficient amount of communicative output.

Table 55

The results for the fifth questionnaire item

Q5: Is target language taught in motivating and realistic contexts in the coursebook you used?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	1	0
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

Table 55 indicated the answers for the fifth questionnaire item. According to the displayed results the EFL teacher considered the coursebook to be motivating and realistic to some degree. The TFL teachers considered the coursebook as motivating and realistic.

Table 56

The results for the sixth questionnaire item

Q6: Where the coursebook encourages practice, does it motivate your students?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	1	0
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

According to the results displayed in Table 56, the EFL teacher evaluated the coursebook he and his learners used as motivating to some extent, while the TFL teachers considered the coursebook as motivating.

Table 57

The results for the seventh questionnaire item

Q7: Does the coursebook include and practice the skills your students need?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	1	0
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

Table 57 displayed the responses of the seventh questionnaire item. Again, the EFL teacher considered the coursebook as sufficient to some degree in terms of providing the skills that learners would need. The TFL teachers considered the coursebook as a sufficient in terms of providing the skills that learners need.

Table 58

The results for the eighth questionnaire item

Q8: Is the language used in the coursebook realistic?			
<i>Possible answers:</i>	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	0	1
TFL teachers	0	0	2
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

As indicated in Table 58, both EFL and TFL teachers agreed that the language displayed in the coursebooks was realistic.

Table 59

The results for the ninth questionnaire item

Q9: Is the language used in the coursebook at the right level for your students?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	0	1
TFL teachers	0	0	2
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

Table 59 exhibited the ninth question where both the EFL teacher and the TFL teachers agreed that the language used in coursebooks is at the right level for their students.

Table 60

The results for the tenth questionnaire item

Q10: Is the language used in the coursebook the right type of language for your students?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	1	0
TFL teachers	0	0	2
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

As displayed in Table 60, the EFL teacher considered the coursebook appropriate in providing the right type of language to some degree for his learners. Both TFL teachers considered the coursebook appropriate in type for their learners.

Table 61

The results for the eleventh questionnaire item

Q11: Is the progression of 'new' language appropriate for your students in the coursebook you used?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	1	0	0
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

As displayed in Table 61, the EFL teacher considered the progression of the language in the coursebook as not being appropriate at all. Conversely, the TFL teachers considered the progression of new language in the coursebook appropriate.

Table 62

The results for the twelfth questionnaire item

Q12: Is the subject and content of the coursebook you used relevant and interesting to your students?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	1	0
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

As indicated in Table 62, the EFL teacher considered the subject and the content of the coursebook relevant and interesting to his students to some degree. The TFL teachers considered their coursebook to be relevant and interesting.

Table 63

The results for the thirteenth questionnaire item

Q13: Does the coursebook you used contain clear guidance for the teacher about how they can be used to the best advantage (for example in a teacher's book)?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	0	1
TFL teachers	2	0	0
TN	3		

Note. TN: # of teachers in total

As for the thirteenth question indicated in Table 63 , the EFL teacher regarded the coursebook and the teachers' book as clear in guidance. On the other hand, the TFL teachers regarded the coursebook and the teacher's book as not being clear in guidance.

Table 64

The results for the fourteenth questionnaire item

Q14: Is the coursebook you used clearly written, and are the objectives clearly stated for both students and teacher?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	0	1
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: total number of the teachers

The fourteenth item questioned the clarity of the objectives in the coursebook, as displayed in Table 64. The EFL teacher regarded the coursebook in terms of the clarity of the objectives as appropriate. The two TFL also teachers considered the clarity of the objectives to be appropriate as well.

Table 65

The results for the fifteenth questionnaire item

Q15: Does the coursebook you used provide necessary information about target language culture for your students?			
Possible answers:	1	2	3
EFL teacher	0	1	0
TFL teachers	0	1	1
TN	3		

Note. TN: total number of the teachers

As shown in Table 65, the EFL teacher indicated that the coursebook provided necessary information about the target language culture for his students in some degree. The TFL teachers indicated that the coursebook provided necessary information about the target language culture for their students.

To summarise, the results indicated that the EFL teacher evaluated an Attitude Questionnaire in the following order: out of 100 % he rated scale one for 20 %, scale two for 46.6 %, and scale three for 33.3 %. Considering the percentage in total, the most frequent scale marked by the EFL teacher was scale two. Therefore, according to the 3-point Likert scale the EFL teacher considered the coursebook as appropriate for him and his learners.

On the other hand, the TFL teachers evaluated an Attitude Questionnaire in the following order: out of 100 % they rated the scale one for 6.6 %, scale two for 33.4 % and finally, scale three for 60%. Evidently, according to the 3-point Likert scale the TFL teachers considered the coursebook appropriate for themselves and their learners for a great deal.

It should be mentioned that the coursebook pack the TFL teachers used did not contain the teachers' book. Nonetheless, they established that they were highly satisfied with the coursebook they had used.

Thus, teachers' questionnaire results provided answers to the research sub-questions three and four. Accordingly, the findings provided support to the H 3.

H 3. Non-native language teachers in a non-native language setting necessitate a coursebook more than native language teachers in a native language setting. For that reason, non-native language teachers rely on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while native language teachers use the coursebook just as a principle. (In this case non-native EFL teacher in Turkey necessitates a coursebook more than the native TFL teacher in Turkey. For that reason, the non-native EFL language teachers relay on the coursebook and use it thoroughly while the native TFL language teachers use the coursebook just as a principle).

All in all, according to the qualitative as well as to the quantitative results, students and teachers stated that the coursebook was used more extensively by the learners and the teachers in a non-native language setting, in this case English language learners and teachers. However, in a native language setting, for Turkish language learners and teachers the coursebook was important, but not the only aid for learning and teaching in a native language setting.

Furthermore, the group of learners and non-native teachers that learn/teach languages in a non-native language setting (English language group) indicated that they needed coursebooks more than learners and native teachers that learn/teach languages in a native language setting (Turkish language group).

The EFL learners and teachers stated that they did not receive a desired contribution from their immediate environment a non-native language setting. Therefore, the coursebook was used as

the main aid for both teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey. The fact of learning a foreign language in a native language country offers a surplus of input from the environment should be acknowledged.

As previously stated, learners, teachers, and materials are three primary components of the foreign language instruction. In the process of learning and teaching while learners are considered to be the focus of attention, materials are supportive of sound instruction. It has been observed, that they often control the instruction process. Therefore teachers and students tend to rely heavily on them.

To summarize, both qualitative and quantitative analyses show that the learners and the teachers in a non-native language setting benefited mainly from the coursebook. On the other hand, the learners in a native language setting benefited mainly from the environment and the teachers in a native language setting benefited mainly from their teaching experience and sufficient language knowledge.

Generally speaking, these finding suggest that the coursebook is a main learning and teaching tool in a non-native language setting and requires more careful consideration by syllabus designers, and coursebook writers while using and designing coursebooks considering the significance of the environment in implementation.

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS AND THE CONCLUSION

This study aimed to explore the role of foreign language coursebooks and the degree to which they influence teaching and learning foreign languages in a native and non-native language settings in Turkey.

To this end, the study aimed to investigate the way in which native versus non-native speaker teachers and foreign language learners in a native and non-native language setting depend on a given language coursebook.

This study also attempted to explore the attitudes of teachers, the way in which being a native as opposed to a non-native speaker affects them while using a particular language coursebook and conducting foreign language instruction.

Finally, the study aimed to determine the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning a foreign language in a native versus non native language setting.

The results indicated that the foreign language coursebook had a more significant role in the learning process for the EFL group than the TFL group. The former was exploited as the main means of learning more extensively by the learners and the non-native speaker teachers in the non-native language setting than by those who were in the native language setting. In particular, the analysis of the observation sessions, interview results and questionnaire results provided answers to two major research questions: “What is the role of the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?” and “What is the role of the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?” and sub-questions

number one, two, three, four, five and six: “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the English coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?”, “To what extent do teachers and learners depend on the Turkish coursebook as a foreign language teaching and learning material in Turkey?”, “How does being a non-native English speaker affect Turkish teachers while using the English coursebook and giving English language instruction in English classes in Turkey?”, “How does being a Turkish native speaker affect teachers while using the Turkish coursebook and giving Turkish language instruction in Turkish classes in Turkey?”, “What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Turkey?” and “What is the importance of the relationship between the environment and the coursebook while teaching and learning Turkish as a foreign language in Turkey?”.

All the results indicated that the coursebook was the main tool used for learning and teaching in the EFL group. According to the observation analysis, the EFL group used the coursebook most of the time during the course while the TFL group made less use of the coursebook than the EFL group. Therefore the amount of time that the non-native language group devoted to usage of the coursebook was considerably greater than that of the native language group.

The results of this study revealed that the role of the foreign language coursebook was more significant in the non-native language teaching and learning setting than that of the native language teaching and learning setting. The fact that the foreign language coursebook was more significant in the non-native language teaching and learning setting is demonstrated by the way in which learners and non-native teachers made extensive use of the coursebook.

The results of this study also indicated that the group of learners and non-native speaker teachers in their non-native language setting required language coursebooks more than the learners and

native speaker teachers in their native language setting. As can be observed, the EFL group learners drew attention to the significance of the coursebook in their immediate and non-native language setting. The TFL group learners asserted the importance of the coursebook as well, though, indicating environmental input as the foremost source for learning in their native language setting. Findings attained through learners' interview responses pointed out that the English language learning group had no other noticeable input than the coursebook and therefore they depended more on the coursebook than the Turkish language learners in question.

Another finding obtained from all three research instruments is that non-native language teachers in their non-native language setting depended on the coursebook more than the native language teachers in their native language setting. Consequently, the non-native language teachers relied greatly on the coursebook and used it thoroughly while the native language teachers used the coursebook in a supportive manner.

The last finding obtained in this study determined that there was no desired contribution from the environment, in this case, in Turkey. Hence, the language coursebook was used as the main aid for both learning and teaching in the non-native language setting. Conversely, the process of learning a foreign language in its native country offers a surplus of input from the environment and accordingly, the native language setting group indicated that throughout their learning process they benefited from the environment a great deal. As indicated by the attitude questionnaire results, the learners of the TFL group pointed out that they had a chance to use language presented in their coursebooks quite often whereas English language learners indicated the reverse. The TFL learners also indicated that they would be able to achieve the same progress in this course if they had not used the coursebook. In contrast to the TFL group the EFL group responded that they certainly would not have been able to achieve the same progress if they had

not used the coursebook. In terms of contribution of the environment to learning, both the questionnaire and interview results revealed that there was no desired contribution from the environment in a non-native setting. Therefore the coursebooks were used as the main aid for both learning and teaching in the non-native language setting. For that reason, the non-native language setting demanded adequately prepared language coursebooks since they were the primary material for learning a foreign language.

To summarize, both qualitative and quantitative analyses revealed that the foreign learners and teachers in a non-native language setting benefited only from the coursebook. On the other hand, the learners in the native language setting benefited considerably from the coursebook as well as from the environmental output throughout, especially in the second half of the course.

