

ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

AN EVALUATION OF EFL TEACHERS' CLASSROOM APPLICATIONS OF TOTAL
QUALITY MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES IN STATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Esra ÖZBEBEK

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA, 2006

ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

AN EVALUATION OF EFL TEACHERS' CLASSROOM APPLICATIONS OF TOTAL
QUALITY MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES IN STATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Esra ÖZBEBEK

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Rana YILDIRIM

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA, 2006

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of English Language Teaching.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Rana YILDIRIM
(Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ayten İFLAZOĞLU
(Member of Examining Committee)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zuhul OKAN
(Member of Examining Committee)

Certified that this thesis conforms to be standarts of the Institute of Social Sciences and I confirm that these signatures belong to the committee members.

Prof. Dr. Nihat KÜÇÜKSAVAŞ
(Director of the Institute)

P.S.: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures, and photographs in this dissertation, whether original or quoted for mother sources, is subject to the Law of works of Art and Thought No: 5846

NOT: Bu tezde kullanılan özgün ve başka kaynaktan yapılan bildirişlerin,çizelge, şekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hükümlere tabiidir.

ABSTRACT**AN EVALUATION OF EFL TEACHERS' CLASSROOM
APPLICATIONS OF TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT
PRINCIPLES IN STATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS****Esra ÖZBEBEK****Master of Arts, English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Rana Yıldırım****June 2006, 75 pages**

Quality in English Language Teaching (ELT) is recently the subject of much concern in many countries around the world. In Turkey, the Ministry of Education started the movement of Total Quality Management (TQM) in all state primary schools in 1990s. In line with this, there is a tendency to ask questions how well EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers having 6th 7th and 8th grade learners apply TQM principles. Thus, this study aims to evaluate the EFL teachers' classroom applications of TQM principles in state primary schools. One hundred and fifty (150) EFL teachers from 54 schools located in Seyhan and Yüreğir districts of Adana were administered scales to find about their views about the classroom applications of TQM principles. Besides, the influence of the two variables (teachers' years of experience and in-service training) on the teachers' classroom applications were investigated. To support the data collected from the scales, 10 teachers were observed during their lessons. In the light of the data gathered, this study will provide implications concerning the fact that the EFL teachers need a comprehensive training to implement TQM principles of Continuous Improvement (CI) and Teaching-Assessment (TA) in state primary schools.

Key words: Total Quality Management, EFL (English as a foreign language) Teachers, Continuous Improvement, Teaching-Assessment, State Primary Schools

ÖZET

DEVLETE BAĞLI İLKÖĞRETİM OKULLARINDAKİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN SINIFTA TKY İLKELERİNİ KULLANIMLARININ DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

Esra ÖZBEBEK

Yüksek Lisans Tezi: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Asst. Prof. Dr. Rana Yıldırım

Haziran, 2006, 75 sayfa

İngiliz dili öğretiminde kalite, dünyanın birçok ülkesinde son zamanlarda çok büyük bir ilgi alanı olmuştur. Türkiye’de Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1990’ lı yıllarda devlete bağlı tüm ilköğretim okullarında Toplam Kalite Yönetimi (TKY) felsefesini başlatmıştır. Buna paralel olarak, 6., 7. ve 8. sınıflardaki İngilizce öğretmenlerinin TKY ilkelerini sınıflarda ne ölçüde kullanabildikleri araştırma konusu olmaya başlamıştır. Bu yüzden, bu çalışma devlete bağlı tüm ilköğretim okullarında, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin TKY ilkelerini sınıf içindeki uygulamalarının değerlendirilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Adana’nın Seyhan ve Yüreğir ilçelerinden toplam 54 okuldan 150 İngilizce öğretmenine ulaşılmıştır ve TKY ilkelerinin sınıf içindeki uygulamalarıyla ilgili görüşlerini ortaya çıkarmak için geliştirilmiş bir ölçek dağıtılmıştır. Ayrıca, iki değişkenin (kıdem ve hizmet içi eğitimi) öğretmenlerin sınıflardaki TKY uygulamalarını etkileyip etkilemediğine bakılmıştır. Ölçeklerden elde edilen verileri desteklemek için, 10 tane öğretmenin dersleri gözlemlenmiştir. Toplanan verilerin ışığında, bu çalışma İngilizce öğretmenlerinin, TKY’nin sürekli gelişim ve öğretim-değerlendirme ilkelerinin sınıflardaki uygulamalarıyla ilgili, yoğun bir hizmetiçi eğitime ihtiyaç duyduklarını göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toplam Kalite Yönetimi, İngilizce Yabancı Dil Öğretmenleri, Sürekli Gelişim, Öğretim-Değerlendirme, Devlete Bağlı İlköğretim Okulları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a real pleasure to thank to people who have contributed to this study.