Therefore, a corpus of evidence was collated for the purposes of testing all four research hypotheses, and the responses to all research questions and sub-questions were supplied through the course of this study.

In a general sense, these findings suggest that the coursebook was the main learning and teaching tool in a non-native language setting and therefore the design and preparation of such coursebooks merits more careful consideration. Indeed, the results of this study may provide insights for teachers and learners, syllabus designers, and coursebook writers while engaged in the design and use of coursebooks especially with regard to the significance of the environment where the coursebook is in use.

Implications for further research

As previously mentioned, there are relatively few research studies concerning the role of the coursebook in a native and non-native language setting. Based on the study of the two group learner populations, it is considered possible to identify important tendencies within these

populations. The fact that a relatively small number of learners was analysed in the study does not permit the claim that the results of these analyses are statistically valid. As pointed out earlier, the findings summarised above represent a set of observations, interviews and questionnaires results concerning general tendencies amongst the two populations. They may serve as the basis for implementing new teaching approaches to the usage of the coursebook in a non native language setting of English that place more emphasis on aspects of real life than most established coursebooks.

However, if the methodology outlined and applied in this thesis were to be implemented on a much larger scale in various non-native and native language settings as a research project, it could provide the basis for statistically valid research on how to improve coursebooks in a non-native language setting. Furthermore, it could also provide a means for developing improved and possibly more realistic teaching materials based on natural corpus data that can be adapted to the level of specific groups or nationalities of students and teachers.

As is the case with most comparative studies in the field, it is difficult to assert any definitive or universally-relevant insight stemming from this research due to the rather limited number of learners and teachers involved in the study. Further research involving a greater number of EFL learners and teachers in a non-native language setting versus the TFL (or any other language) learners and teachers in a native language setting may yield further and more precise information about the probable effects of coursebooks on the teaching and learning processes.

REFERENCES

Books

- Allwright, R. L. (1990). What do we want teaching materials for? In Rossner, R. & Bolitho, R. (Eds.), Currents in language teaching (pp. 110-125). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Asher, J. (1982). Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guide book. Los Gatos, Calif: Sky Oaks Productions, Inc.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). The Dialogic Imagination. Ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Braine, G. (1998). Non-native educators in English language teaching. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (1993). Principles of language learning and teaching. USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). The elements of language curriculum. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Byram, M. (1991). Mediating languages and cultures. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. and Fleming, M. (1998). Language learning in intercultural perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). English as a global language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1984). Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching materials. Heineman Books Ltd.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). Choosing your coursebook. Bath: Hainemann.
- Crowley, T. (1989). Standard English and the politics of language. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Davies, A. (1991). The native speaker in applied linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

- Davies, A. (1996). Proficiency or the native speaker: what are we trying to achieve in ELT? In G. Cook, & Seidlhofer, B. (Eds.), Principle and practice in applied linguistics (pp. 145-157). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dencombe, M. (1998). The good research guide for small-scale social research projects. Philadelphia: Open University Press McGraw-Hill Education.
- Denzin, N. (1978). The research act. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Dubin, F and Olshtain, E. (1986). Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dubin, F. and Olshtain, E. (1987). Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Edge, J. (1998). Essentials of English language teaching. London: Longman.
- Edge, J. and S. Wharton (1998). Materials development in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ersoz, A. (1990). Coursebook analysis and design for ELT in Turkish state schools. Unpublished PhD. Ankara: Gazi University.
- Finocchiaro, M. and Brumfit, C. (1983). The functional – notional approach: From theory to practice. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gategno, C. (1972). Teaching foreign languages at schools: The silent way. New York: Educational Solutions, Inc.
- Grant, N. (1989). Making the most of your textbook. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (1999). Trumpet voluntary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching. London: Longman.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). A history of English language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jick, T. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. London: SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, K. R. (1989). The second language curriculum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kelly, L. G. (1969). Centuries of language teaching. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram, & M. Fleming, (Eds.), Language learning in intercultural perspective (pp.61-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). Context and culture in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Littlejohn, A. (1998). The analysis of teaching materials: inside the Trojan Horse. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), Materials development in language teaching (pp. 56-73). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlejohn, A. and Windeatt, S. (1989). Beyond language learning: Perspective on materials design. In R. K. Johnson (ed.), The second language curriculum (pp. 46-59). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lozanov, G. and Gateva, E. (1988). The foreign language teacher's suggestopedic manual. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Mahwah, N. J. L. (1999). In G. Braine (ed.), Non-native educators in English language teaching (pp.32- 51). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Maley, A. (1998). Squaring the circle - reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), Materials development in language teaching (pp. 279-294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Masuhara, H. (1998). Materials development in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McArthur, T. (1992). Oxford companion to the English language. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (1993). In ELT: A teacher's guide. London: Blackwell.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milroy, J. and Milroy, L. (1991). Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Nunan, D. (1988). Syllabus design. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement. London: Pinter Publishers Ltd.
- Pavel, M. (1999). American Indians and Alaska natives in higher education. In K. Swisher and J. Tippeconnic (Eds.), Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education (pp.133-152). Charleston, WV: ERIC, Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Pekkan, G. (1997). Evaluation and selection, adaptation and development. Istanbul: Sürat English language teaching.
- Paikeday, T. (1985). The native speaker is dead. Toronto: Paikeday Publishing Inc.
- Pallant, J. (2001). SPSS survival manual. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prator, C. H. and Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). An outline of language teaching approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia, and L. McIntosh (Eds.), Teaching English as a second or foreign language (pp.187-212). New York: Newbury House.
- Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (1986). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, S. and Rodgers, T. (1997). Approaches and methods in ELT teaching. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (1997). Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). Beyond training. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A. and Kroskrity, P. (1998). Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1987). ELT textbooks and materials: problems in evaluation and development. London: Modern English Publications.
- Smith, H. W. (1975). Strategies of social research: The methodological imagination. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Stern, H. (1983). Fundamental conceptions of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stern, H. (1992). Issues and options in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swisher, K., & Tippeconnic, T. (1999). Research to support improved practice in Indian education. In K. Swisher & J. Tippeconnic (Eds.), Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education (pp. 302-329). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Tomalin, B., & Stempleski, S. (1993). Cultural awareness. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development. Great Britain: Eastern Press.
- Ur, P. (1996). A course in language teaching: Practice & theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valdes, J. (ed.) (1986). Culture Bound. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valdes, J. (1990). Culture and the language classroom. Hong Kong: Modern English Publications and the British Council.
- Van Ek, J. and Alexander, L. (1975). Threshold level English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Webb, E. J. , Campbell, T. D., Schwartz, R. D. and Sechrest, B. (1966). Unobtrusive measures: Non reactive research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). Aspects of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1964). The psychologist and the foreign language teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). Linguistics in language teaching. London: Arnold.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1976). Notional syllabuses. London: Oxford University Press.
- Woodward, T. (2001). Planning lessons and courses. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Articles

Allwright, R. L. (1982). What do we want teaching materials for? ELT Journal, 36, 131-147.

Ansary, H. and Babaii, E. (2002). Universal Characteristics of EFL/ESL Textbooks: A Step Towards Systematic Textbook Evaluation. The Internet TESL Journal, 4, 17-28.

Brumfit, C. J. (1980). Seven last slogans. Modern Language Journal, 7/1, 30-31.

Byram, M. (1986). Cultural studies in foreign language teaching. Language Teaching, 19/4, 322-336.

Cook, V. J. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 33/2, 185-209.

Cook, V. J. (1997). Monolingual bias in second language acquisition research. Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 34, 35-50.

Darian, D. (2001). Adapting authentic materials for language teaching. English Teaching Forum, 6, 2-5.

Ekmekçi F. Ö. and İnal, N. (1994). Discrepancies between native and non-native speaker trainers. TOMER Language Journal, 23, 32-41.

Elis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. ELT Journal, 51/1, 36-43.

Harmer, J. (1991). Taming the big "I": Teacher performance and student satisfaction. ELT Journal, 49/4, 337-345.

Harwood, N. (2002). Taking a lexical approach to teaching: principles & problems. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12/2, 139-155.

Hutchinson, T. and E. Torres (1994). The textbook as agent of change. ELT Journal, 48/4, 315-328.

Jiang, W. (2000). The relationship between culture and language. ELT Journal, 54/4, 328-334.

Jumaily, S.A. (2005). Choosing my coursebook for multilevel class. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciencies, 2, 22-34.

Kim, D., and Hall, J. K. (2002). The role of an interactive book reading program in the development of second language pragmatic competence. Modern Language Journal, 86, 332-348.

Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the non-native speaker. PMLA 112/3, 359-369.

Lazaraton, A. (2003). Incidental displays of cultural knowledge in the non-native English-speaking teacher's classroom. TESOL Quarterly 37/2, 213-247.

Lee McKay, S. (2000). Teaching English as an international language: Implications for cultural materials in the classroom. TESOL Journal, 14/3, 7-11.

Lee, J. J. (2005). The native speaker: An achievable model? Asian EFL Journal, 7/2, 7-19.

Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking professionals in TESOL. Tesol Quarterly 33/1, 85-103.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? ELT Journal, 46/4, 340-349.

Nixon, U. (1995). Developing appropriate materials. The Vietnam Project, 33, 3-9.

Oka, H. (2003). A non-native approach to ELT: Universal or Asian? Asian EFL Journal, 6, 1-7.

O'Neill, R. (1982). Why use textbooks. ELT Journal 36/2, 104-111.

Prodromou, L. (1996). Correspondence. ELT Journal 50/1, 88-89.

Rampton, M.B.H. (1990). Displacing the "native speaker": expertise, affiliation and inheritance. ELT Journal, 44/2, 338-343.

Tang, C. (1997). On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. TESOL Quarterly, 31/3, 577-580.

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view, ELT Journal 56/3: 240-249.

Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. ELT Journal, 37/3, 251-255.

Online resources

Bolt, R. (2000). The Foreign Language Classroom, Culture and British Studies. [On-line]. Available at: <http://elt.britcoun.org.pl/forum/foreign.htm>

Burka, L. P. (1998). A hypertext history of multi-user dimensions. MUD History. [On-line]. Available at: <http://www.ccs.neu.edu/home/lpb/mud-history.html>

Caputa, S. (2000). Teaching culture through language: National stereotypes in EFL coursebooks in Poland. [On-line]. Available at: <http://neolitonline.us.edu.pl/between/articles/Sonia%20Caputa.htm>

Clouston, M. L. (1997). Towards an Understanding of Culture in L2/FL Education. The Internet TESL Journal, 3/5. [On-line]. Available at: <http://itslj.org/>

Kılıçkaya, F. (2004). Guidelines to evaluate cultural content in textbooks. The Internet TESL Journal, 10/12. [On-line]. Available at: <http://itslj.org/>

Kitao, K. (1997). Selecting and developing teaching/ learning materials. The Internet TESL Journal, 4/4. [On-line]. Available at: <http://itslj.org/>

Ranalli, James M. (2003). ELT coursebooks in the age of corpus linguistics: constraints and possibilities. [On-line]. Available at: <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Ranalli6.pdf>

Raux, A. and Eskenazi, M. (2004). Non-Native Users in the Let's Go!! Spoken Dialogue System: Dealing With Linguistic Mismatch. Retrieved April 12, 2004. [On-line]. Available at: "citeseer.ist.psu.edu/raux04nonnative.html"

Skelton, J. and Willis, J. (2000) Approaches to syllabus specification course and syllabus design. [On-line]. Available at: <http://www.philseflsupport.com/csd1.htm>

TOMER. [On-line]. Available at: <http://www.tomer.ankara.edu.tr/english/index.html>

Conferences

Baker, W. (2003). An investigation into the relationship between cultural awareness and second language acquisition amongst Thai undergraduate students. MA Dissertation, Leicester University. Retrieved January 22, 2004.

Bettinelli, B. (2003). The native speaker is dead! Long live the native speaker! British Council National Conference for Teachers of English. Retrieved May 05, 2005.

Bolt, R. (2000). The Foreign Language Classroom, Culture and British Studies: reflections and suggestions. Studium Podyplomowe Łódź. Retrieved May 03, 2005.

Pulverness, A. (2003). Here and there: issues in materials development for intercultural learning. Retrieved May 23, 2005.

Trujillo, Viri, and Figueira (2002) The Native Educators Research Project. Presented at the Sixth World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education Stoney Park, Morley, Alberta, Canada. Retrieved April 20, 2005.

Akdo, G. (2001). Teaching of Turkish as a Foreign Language in Turkey and Ankara University TÖMER. Teaching Turkish as a Second or a Foreign Language in Europe as a contribution to the European Year of Languages. Retrieved June 20, 2005.

APPENDICES

APENDIX A

A SAMPLE OBSERVATION TAPESCRIPIT OF THE EFL GROUP

Typescript 2

Class: English

Number of hours per week: 10 (each 50 minutes)

Date: 24. 12. 2003

Time: 07:00 pm

Number of students: 7

Teacher: Ufuk Keleş

Material: New Headway-elementary- Liz & John Soars

Description of the Ss:

``

1. Age: 19-35
2. Sex: 4-females, 3- males
3. Nationality: Turkish
4. Social-cultural background: Middle class
5. Occupations: 2 students, 5 working
6. Motivation-attitude: job obligations, interest educational reasons
7. Educational background: 4 students graduated from high school and 3 graduated from university
8. English level: Basic 1 - B

19: 05 Class begins, T hands out homework papers and chats with Ss for couple of minutes

4th minute - T and Ss work on Vocabulary activity from the workbook

10th minute - checking homework (workbook)

24th minute - fill in the blanks, activity (workbook)

28th minute - answering the questions from the text (workbook)

33rd minute - negative short forms - activity (workbook)

37th minute - answering the questions from the workbook, communicative activity

45th minute - filling in the blanks (coursebook)

T: Hello!

Ss: Hello...

T: (Hands out homework papers)

Ss: (murmur)

T: Is this your handwriting Aygul?

S1: Yes...

T: I think this is yours..

Ss: (murmur)

T: How are you today?

Ss: Fine.. Good..

S1: Bir kağıt daha vardı?

T: Yes, I have.. er.. I couldn't finish it.. I hadn't enough time I'm sorry for that. Anyway, after I finish, I will I promise... I'll give them back to you.. OK... Do you remember.. er... in book one?(coursebook)

(murmur)

Did you have any problem with writing homework, or worksheets? Come early and see me during the break, after the lesson.. OK, if you had any problem... What you did wrong... OK, er.. workbook ... (murmur)... and, oh, sorry my friends!

I forgot... do you remember her?

(Introduces the observer to new students).

Ok, my friends, let's start with... Engin, Engin...

(murmur)... ah! This...

OK, oh vocabulary part...vocabulary part, sorry, page 40. Parts of speech...parts of speech.. Today we will talk about grammatical terms, adjectives, what else?...

Prepositions, verbs, so, er, you know most of them... you know them grammatically, noun, verb, adjective.. Could you do an exercise or... was it difficult?

Ss: Difficult...

T: Difficult? OK nine, adjective, why is a 'nice lady, nice boy, and nice behavior, huh?

Nice girl? Yeah... and party?

S1&S3: noun...

T: Noun... famous?

Ss: Famous?

T: Sting is a famous pop singer.

S3: Al Pachino...

T: Al Pachino is a famous film star... huh?

S4: Adjective..

T: Yeah, adjective, postman?

Ss: Noun!

T: Noun, very good! Enjoy?

Ss: Verb!

T: Do you enjoy English?

S4: No...

T: No? Yeah, I also didn't enjoy it when I was at school...and in?

S6: Preposition!

T: What, Aygül?

S1: Preposition...
 T: Preposition, yeah... niye?
 (murmur)
 T: OK, near?
 S3: Preposition...
 T: OK, on?
 S6: Preposition...
 T: I don't hear you... holiday?
 S1: Noun?
 T: Noun. See?
 S5: Verb..
 T: Earn?
 S4: Adjective...
 T: Relax?
 S6: Adjective...
 S1& S4: Verb..?
 T: Relax man... I always relax after the course, after I finish the class. New?
 Ss: Adjective...
 T: It's a new car... Warm?
 Ss: Verb...
 T: Verb?
 Ss: Adjective...
 T: It's a warm day today...huh?
 Ss: Adjective.
 T: Win?
 Ss: Verb.
 T: OK... Aygöl you start with the sentences... My aunt lives in a nice old house near the sea... so, number two?
 S1: Did you see Frank's new car... this morning? It's red.
 T: Very good, Barış?
 S2: I play tennis with her on Sundays and she always wins.
 T: Very good... (Sees that S5 didn't finished the rest of the sentences) Oh, OK... Mehmet?
 S3: O bende de boş... I... bla, bla...
 T: Aha... I...
 S4: I relaxed and watched television yesterday evening.
 T: Yesterday evening. I relaxed... I watched TV... biliyorsunuz...I relaxed and than watched television... OK? Go on...
 S3: It was so... in front of the fire...
 T: Fire! (Goes to the radiator and says:) Yeah, it's worm! It was so...? It was so warm...?
 Ss: Warm..
 T: Warm! Yeah, go on...
 S3: Warm... in front of the fire...
 T: OK, Aysu?
 S5: I saw a famous film star at Peter's...
 S3: Party...

T: Peter's?
T: Famous is good... that's OK...
S5: Party?
T: Party, OK, go on...
S6: Birincisini yapmadım, ikincisi enjoy...
T: Please read...
S6: He worked as...
T: Bla, bla...
S6: ... 'Until he died, and he only enjoyed 10 000 pounds a year...'
T: Ten thousand pounds a year... Very good. What about sixth question? He worked as an...?
S1: Postman..
T: Yeah, I have as a teacher, you write as an...
S1: Accountant..
T: ...As an accountant, ok, they had a ... Aygöl you go on...
S1: 'They had a holiday in Spain and they...'
S4: Enjoyed...
T: And they...
S4: Enjoyed...
S1: Very much...
T: Enjoyed, not 'j' (Turkish), in English we don't have 'j' sound, enjoyed! OK?
Prepositions, about, after, for... 'My family left London and moved...?'
S4: To...
S1: In...
S4: ...to a small village.
T: OK, move, to move in, they are both OK. And, Engin?
S3: People all over the world...
T: All over the world... very good... İlker?
S4: (murmur)
T: To speak to... do you remember? OK, did you speak to the teacher?
Ss: (murmur)
S2: For?
T: For the homework? About.
S2: Şey gibi... er... düşündüm hocam...
T: About, about... OK... Aysu?
S5: What do you know about George Washington?
T: Very good... What about homework? 'Peter stayed.... grandmother...'
S6: With...
T: Very good... 'Peter stayed with his grandmother at Christmas Day'... Aygöl?
S1: ...About.
T: I... 'I often think...' Think about! Next?
S2: 'New Year's day is one week after Christmas Day.'
T: Very good...
S3: 'He arrived to, at airport to... er... in New York at 5.45 am .'
T: He arrived at, he arrived at... OK? İlker?
S4: 'Here is a postman... with a letter for you.'

T: Here is a postman... with a letter... with a letter, OK? With a letter for you.
S5: Speak with me in English...
T: Speak...
S4: ...to!
T: To speak to... OK? (murmur) Let's skip the writing part... OK.. Past simple... Fill in the blanks... Do this... OK.. Louise Braille.. Do you know anything about Braille? You know Braille? Braille? OK, let's learn about him... ' Louis Braille was the son of a French leather worker...' Aygöl?
S1: He went...
T: 'He went blind at the age of three when he...' Barış?
S2: Fill...
T: Fill..?
S2: Yazılışını biliyorum, ama...
T: Fell..
S2: Fell..
T: Fall, fell, fallen... forget about fallen... 'fell in his father's workroom. But Louis was very clever. He...'
S5: ...wanted to...
T: 'He wanted to be a musician so...'
S6: ...learned
T: 'Learned to play the cello, and at the age of ten he...'
S3: ...win
S4: ...won
S5: ...won
T: '...won the scholarship to the National Institute for Blind People...' do you know blind people? Blind? Metin Şentürk is blind...blind..
Ss: Blind... Kör...
T: OK...' for blind children in Paris. He ...?'
S6: Could..
T: '...could play the cello, but he '... Aygöl?
S1: Couldn't...
T: 'read or write'... In 1899 a French soldier, Charles Barbier... Engin?
S3: ...Invented...
T: '...invented night writing. He...'
S4: ...used..
T: '... used, used special dots on paper so that soldiers...
S5: ...could read...(pronouncing the sound 'l' too)
T: Not! ...er... friends please don't use ,l'! (Writes could, would on the board) 'l' is silent! Could! Could! ...'so that soldiers could read at night. Louise Braille....' Mehmet?
S6: ...Understood... (wrong pronunciation)
T: 'Understood the importance of this invention for blind people, and when he was fifteen, he...' Aygöl?
S1: ...began..
T: Began?
S1: Began...
T: ...'began to develop it. In 1829 he...'

S2: ..started...

T: ...'Started to use it at the institute. By 1932 'Braille'.... the invention... (draw some dots on the board) ... this is 'Braille' alphabet... six points... for a blind people... OK?' 'Braille' was in use all over the world, but Louise...?

S3: ...died..

T: ...'died in 1852 and he never'...?

S4: ...knew..

T: ..'knew of the importance of his invention.' OK. Let's answer the questions about him! First of all...let's correct the sentences. ' Louise Braille was American.' 'No he wasn't American he was French...'

'He wanted to be an artist.'

S3: No, he didn't want to be an artist, ...

T: He didn't...

S3: ...want to be an artist he wanted to be a mu.. mu...

T: ..Musician

S3: Musician.

T: Very good. OK, Aysu? 'His father was a teacher.'

S5: Ben bunu yapmadım...

T: OK, Mehmed?

S6: He didn't want...

T: Number three! Number three!

S6: His father wasn't a teacher... (murmur) ...devamını yapmadım..

T: OK. 'His father wasn't a teacher he was a musician?

Ss: ..Yok...

T: ..leather worker?... 'Louise Braille was the son of a French leather worker.' On the top... OK, number four! Aygöl?

'He went blind when he was six'.

S1: He didn't went blind when he was six, he was three.

T: OK, now... tell me... He didn't, be careful, ya! Mehmet you also be careful, not he didn't went, - he didn't go.. OK?

S6: Ben yapmadım...

T: Ya... why are you here then?! Barış? Do it..

S2: (murmur)

T: You never finish your homework! İlker go on!

S4: He didn't learn to play the piano...

T: Aha...

S4: ..he learned ...

T: Forget about this! He didn't learn ... blank, to play the piano...

S1:... he learned to play the cello.

T: ...he learned to play the cello. Aysu?

S5: ...ben sekizinci alıstirmayi yapmadım...

T: Ah! Mehmet?

S6: He didn't... er... won a scholarship to the Institute of music, he, er... won a scholarship to the National Institute for Blind Children in Paris.

T: OK, blind.. institute.. institute for blind children... He didn't 'win' that, OK? But he won, be careful, Aygöl?

S1: Ben yapmamıştım...

T: Come on.. try it.. Make it negative . 'He invented 'night writing''. He didn't...

S1: He didn't invented night writing.

T: Ha!

S1: He...

T: He...

S1: He invented ...

T: What did he do? He began to develop night writing. He invented it... So, Engin? The last one?

S3: 'He died when he was 53.'

'He didn't die when he was 53...

T: Aha... he died when he was... he died when he was... How old was he when he died?

Ss: (murmur)

T: It says : How old was he when he died? How old was he? 52 minus... 41?

S4: 43?

T: Yes 43... he died when he was 43 years old. Ok, negative short forms... Be quick! She did not see me - she didn't see me! Barış?

S2: I didn't go to school on Monday.

T: I didn't go to school on Monday. Very good!

S3: Our teacher didn't come to school on Monday..

Ss: (murmur)

T: Very good...

S4: Anna wasn't in Paris last month.

S5: They weren't at home.

T: OK...

S6: Paul couldn't ... (bad pronunciation)

T: Aaaa! Couldn't!

S6: Paul couldn't read until he was eight.

T: OK.. Aygöl you make the positive words negative. OK? Negative into positive... It is pretty simple. She drove to work - she didn't drive to work.

S1: My aunt didn't give me a birthday present.

T: Thank you... Barış?

S2: It rain... rained...

T: Rained...

S2: It rained a lot during our holiday.

T: Very good. Engin? I didn't drink the coffee...

S3: I did drank coffee..

T: Not drank, not drank, drunk!

S1: Drunk..

T: I...

S3: ..I...

T: We never use did, in positive sentences... OK? I ...

S3: I...

T: I...

S1: I drink coffee but I didn't ate the sandwich.

T: OK...Number three...

S4: She brought a bottle of wine.

T: OK...

S5: She was tired so she went to bed.

T: Very good.

S6: He didn't forget his passport and he didn't lost his plane ticket.

T: He didn't forget his passport, not passport! Huh? Passport. OK. Aygöl?

S1: It cost a lot of money.

T: It cost a lot of money. Very good.

S2: I had a lot of time, so I did the shopping.

T: You make negative - positive sentences, yeah, so?

(Murmur)

T: The second form of do...? I didn't... sorry, I had a lot of time so I did the shopping. Not did...

(murmur)

T: OK? Engin? Number the time in chronological order... from nearest, for example... chronological... 2 days ago, 3 days ago, a month ago... OK? First one?

S1: This morning...

T: This morning...

S5: Yesterday evening...

T: Yesterday evening...

S1: Last winter...

S3: The day before yesterday...

T: The day before yesterday...

S2: Ten years ago...

S1: Ten years ago...

T: Very good...

S1: 1980..

T: Ninety... ninety eighty, not eighteen, OK? That's good, OK, next? No one?

S1: Ben ötekileri yaptım...

T: No one?

Ss: (murmur)

T: OK, madem yapmadınız, do it orally... OK, Engin?

(murmur)

T: What did you do two days ago?

S3: (Silence)

T: Did you came to TÖMER?

S3: Yes...

T: Two days ago? Two days ago?

S3: Er...

T: You didn't came here... on Monday... Huh?

S3: Yeah.

T: Yeah, you came... OK, İlker, last winter?

S4: Er...

T: Did you go anywhere?

S4:(murmur)

T: Last winter? Do you remember?

S4: No...

T: Did you go on holiday? Who remembers? The last winter?

S4: Er...

S4: I was in Erciyes.

T: Ok, than tell me, I was...Ok? Aysu, what about you? Ten years ago? Do you remember?

S5: I was in Paris 10 years ago.

T: No, I was in Karabük 10 years ago. Did you like it?

S5: No.

T: No, it's a boring place... Ok, ago...do you remember the exercise... ago... I saw him last June... You count...

S3: June.

S2: June.

T: I saw him 3 months ago ... Ok? I had breakfast at eight o'clock. Mehmet? How many hours ago? Do you remember?

Ss: (Laughter)

S6: I had breakfast at 9 o'clock... 9 hours ago...

T: No, ten hours ago! They got married in 1980, Aysu?

S5: Bunu geçelim...

T: Geçmeyelim kardeşim, bu sınavda çıkacak!

Ss: (murmur)

S1: They got married 23 years ago.

T: Yeah, 'They got married 23 years ago'. We saw John the day before yesterday'. We saw John...?

S6: We saw John... er... 2 days... ago.

T: Two days ago. Aha.

(murmur)

T: OK! 'My daughter started school last September...'How many months ago?

Ss: (murmur)

S5: Three months ago...

(latecomer enters and apologizes for being late)

T: You are never late so I believe in you. OK...'Princes Diana died in 1997.' Mehmet?

S6: Five...

T: Five or six?

(laughter)

S6: Six years ago...

T: OK, 'Alice came back from America last month'

(murmur)

T: How many months ?

S4: One month ago...

S6: ..two...

T: One month ago...One month is also possible but it's not good. 'Their son was born at two o'clock this morning.'

(murmur)

S2: Twelve...

T: Twelve? Sixteen?

S3: Sixteen... sixteen...

T: Sixteen hours ago... OK, 'I married an American soldier'. I, When I was a child I remember... er... cartoon, 'J - I- Jo' Do you remember? Huh? The cartoon... it was a...?

Ss: (murmur)

T: ... cartoon... it is a cartoon but they have toys... OK, but, my friends... First of all... let's fill in the blanks... the phrases... Do this... OK?

S2: Yapmadık...

T: Nobody did it? So, I'll give you 2 minutes to do it. 2 minutes! Be quick! I'm sorry Aygöl, (apologizes to only student that did her homework) Aygöl that is punishment for you... I'm sorry...

S1: That's OK...

(5 minutes latter)

T: Ready?

Ss: (murmur)

T: OK? Finished?

S5: No...

T: What can I do? Come on! 'Well, I was 16', Aygul assist me please, 'It was 1942 and my mother and I lived in a small village in the country. My father wasn't there. He was ...

S1: ...away in the war...

S2: Away in the war...

T: Yes, he was not there, he was not... er... at home... he was away in the war... ' Suddenly on... S1: 26th

T: On the 26th of January... January 26th ... huh?

S1: ... our lives...

T: ...'our lives...

S1: ... our lives changed

T: ...'Our lives changed. Hundreds of American soldiers G.I's came to our village. Oh! We girls in the village loved them! They were...'?

S1: ...so different from...

T: '... they were so different from English boys. They talked to us. They... didn't talk about cars and football.' You see, English boys talk about cars and football... OK... 'They...?

S1: ... gave us chocolate...

S2: ... gave us chocolate...

T: ' ...gave us chocolate and cigarettes. Every day was like Christmas Day! And the way they danced! Oh, they danced...?

S5: (murmur)

T: ...'they danced ... like... in the films.' They danced very well...

'I met Hank at the Saturday dance. I think I fell in love the first... the first...?

S1: ...time we danced...

T: ... time we danced...Güzel. ' I was so shy that... Aha?

S1: I cou...

T: ' ...I couldn't look at him, but he took me to the dance every Saturday after that. He told me he loved shy English girls. My mother'...?

S1: ... was very ... worried...

T: '... was very worried because she didn't know any American people then. In 1943 Hank went to France, but we wrote to each other. We wrote for two years and at the end of the war he...?

S1: ... come back for me...

T: Come, or?

S1: Came...

T: '...came back for me...' very good, ' He took me to States to his home in Arizona.

Well, now we have four children and twelve grandchildren!'

OK, please, when I say do your homework, please do it... it is for your own sake... OK, it's break now...

APPENDIX B

A SAMPLE OBSERVATION TAPESCRIPT OF THE TFL GROUP

Typescripts 2

Class: Turkish

Number of hours per week: 10 (each 50 minutes)

Date: 22.12. 2003

Time: 02:00 pm

Number of students: 6

Teacher: Eda Demirtaş

Material: Hitit Öğretim - Yabancılar için Türkçe - Ankara University - TÖMER

Description of the Ss

1. Age: 18 - 55
2. Sex: 3-females, 3- males
3. Nationality: Colombia, Israel, South Korea, France, Russia, and USA.
4. Social-cultural background: Middle class
5. Occupations: 3 students, 3 working
6. Motivation-attitude: job obligations, interest, educational reasons, (married to Turkish people)
7. Educational background: 1 learner graduated from high school, 3 learners graduated from university, and 2 learners held their MA degrees
8. Turkish level: Basic 1-B

5th minute - T hands out homework papers to the Ss

7th minute - T and Ss start doing exercise from the coursebook

23rd minute - T and Ss start chatting in target language

30th minute - T and Ss start doing exercise from the extra material brought in the class by the teacher

46th minute T and Ss start doing exercise from the coursebook till the end of the class

14:05h - class begins

T: Merhaba! Bugün yine misafirimiz var!

Ss: Evet!

T: Tamam...nasılsınız? Sinan, nasılsın?

S1: İyiyim..

T: Sung Mi, sen nasılsın, neyin var?

S2: (looks at the teacher in confusion)

T: Her şey normal...

Ss: (Murmur)

T: Sen Ricardo?

S3: Merhaba...

T: Merhaba

(laughter)

S3: Nasılsınız?

T: İyiyim teşekkür ederim, sen nasılsın?

S3: Çok iyiyim...

T: Çok iyi..Hafta sonu nasıldı.. tatil? Hafta sonu? Cumartesi, pazar?..... Güzel?

S3: Çok güzel.. hava çok güzel...

T: Evet, hava çok güzeldi... Miki, iki... iyi misin Miki?

S4: İyiyim..

Ss: (murmur)

T: Aaa... Christina yok mu?

S3: Yok, ne.. ni.. nezli?

T: Nezle, grip, Christina biraz hasta bu gün...Bakalım... (T hands out homework papers to Ss)

S5: Çok var...

T: Çok doğru...

... Evet ne yaptınız? Ödev vardı... Evet... çalışma kitabı, sayfa 25. Yaptınız mı...? Tamam mı...? Sinan yaptı, Olga yaptı, Miki yapmadı, çünkü cuma günü... yoktu... tamam... Peki, Yehoshua... lütfen başlıyoruz, önce örnekleri okuyorsun... tamam?

S5: Evet... Sınıfta 20 kişi var, sini... sini... sini... da...

T: Sınıfınızda!

S5: Sınıfınızda...

T: Sınıfınız!!!

S5: Sınıfınız 20 kişi var.

T: Güzel- Peki, bakalım Türkçede, benim sınıfım, tamam, söylüyorum, ya da, bizim sınıfımız...Tamam söylüyorum... Ama bir opsiyon daha var... ne? Benim sınıfım, ya da sınıfım, bizim sınıfımız...ya da sınıfımız, ikisi de mümkündür... Peki... Yehoshua, fiil nasıl?

S5: Ayşe bugün...er..eve gidiyor.

T: Evet, Ayşe bugün eve ...

S5: ...gidiyor..Ayşe bu gün senin evine gidiyor.

T: Peki... Şimdi...Benim?

S5: Evim.

T: Senin?

S5: Evin,

T: Peki, onun?

S5: Evi

T: Senin? Evin...?

S5: A! Evine!

T: Nereye gidiyor?

S5: Yani, evi...evine!

T: Ha! Güzel... Ayşe bu gün senin evine gidiyor, ya da Ayşe bu gün onun...

S5: Yani...ayni...

T: Evet, aynı... Onun evine gidiyor... ama burada bir 'n' var, bunun fonksiyonu başka, burada extra bir 'n' var. Niçin? Hatırlayacaksınız, perşembe günü bunu yaptık, benim evim, normal, problem yok, senin evin, ama o için, ve onlar için iyelikte bir istisna hatırlıyorsunuz, onun evi - nereye, nerede, nereden. O zaman extra bir 'n' istiyor. Onun evine, gidiyor... anlıyor musunuz?

Ss: ...İyi... Evet...

T: Güzel. Peki... Miki, iki yaptın mı?

S4: Okul...

T: Nereden çıkıyorsun? Nereden çıkıyorsun?

S4: Okul...

T: Okul?

S4: (Okul) ...dan.

T: (Okul)...dan! Çıkmak, çünkü ne istiyor? Çıkmak.

S5: Kapıyı kapalı... bir

T: Evet bir yerden...

S5: Çıkmak...

T: Terketmek... terketmek, bir yerden gitmek,. Bunun için ben şimdi sınıftan... çıkıyorum... ve ben okuldan çıkıyorum. Peki, bu nasıl... Ben benim... okulum...

S4:... dan.

T: Evet, çıkmak var, çünkü, ben benim okulumudan çıkıyorum... ve Miki...

S4: ...muz...dan.

T: Sizin okulunuzdan... çıkıyorum... Peki, Ricardo 3 nasıl?

S3: Biz odada oturuyouz ve TV izliyoruz...

T: Güzel, normal... Bir problem yok. Biz odada oturuyoruz ve TV izliyoruz.

S3: Biz benim odamda oturuyoruz ve ...

T: Güzel, benim odam.

S3: Biz onun odasında oturuyoruz...

T: Güzel onun odası. Nerede oturuyoruz...? Onun odasın...da oturuyoruz. Biliyorsunuz, ne zaman iyelik var, ama a, e, da, de, dan, den, o zaman burada ekstra bir 'n' var... Peki, ama sadece o ve onlar... Sung Mi?

S2: Bu gömleği dolaba aldım...

T: Peki, şimdi ne yapıyorum? Sung Mi? Kitaba ne yapıyorum? Alıyorum...

S2: Almak...

T: Peki, nereden alıyorum...masa?

S2: Masa...dan...

T: Masadan alıyorum! Şimdi ben kalemi Olga'dan alıyorum çünkü kalem Olga'dan çıkıyor, gidiyor, ayrılıyor... dan! Almakta dan-den kullanılır. Bu gömleği dolaptan aldım! Çünkü... Sung Mi... dolap var... dolap, dolabı açıyorum ve gömlekler de var, pantolonlar var ve dolaptan alıyorum, çıkıyor... dolaptan... değil mi? Peki, “Gömleği dolaptan aldım”, böylelikle, Sung mi, bu gömleği... senin..

Miki, benim dolap... sen soyle, Miki değil, hadi Sung mi, benim dolap.

S2: Benim

T: Senin...

S2: dolabın,

T: Onun...

S2: dolabı,

T: Bizim

S2 dolabinizi...

T: Dolabı...

S2: dolabımız

T: Sizin...

S2: do...labi...ni..

T: dolabı-nız! Güzel. Peki,... Gömleği sizin dolabın...

S2: dolabınız...dan

T: ..dan, bakın 'ketçap' kuralı biliyorsunuz, dolap - dolabınızdan aldım, peki, Sung Mi...

S2: Gömleği onların dolabından...

T: Güzel..onların dolabı... nereden? Onların dolabından ya da... Olga başka bir opsiyon daha var mı?

S6: Dolaplarından...

T: Ha! Onların dolaplarından. O zaman ketçap yok, değil mi? Onların dolapları.

Nereden? Onların dolaplarından aldım. Evet, Sinan... beş..

S1: Beş.. Sınıfa yeni bir öğrenci geliyor.

T: Güzel, sınıfa yeni bir öğrenci geliyor.

S1: Sınıfımıza yeni bir öğrenci geliyor.

T: Çok güzel, bizim sınıfımıza, değil mi?

S1: Bizim sınıfımıza...

T: Evet Sinan, şimdi?

S1: Sizin sınıfınıza yeni bir öğrenci geliyor.

T: Tabii, doğru söylüyorsun.. yeni bir öğrenci geliyor, nereye? Çünkü... Evet, Yehoshua, altı?

S5: Çocuğuma bakıyorum..

T: Ha!Tamam, çocuğuma bakıyorum! Güzel, yanlış değil, ama... ya da, sadece çocuğa, şimdi tamam, doğru, ama çocuğuma yanlış değil, güzel... Peki...

S5: Benim çocuğuma bakıyorum...

T: Senin..

S5: Şimdi...

T: Çocuğu...

S5: Çocuğu....

T: Benim çocuğum,

S5: Çocuğuma...

T: Benim çocuğum- çocuğuma, senin çocuğun- çocuğuna! Kime bakıyorum? Senin çocuğuna bakıyorum! Diğeri?

S5: Senin çocuğa, çocuğuma, cocuya...

T: Yok, yok, 'y' yok! Yavaş! Dur. Şimdi...

S5: Cocuya, çocuğa...

T: Evet benim?

S1: Çocuğa?

T: Ha! Tamam! Güzel, benim çocuğum! Hepsini söyle... benim?

S1: çocuğum...

T: Onun çocuğu..Peki..onun?

S1: çocuğu..

T: Onun çocuğu.. Şimdi bakmak... Kime bakıyorum? Çocuğuma bakıyorum..Senin çocuğuna bakıyorum.. Ama onun çocuğu... Kime bakıyorum?

S6: Çocuğuna..

S5: Cocuğa..

S3: Çocuna..

T: Çocuğuna bakıyorum, böylesine extra 'n' çocuğuna bakıyorum, benim çocuğum, senin çocuğun, onun çocuğu, kime bakıyorum? Onun çocuğu-na bakıyorum...

S2: Çocuklarına...

T: Onun çocuklarına çünkü, eğer onun çok çocuğu var, 3 tane çocuğu var, o zaman söylüyorum, onun çocuklarına bakıyorum... Tamam mı? Hazır mısınız?

Peki o zaman.... Miki, yedi...

S4: Ev..de ders çalışıyo.. rum...

T: Güzel, 'Evde ders çalışıyorum'... Başka?

S4: (murmur)

T: Şimdi Miki! Benim... Evet... Benim...Benim...

S4: Benim?

T: Kalem-im, benim ev-im, benim evim, senin Miki? Senin evin,onun? Ya!

Çalışmıyorsun sen! Ha! Onun, nerede ders çalışıyorum? Tamam, zorlamıyorum fazla...

Ricardo, sen söyle. Onun? Ha?

S3: Evi..

T: Evet..

S3: ..nde... Onun evinde ders çalışıyorum...

T: Ha! Güzel... Bak Miki, iki... onun evi. Tamam mı? Benim evim, senin evin, onun evi, ama, nerede? Onun evinde, onun evinde ders çalışıyorum.. Peki Ricardo ikincisini de söyler misin? Sen benim?

S3: Sen benim evimde ders çalışıyorsun.

T: Güzel, ben senin evinde ders çalışıyorum! Peki Sung Mi, öteki nasıl?

S2: Kitapları masaya koyuyorum...

T: Güzel, kitapları masaya koyuyorum.

S2: Kitapları ma...asana koyuyorum...

T: Çok güzel...

S2: Kitapları masasına koyuyorum...

T: Tamam, problem var mı?

Ss: Yok...

T: Tamam mı Sinan?

S5: (murmur)

T: Masaya koyuyorum, ya da cebime koyuyorum, tamam mı? Başka ne vardı, Olga ödev?
Ha, öğrenci işleri. Tamam, bekliyorum..

S3: (murmur)

T: Evet Olga-memur, Sinan-David. Tamam mı?

S6: Adınız, soyadınız?

S1: Benim adım David Pierson.

T: Senin adın... Oh...(laughs)

S6: Kac yaşındasınız?

S1: Ben 20 yaş.. yaşı.. da..m

T: Yaşında?

S1: Ben 20 yaşıdam...

T: 20 yaşı..da..yım

S1: 20 yaşıdayım.

S6: Nerelisiniz?

S1: Amerikalıyım.

S6: Nerede oturuyorsunuz?

S1: Şimdi?

S6: Şimdi...

S1: Şimdi Göztepe'de oturuyorum.

S6: Telefon numaranız ne?

S1: Er, 935 72 53 (Dokuzyüz otuz beş, yetmiş iki elli üç)

T: Vay, bravo!

S6: Kimliğiniz, buyrun, pazartesi günü saat dört...

T: Dört? Dört?

(laughter)

S6: .. Dokuzda kursa başlıyorsunuz.

S1: Teşekkür ederim.

S6: Rica ederim!

T: Güzel! Tamam mı herkesin tamam mı?

Ss: (murmur)

S5: Mi..mi..milliyet?

T: Milliyetiniz ne? Tamam, doğru ama pratikte böyle sormuyoruz, milliyetiniz ne, çok pratik olmuyor.

S5: Memleket?

T: Memleket ne? Bunu sadece Türkler soruyorlar. Türkler, memleketiniz ne, ama Türkiye için, benim memleketim İzmir, doğru söylüyorsun, biraz yanlış bir kullanım belki, ama milliyet çok pratik değil, nerelisiniz daha pratik. Daha...

S3: (murmur) .. Ben Ankara'lıyım, yani...

S3: Ama burada tarih...

T: Ama burada kaç yaşındasınız yazıyor..

S5: Ben 25.. yaşıdayım....

T: Ben 25 yaşıdayım ve doğum tarihim...

S5: Aha...Tamam..

T: 17. 09.... Tamam mı?

S5: Tamam...

T: Bunu yaptınız mı?

S6: Yok...

T: İkisi de problem. Bu çok problem. Yaptın mı Ricardo?

S3: (silence)

T: Ricardo, resminde... resme bakıyor... tamam ve eşyalar yanlış yerde... yanlış... mesela buzdolabında, piyano üstünde... Ricardo?

S3: Buzdolabında kitaplar var.

T: Evet...

(laughter)

T: Peki, Olga, iki?

S6: Piyanoda lamba var...

T: Ha! Piyanonun üstünde, bu grameri bugün yapıyoruz... piyanonun üstünde, piyanonun üstünde lamba var... evet... Bunun gibi yapıyoruz Ricardo, tamam mı?

Peki, top nerede?

S5: Top... er... kitap... kitap... dolapta!

T: Ha, güzel! Top kitaplığın rafında, ya da, kısaca rafta. Top nerede? Rafta! Ya da... kitaplıkta.

S1: Futbol topu..

T: Evet, futbol topu... evet...

S6: Ama kitap yok!

T: Evet, sadece buzdolabında... başka var mı?

S2: Yerde kitap var...

T: Yerde kitap var...Sinan?

S1: Kitap dolabında...

T: Kitaplıkta...

S1: Ne?

T: Kitaplık.

S1: Kitaplıkta kitap var...

T: Var mı? Yok!

S1: Kitaplıkta kitap var, çok kitap...

T: Hangi kitaplık?

(S1 shows on the picture)

T: O kitaplık değil! O buzdolabı..

S1: Buzdolabı?... O ne?

T: Bak...kitaplıkta burada yanlış, kitaplıkta değil, buzdolabında...

S3: Buzdolabında...

S1: Bu ne? Kitap!!

T: Evet, kitap ama, buzdolabında...

S1: Tamam, bu buzdolabı, bu ne?

T: Raf

S1: Bu raf değil! Ne bu? Kitap!

T: Evet, kitap buzdolabında ama yanlış...

S1: (quits) Ok, tamam... kitap dolabında...

T: Ama bak! Tamam, burada bir fırça var, görüyor musun?... fırça...

S1: Tamam, fırça, dış fırça...

T: Dış fırçası nerede?

S1: Kitap dolabi...

T: Aaaa! Kitap dolabı - kitaplık!

S1: Kitaplık.

T: Ha!

S1: Kitaplık! (laughs)

T: Evet, Kitaplıkta ayakkabılar var, bakın, görüyor musunuz?

S1: Kitaplık...

T: Ha...ayakkabılar kitaplıkta, o da yanlış...

Ss: (murmur)

S1: Piyanonun sandalyesi yok...

T: Evet, piyanonun sandalyesi yok, ve telefon... telefon nerede?

S3: Kitaplıkta...

T: Evet, telefon da kitaplıkta! Değil mi? Piyanonun sandalyesi yok, ve kitaplıkta bir de telefon var...

S5: Resim...

T: Evet, resim...düz...

S3: Değil...

T: (Drows on the board) Düz değil... bu düz... ama bu düz değil!

S5: Düz...

T: Düz, düz, fark etmez.... ya da düzgün söylüyoruz...ama düz çok pratik... Peki, soru var mı? Sorunuz var mı?

Ss: Yok...

S1: Ben soru...

T: Benim sorum...

S1: Benim sorum...

T: Var...

S1: Var..

T: Buyrun Sinan.

S1: Bu sınıf ne zaman bitecek?

T: Bu sınıf ne zaman bitecek... 31 aralık...

S1: Yok, yok, yok, şimdi, bugün?

T: Bugün beşte, beşte, bugün beşte, ama bir saat ekstra var ya...

S5: Evet, perşembe...

S1: Çarşamba, perşembe..

T: Perşembe yapıyoruz.Tamam mı? Çünkü bugün kimse yok, Christina da yok...

S1: Deniz yok...

T: Geliyor mu?... Geliyor, çünkü...sınava... zaten dört gün, ama üç gün diyor... Bu gün de gelmiyor...o zaman...

(They go on talking about the absent Ss for 3 more minutes)

T: Evet, şimdi kitap tamamdır... sayfa 33te alıştırma yedi var, sayfa 33te alıştırma yedi... bunu yapmadık? Şimdi yapıyoruz.. Yapmadık değil mi?

S3: Yaptık...

Ss: (murmur)

T: Ne zaman yaptık? Olga yaptık, değil mi bunu?

S6: No, no...

T: Yapmadık... Olga'da da yok, Ricardo'da var...Yapmadık... Yapmadık..

(laughter)

T: Tamam, kontrol o zaman, Sinan'da var mı? Alıştırma yedi Sinan'da da var... Tamam, yavaş, yavaş yapalım! Tamam, bir, iki dakika yapıyorsunuz... Olga..

(10 minutes later)

T: Güzel...Peki, Yehoshua... soru 1..

S5: Onların yazlık dört oda var...

T: Şimdi.. Onların yazlıkları... dört oda var. Evet?

S5: Evet... (murmur)

T: .. Yazlık...

S5: ... yazlıkları...da

T: Yazlıklarında!

Ss: (murmur)

T: Yehoshua, şimdi, problem... büyük bir problem! Extra 'n' nerede?

Ss: (murmur)

S5: Yazlıklarında..

T: Yazlıklarında!

T: Onların, onların yazlıklarında dört oda var!

Belki çok yazlıkları var, belki bir yazlıkları var!

S6: Nasıl... bir yazlıkları? Çok saçma!

T: Yok, yok! Belki bir yazlık, belki bir yazlık...

S2: Yazlığında...

T: Yazlığında... (writes on the board)

Onların yazlığında dört oda var... Tamam... Onların çok yazlıkları var, onların yazlıklarında dört oda var, ya da, onların yazlık, nerede? Yazlıklarında! Tamam mı?

Ss: (murmur)

T: Evet, bunu sonra tartışırız... şimdi teneffüs var!

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEWES –LEARNERS

1st interview (24. 12. 2003)

Q1: Have you got any English- Turkish speaking friends in your immediate environment?

EFL group

S1: İngilizce konuşabileceğim arkadaşım var, Türk kendisi, ama İngilizceyi iyi bilir, fakat kendisiyle de az görüşebiliyorum... zaten şuanda pek konuşamıyorum...

S2: Maalesef yok...

TFL group

S1: My wife, and my wife's friends.

S2: No...

S3: Yes, but all of them speak in English with me... But sometimes they some words in Turkish...

S4: I do have some Turkish friends.

2nd interview (14. 01. 2004)

Q2: Can you study English- Turkish without exploiting your coursebook?

EFL group

S1: Çalışamıyorum...

S2: Yok...

S3: Hayır...

TFL group

S1: No

S2: I learn from my environment a great deal too...

3rd interview (26. 02. 2004)

Q3: Can you study English- Turkish from any other source than your coursebook?

EFL group

S1: Çalışmıyorum... Ekstra çalışabileceğimiz hiç bir şey yok. Kitaba bağlıyız...

S2: Yok...

S3: Yardımcı kitapları da kullanıyorum, workbook, grammar book...

TFL group

S1: I continually study from the book.

S2: I have some friends and I try to learn from them...

S3: TV izliyorum, and I listen to music, Türkçe, of course... I learn from them a bit too...

Q4. How important is your coursebook for you while learning a foreign language?

EFL group

S1: Bence çok önemli, yoksa nasıl öğrenebiliriz başka türlü?...

S2: Ders kitabı önemli, ama aynı zamanda , TV de olmalı, daha farklı materyaller de olmalı.

S3: Tekrar yapmak için, soru çözmek, iyi oluyor...

TFL group

S1: I,m just moving to a new flat so I hope that there will be more Turkish than now, I need practice more than my coursebook here...

S2: At the begining of the course, çok önemli... di.. şimdi konuşmak, yani... er... pratik daha önemli...

4th interview (24. 03. 2004)

Q5: Where do you learn more from: your environment or your coursebook?

EFL group

S1: Ders kitabından...

S2: Coursebook-tan, workbook-tan... sınıf dışında zor öğreniriz...

TFL group

S1. From my environment!

S2: I'm learning from book usually. I'm like this... that's my style.

S3: Environment! İnsanlardan, TV, radyodan...

Q6: Which learning tool have you used the most for learning English-Turkish throughout the course?

EFL group

S1: Okulda ders kitabını, evde de gramer kitabı, genel olarak.

S2: Coursebook-u kullandım.

TFL group

S1: İlk başta kitaptan çalışarak, sonra arkadaşlarımla konuşarak, yani... er... pratik yaparak...

S2: Genellikle insanlarla pratik yaparak, ve başta kitaptan çalışarak Türkçe öğrendim.

5th interview (14. 04. 2004)

7: *Do you still use the coursebook intensively as you did at the beginning of the course?*

EFL group

S1: Okuma konularında, ders kitabına genelde ihtiyacımız var, ama gramer olarak artık o kadar ihtiyacımız yok... ama yine de evet...

S2: Evet, her açıdan yönlendirmesi için ders kitabına ihtiyacımız var.

TFL group

S1: İlk başında kitabı çok kullandım, ama şimdi daha çok konuşarak öğreniyorum.

Çünkü, bence bir dil öğrenmek için konuşmak en iyi yoldur...

S2: Hayır, hayır, şimdi çevreden daha çok öğreniyorum...

Q8: *Have you used any other tools than the coursebook for learning English-Turkish throughout the course?*

EFL group

S1: Çok fazla ortam olmadı, ders kitabı dediğim gibi birincisi, yardımcı gramer kitapları, ve belki yabancı kanalları, internet, ama onlar da çok az...

S2: Hayır kullanamadım.

TFL group

S1: Tabii kullandım. En çok TV izleyerek, gazette okuyarak, insanlarla konuşmak, daha iyi Türkçe öğreniyorum.

S2: Gazete okuyorum, Türkçe muzik dinliyorum, ve Turk kızlarla konuşuyorum...

6th interview (21. 05 2004)

Q9: *How much help have you received from your environment in learning English – Turkish?*

EFL group

S1: Türkiye’de İngilizce öğrenmek için çevredeki koşullar çok fazla yardımcı değil, konuşacak biri olması gerekiyor.

S2: Pek yardımı olmadı.

TFL group

S1: Başka bir ülke, ülkede öğrenseydim, bu kadar örne...öğrenemezdim...

S2: Çok...

Q10: What would the main tool be without which you would not be able to achieve the same in this course?

EFL group

S1: En başında düşünülürse, bir kitap, bir ders kitabı, o olmasaydı zaten başlangıçta öğrenme de olmazdı.

S2: Ders kitabım...

TFL group

S1: Mmm... en çok çevre olmasaydı, bu kadar iyi Türkçe öğrenemezdim.

S2: Başka bir ülkede Türkçe öğrenseydim, bu kadar örne... öğrenemezdim...

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW RESULTS – TEACHERS

(15. 05. 2004.)

Q1. What is the main aid for you and your students in teaching / learning a foreign language?

EFL group

T1: Bizim yoğun bir program olduğu için kitaplar çok önemli, çünkü planlı bir şekilde öğretebilmek için kitaplar gerçekten önemli, bunun dışında yapabileceğimiz konuşma aktiviteleri de çok önemli, ama en önemlisi kitap.

TFL group

T1: Bence en önemli araç kitaptır, öğretmenin kendisi, üçüncü olarak ta öğrenciler.

T2: İnsan ...kitaplar da çok önemli onlar için, bizim kullandığımız kitaplar, dışardan da... eğer okuldan sonra eve gittiklerinde ne yaptıklarıysa bizim kitaplarımızda ödevlerini yazıyorlar, mesela, o da önemli bir araç...

2. Do you think it is necessary to use a coursebook or not? Why, why not?

EFL group

T1: Kitap kullanmak çok gerekli, çünkü belli bir program içinde öğretmemiz gerekiyor, ders kitabı o programı sunuyor bu yüzden diyebiliriz.

TFL group

T1: Evet, bence çok önemli, çünkü, öğrencilerin konuyu takip etmesi için ve kendilerinin de evde bağımsız çalışma yapabilmeleri için mutlaka ders kitabı olmalı.

T2: Çünkü bir yöntem belirlemek zorundasın öğrenciye, bir yabancı dil öğretirken, o yöntemi kitabında uygulamak zorundasın, teknikler uygulamak zorundasın, dolayısıyla bir sistem içerisinde öğretmek zorundasın, onu da ancak yazılı bir kaynaktan oluşturabilirsin, o da, bu nedenle, bence ders kitabı çok gerekli, ayrıca öğrencinin sadece dinleyerek, sadece görerek değil, aynı zamanda okuyarak da bir şeyleri öğrenmesi gerekiyor, dolayısıyla kitap, bize göre en temel araçlardan biri zaten.

3. Is the coursebook you used suitable as a self-study material?

EFL group

T1: Ders kitabı uygun değil, yalnız çalışma kitabı uygundur, tabii ki. Zaten öğrendikleri her konuyu, pratik olarak orada tekrar ediyorlar. Ama ders kitabında tek başına öğrenci çalışarak yapamaz diye düşünüyorum. Tek başlarına şu şekilde yapılacak alıştırmaları zaten yukarıda ne şekilde yapılması gerektiğini öğrenciye veriyor, bunu uygulayabilirse öğrenci tabi ki yapabilir, ama genelde seviyesinin üstünde olduğu için, onu anlamakta zorluk çekebilir, zaten biz söylemedikçe onlar da dikkat etmiyorlar.

TFL group

T1: Alıştırmalar ve okuma parçaları öğrencilerin yalnız çalışması açısından uygun, ama gramerleri mutlaka bir, yönlendiren biriyle, bir öğretmenle, çalışmaları gerekirdi.

T2: Çok kolay değil öğrencilerin kitabı tek başına kullanabilmeleri. Bir öğretmene ihtiyaç duyacakları kesin, çünkü kitapta dil bilgisi yapıları da var. O dil bilgisi yapılarını öğrenciye anlatacak biri lazım. Dolayısıyla yanında mutlaka birine ihtiyaç duyuluyor.

4. Is there a teacher's book and does it provides detailed information on the language items to be taught?

EFL group

T1: Öğretmen kitabı var, gayet açıklayıcı, yalnız alıştırmalar olarak öğretmen kitabı olarak bize fazla materyal sunmuyor... Açıklama olarak, neyi ne şekilde yapılacağı konusunda, yeterli diyebiliriz ama, alıştırmalar çok fazla sunmuyor.

TFL group

T1: Hayır öğretmen kitabımız yok, hayır...

T2: Yok.

5. Do you use your coursebook all the time in the class? If not, when do you use it?

EFL group

T1: Ders kitabını her zaman kullanmak zorundayız, buranın sistemiyle ilgili biraz, ama arada bir kullanmadığımız oluyor, ama çoğunlukla ders kitabı kullanıyoruz.

TFL group

T1: Her zaman kullanıyoruz, derslerimizin gidişatı böyle çünkü... Kendimiz sık sık ek materyaller de kullanıyoruz.

T2: Her an değil, hayır, zaten kitabımız da ona göre ayarlanmış bir kitap. Örneğin konuşma konusunu elbette kitaptan alabilirsiniz, ama dışardan da yararlanabilirsiniz. Kendi kendine de bir konuşma konusunu belirleyebilirsin, her an kitapla ders yapamazsın.

6. *Can you imagine one week of systematic teaching without using the coursebook? How would it be?*

EFL group

T1: Aslında düşünemem, düşünürsem de, kabüs olurdu.

TFL group

T1: Bunu yapanlar var, tamam, olabilir, öğretmenlerin kendi planlarıyla ve işte dışardan getireceği ek materyallerle olur, ama bence sağlıklı olmaz.

T2: Evet, evet düşünebilirim, ama böyle düşünebilirim. Şu ana kadar edindiğim deneyimlerle şöyle düşünüyorum. Tamamen onunla ilgili. Yani, kimi zaman özel öğrencilerle, ya da özel amaçlı ayarladığımız kurslarımız var, onlara kitapsız da girebiliriz. Özel amaçlı sınıf olabilir, ama tabii ki yazılı bir şeyler de kullanıyorum. Bu kitap yazılmadan önce de eski kitabımız çok yetersiz olduğu için kitabı % 5 falan kullanıyorduk. Onun dışında hep bizim deneyimlerimizin oluşturduğumuz ekstra etkinlikler, onlarla işliyorduk dersi, dolayısıyla, çok yaptığımız bir şey, düşünebilirim. Ama kitabın faydasını çok gördüğüm için, kesinlikle kitapla birlikte ders yapmayı tercih ederim.

7. *Is there a teacher's book and does it provides detailed information on the language items to be taught?*

EFL group

T1: Aslında ikisi de uygun diye düşünüyorum çünkü, ben mesela, kendi ana dilimi kullanan öğretmen olarak kullanıyorum, bir de bir arkadaşım var, o da yine native speaker, o da kullanıyor ve gayet rahat olduğunu söylüyor... Uygundur.

TFL group

T1: Kitap hem yabancı hem de Türk öğretmenlerin öğretebilmesi için uygun, ama bence ana dil konuşucusu olmayan bir öğretmenin bu dili öğretmesi ne kadar uygundur o konuda her zaman kafamda bir soru işareti var, ama genel olarak kitap uygun...

T2: Eğer öğretmen yeterince eğitim aldıysa Türkçe konusunda elbete yeterli. Çünkü içerisinde yeni bir terminoloji var, bu terminolojiyi öğretmenin çok iyi biliyor olması lazım.

APPENDIX E

A MATERIAL EVALUATION FORM FOR THE EFL AND TFL LEARNERS

Adapted by the researcher from Jeremy Harmer (1991)

Scales: (1) - not at all, (2)- some, and (3)- a great deal

Questionnaire

Coursebook:

Name of the student:

Coursebook evaluation:

1. Is the layout and design of your coursebook appropriate and attractive?

1 2 3

2. Are the instructions in your coursebook clear?

1 2 3

3. Does your coursebook provide a balance of appropriate activities?

1 2 3

4. Does your coursebook have an appropriate balance of language skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing)?

1 2 3

5. Does your coursebook support accuracy?

1 2 3

6. Does your coursebook support fluency?

1 2 3

7. Is the target language introduced in motivating and realistic contexts in your coursebook?

1 2 3

8. Does your coursebook have adequate supportive materials such as workbooks, audio/video cassettes, CDs, flashcards...etc?

1 2 3

9. Is your coursebook suitable for self- study mode?

1 2 3

10. Is the subject and content matters in your coursebook interesting and relevant to you?

1 2 3

11. Is your coursebook an important aid for learning a foreign language?

1 2 3

12. Does your coursebook provide necessary information about target language culture?

1 2 3

13. Does your coursebook provide necessary information about social roles in target language culture?

1 2 3

14. To what extent has your reading skill been improved as a result of using this coursebook?

1 2 3

15. To what extent has your vocabulary range increased as a result of using this coursebook?

1 2 3

16. To what extent has your writing skill increased as a result of using this coursebook?

1 2 3

17. To what extent has your listening ability increased as a result of using this coursebook?

1 2 3

18. To what extent has your comprehension skill increased as a result of using this coursebook?

1 2 3

19. How often you had a chance to use language presented in your coursebook (in your daily life)?

1 2 3

20. Could you have achieved the same in this course if you had not used this coursebook?

1 2 3

Anket

Ders kitabı:

İsim:

Ders kitabın değerlendirilmesi

1. Yararlandığınız ders kitabı düzenleme ve desenleme açısından sizce uygun ve çekici mi?

1 2 3

2. Alıştırmadaki yönergeler yeterince açık mı?

1 2 3

3. Kitabınız dengeli bir alıştırma dağılımı içeriyor mu?

1 2 3

4. Dört dil becerisini de dengeli bir biçimde içeriyor mu?

1 2 3

5. Doğru bir dil kullanımı sağlıyor mu?

1 2 3

6. Akıcı bir dil kullanımı sağlıyor mu?

1 2 3

7. Yabancı dil gerçekçi ve güdümlayici bir şekilde sunulmuş mu?

1 2 3

8. Kitabınız uygun ve destekleyici ek malzeme sunuyor mu (çalışma kitabı, işitsel-görsel kasetler, CDler, resim kartları) içeriyor mu?

1 2 3

9. Öğrencinin bireysel çalışması ve verim alabilmesi için uygun mü?

1 2 3

10. Kitap, konuları ve içeriği bakımından sizin için ilgi çekici ve uygun mu?

1 2 3

11. Sizce ders kitabınız yabancı dil öğreniminde önemli bir faktör mü?

1 2 3

12. Kitabınız hedef dilin kültürü hakkında yeterince bilgi sağlıyor mu?

1 2 3

13. Kitabınız hedef dilin kültüründeki sosyal rollerle ilgili gerekli bilgileri içeriyor mu?

1 2 3

14. Kullandığınız ders kitabı sayesinde okuma beceriniz gelişti mi?

1 2 3

15. Kullandığınız ders kitabı sayesinde yeni sözcük dağarcığınız ne kadar gelişti mi?

1 2 3

16. Kullandığınız ders kitabı sayesinde yazma beceriniz gelişti mi?

1 2 3

17. Kullandığınız ders kitabı sayesinde dinlediklerinizi anlama beceriniz gelişti mi ?

1 2 3

18. Kullandığınız ders kitabı sayesinde dilli anlayabilme beceriniz gelişti mi ?

1 2 3

19. Ders kitabındaki hedef dili günlük hayatınızda kullanabilme olanağınız oluyor mu?

1 2 3

20. Ders kitabınız olmasaydı hedef dili aynı derecede öğrenebilir miydiniz?

1 2 3

APPENDIX F

MATERIAL EVALUATION FORM FOR TEACHERS

Adapted by the researcher from Jeremy Harmer (1991)

Scales: (1) - not at all, (2)- some, and (3)- a great deal

Questionnaire

Name of the teacher:

Years of teaching experience:

Subject:

1. Is the layout and design of the coursebook you used appropriate for your students?

1 2 3

2. Does the coursebook you used provide a balance of activities that is appropriate for your students?

1 2 3

3. Does the coursebook you used provide enough comprehensible input for your students?

1 2 3

4. Is there a sufficient amount of communicative output in the coursebook you used?

1 2 3

5. Is target language taught in motivating and realistic contexts in the coursebook you used?

1 2 3

6. Where the coursebook encourages practice, does it motivate your students?

1 2 3

7. Does the coursebook include and practice the skills your students need?

1 2 3

8. Is the language used in coursebook realistic?

1 2 3

9. Is the language used in the coursebook at the right level for your students?

1 2 3

10. Is the language in the coursebook the right type of language for your students?

1 2 3

11. Is the progression of 'new' language appropriate for your students in the coursebook you used?

1 2 3

12. Is the subject and content of the coursebook you used relevant and interesting to your students?

1 2 3

13. Does the coursebook you used contain clear guidance for the teacher about how they can be used to the best advantage (for example in a teacher's book)?

1 2 3

14. Is the coursebook you used clearly written, and are the objectives clearly stated for both students and teacher?

1 2 3

15. Does the coursebook you used provide necessary information about target language culture for your students?

1 2 3

Anket**Öğretmenin ismi:****Deneyimi:**

1. Kullandığınız ders kitabı düzenleme ve desenleme açısından öğrencileriniz için uygun mu?

1 2 3

2. Kullandığınız ders kitabı öğrencilerinizin seviyesine, yaşlarına ve ilgi alanlarına uygun etkinlikler içeriyor mu?

1 2 3

3. Kullandığınız ders kitabı öğrencilerinizin anlayabileceği şekilde bilgi sunuyor mu?

1 2 3

4. Kullandığınız ders kitabı gereken iletişimsel etkinlikleri sağlıyor mu?

1 2 3

5. Kullandığınız ders kitabı yabancı dili aslına uygun ve motive edici şekilde sunulmuş mu?

1 2 3

6. Kullandığınız ders kitabı pratiği öne sürdüğünde öğrencilerinizi motive ediyor mu?

1 2 3

7. Kullandığınız ders kitabı dört beceriyi (konuşma, okuma, yazma ve dinleme) içerip pratik yapma fırsatları sunuyor mu?

1 2 3

8. Kullandığınız ders kitabındaki dil gerçekçi mi?

1 2 3

9. Kullandığınız ders kitabı öğrencilerinizin dil seviyesinde mi?

1 2 3

10. Kullandığınız ders kitabındaki dil (resmi/ konuşma diline özgü) öğrencileriniz için uygun mu?

1 2 3

11. Kullandığınız ders kitabındaki ilerleme öğrencilerinizin seviyelerine uygun mu?

1 2 3

12. Kullandığınız ders kitabındaki konuları ve içeriği bakımından öğrencileriniz için ilgi çekici ve (yaşlarına) uygun mu?

1 2 3

13. Kullandığınız ders kitabın öğrencileriniz için açık ve anlaşılır şekilde yönlendirmeler sunuyor mu?

1 2 3

14. Kullandığınız ders kitabın öğrenciler ve öğretmenler için anlaşılır şekilde yazılıp hedefleri açık şekilde belirlenmiş mi?

1 2 3

15. Kullandığınız ders kitabı öğrencilerin için hedef dilin kültürü hakkında yeterince yeterince bilgi sağlıyor mu?

1 2 3

APPENDIX G

THE EXPLANATORY LEAFLET OF ANKARA UNIVERSITY TURKISH AND
FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESEARCH AND APPLICATION CENTERTÖMER

Ankara University Turkish and Foreign Language Research and Application Center, TÖMER was established in 1984. TÖMER was the first and the only institution to teach the Turkish language spoken in Turkey to the learners whose native language is not Turkish. TÖMER tackled Turkish, spoken by a great number of people in the world, as a 'project' and has made teaching Turkish as a foreign language have an academic base providing linguistic researches. TÖMER with the founding principle of teaching Turkish to foreign students has since been a pioneer in the teaching of Turkish as a foreign and native language by developing programmes, methods, techniques and materials. Moreover within the framework of agreements with various government and private institutions, TÖMER teaches foreign languages to Turkish citizens as well as teaching Turkish to foreigners. At TÖMER, initially, traditional teaching methods were used; yet in time, newly-developed approaches came to be put into application and today TÖMER use language material produced within the organization. Experience gained in 20 years through the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language has led to the writing of the coursebook titled the “Hitit”. For the last two years, the “Hitit” series and its supplementary material has been the standard coursebook both in TÖMER branches and in various countries. Each year, TÖMER teaches Turkish to thousands of language learners, among whom are not only those students who study in Turkey, but also foreign representatives in Turkey.

At TÖMER, language learning is organized around a programme enhanced with printed and visual classroom material, designed to meet language learning needs of language learners as well to convey features of the language to be taught. Classrooms are organized to meet foreign language teaching principles; there 5-15 students in each class. In each TÖMER branch, there is a video club and a language library to help learners improve their language skills. Also, various trips, seminars, cultural activities, and celebrations on special days are organized.

Today at TÖMER, approximately 20 languages such as, Turkish, English, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Russian, Japanese, Greek, Dutch, Bulgarian, Chinese, The Ottoman Language, Arabic and Euroasia Turkish Languages are taught.

Ankara University TÖMER is a large institution with 11 branches throughout Turkey and with its capacity which includes twenty-thousand students in a single term.

The teachers of (Turkish) TÖMER are graduates of Turkish language and literature departments of various universities. Most of the teachers do not know a foreign language: thus, only the Turkish is used in class.

The teachers of (English) TÖMER are graduates of English language and literature departments of various universities. The native language (Turkish) is minimally used in the class.

As a result of placement exam, applications are placed in one of six levels (beginning1, 2: intermediate 1, 2; advanced 1, 2). At the end of the beginning level, students learn mostly everyday speech of about 2000 words. At the intermediate level besides everyday speech, 3000 new words are taught by using some passages and articles from Turkish newspapers. At the advanced level some samples from Turkish literature, articles from

newspapers and periodicals, subjects introducing Turkish culture and Turkey, and proverbs and expressions are dealt with.

At the end of each level a certificate is given to successful students and at the end of the level of advanced 2 they receive a diploma which is accepted by all Turkish universities as evidence of their adequate knowledge of Turkish which is necessary for required courses (Turkish and Turkish History) even in English medium universities.

The HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set consists of 4 parts:

1. Course Books: HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set consists of 3 course books each with 16 units (Hitit 1,2,3). Hitit 1 is for Basic Turkish-Levels 1,2,3; Hitit 2 is for Intermediate Turkish-Levels 1,2,3; and Hitit 3 is for Advanced Turkish-Level 1,2,3.
2. Workbooks: There are 3 workbooks prepared to parallel the course books which contain exercises and classroom activities for the units.
3. Audio Cassettes: The set also contains 6 audio cassettes to accompany each level. They consist of the listening text and exercises in the Course Books.
4. Video Cassettes: The set also includes video cassettes which parallel the grammar in the Course Books, but are independent of the subjects covered in the units of the Course Books. The video cassettes consist of 16 episodes for the Basic Turkish Level, and documentaries for the Intermediate and Advanced Turkish Levels.

The units in the Course Books are composed of integrated texts, dialogues, grammar structures, exercises and listening comprehension exercises on the subjects to be covered.

During the preliminary studies for HITIT, the structures and contents of the foreign language teaching course books used at TÖMER were analyzed. The points essential to teaching Turkish as a foreign language were considered and an effort was made to use the

features and traditional motifs of the Turkish culture. The texts and dialogues used in the set are typical examples of Turkish cultural features, life style and social habits. For the Advanced Turkish course, special attention was paid to enriching the books with daily dialogues and texts, and to avoiding the cliché and memorization based ones.

The preparations for the HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set started in February, 2001. This project, which included about 30 members of the TÖMER staff, was carried out under the Project General Coordination of Aypar ALTINEL, Head of TÖMER. The sub-units of the project were the Coordination Group, the Authors Group, the Evaluation Group, the Listening Comprehension Studies Group and the Video Study Group.

During the period prior to publication, related TÖMER units were tasked with providing the necessary visual images like photographs and graphics. In every step of this project, was carried out by TÖMER's academic and administrative staff. The groups mentioned above were chosen from among the staff of TÖMER and were assigned only to this study.

HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set has been presented to institutions teaching Turkish in many different countries as well as inside Turkey. This set was introduced to the world via the internet. The advertising activities are also carried out by the related TÖMER units.

It is believed that HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set will fill a large gap in teaching Turkish to foreigners. Due to the lack of a resource book which was complete in every respect, to meet the demand of those desiring to learn Turkish and the Turkish culture, and the fact that the present books were outdated meant it was necessary to prepare a

new Turkish teaching set. TÖMER regards quality and world standards in education as being of primary importance, and thus continuously renovates its educational policy according to the universal criterion. The HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set is a direct result of the successful studies TÖMER has carried out as a scientific research and application center.

This set is designed as to provide the student with the ability to self-study using only a dictionary and a grammar book. Grammar structures according to the level are given with explanatory examples and the set reinforces the obtained knowledge through texts and dialogues. In order to correct pronunciation mistakes and to remove the difficulty in understanding, special attention was paid to make the audio and video cassettes support the written materials. Therefore the student will be able to find within this set many examples of how and where to use the grammatical structures they learned.

Formed according to the fundamental principles of Turkish Language teaching, TÖMER is the communication point for uniting the Turkish Language teaching activities abroad. It concentrates on research and follows a program based on application. TÖMER's scientific identity is not based only on teaching Turkish as a language, but on its continuing linguistics researches and study of the Turkish Language in an academic setting. HITIT Turkish Language Teaching Set is the outcome of these studies and experience. This project carried out by TÖMER, a large institution with experienced lecturers and administrative staff, will guide the people and institutions studying the education and teaching of the Turkish Language. TÖMER is the first example in teaching Turkish in Turkey, and it is a hub for teaching the Turkish Language around the world.

TÖMER has a solid academic base from which to plan its scientific researches and put them into practice.