First of all, I would like to thank to my supervisor Asst. Prof.Dr. Rana Yıldırım, a great academician and a very helpful person, for her invaluable suggestions, everlasting support, positive attitudes and invaluable remarks which constructed the format of the study.

I would like to to express my heartiest thanks to Asst. Prof. Dr. Ayten Iflazođlu for her positive approach and help during the whole process.

I would like to give a note of thanks to Dr. Hayal Köksal for her contribution and invaluable resources.

I would like to express very special thanks to Mükerrerem Taş for her help during the construction of the format of the study.

I would like to thank to Mrs. Leslie Revis, an American teacher working at Incirlik American High School, for her reading the thesis as a native speaker.

And, finally, I want to send my very special thanks to my husband İbrahim Özbebek, my daughter Elifnaz Özbebek and our family members for their marvelous support, patience and understanding from the beginning till the end.

This study was supported by the project numbered EF2006 YL13.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION	
1.1. Background to the Study	2-3
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3-6
1.3. Operational Definitions	6
1.4. Limitations	7
 CHAPTER 2 	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1. TQM Philosophy	8
2.1.1. Historical Background	8-12
2.1.2. TQM in Education	12-18
2.1.3. Quality in ELT	19-21
2.1.4. TQM in the Classroom	22-26
2.1.4.1. Continuous Improvement in the Classroom	26-28
 CHAPTER 3 	
METHODOLOGY	
3.1. Introduction	29
3.2. Participants	29-30
3.3. Instrumentation	30

	PAGE
3.3.1. The TQM Classroom Application Scale	30-31
3.3.1.1. Developing the TQM Classroom Application Scale	31-35
3.3.2. Observation of the Lessons	35
3.4. Data Analysis.....	36

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction	37
4.2. Findings from the TQM Classroom Application Scale and Classroom Observations	37-50

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Conclusions and Implications	51-55
5.2. Implications for ELT	55-56
5.3. Suggestions for Further Research	56
REFERENCES	57-60
APPENDICE	61-74
CURRICULUM VITAE	75

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	PAGE
Table 3.1. Factor Analysis Results	34
Table 4.1. One-Way Anova Analysis of the Relationship between the Factors and the Teachers' Years of Experience.....	38
Table 4.2. T-Test Results of the Relationship between the Factors and the Teachers' Inservice Training.....	38
Table 4.3. The Nature of Inservice Training Taken	39
Table 4.4. Teachers' Awareness of TQM	40
Table 4.5. Teachers' Views about TQM	41
Table 4.6. Teachers' Views about the Classroom Applications of CI Principles	42
Table 4.7. Teachers' Views about the Classroom Applications of TA Principles	48

APPENDICE

	PAGE
APPENDIX 1	61
APPENDIX 2	65
APPENDIX 3	69
APPENDIX 4	73-74

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In all organizations the issue of quality receives much more attention than any other concepts today. However, there have always been problems with quality in different kinds of institutions because of the rapid changes in the world, which leads institutions to transform. Thus, the concept of quality has been heavily discussed in different areas, especially in commerce and in general education. For example, educators and educational leaders are searching for the meaning of Total Quality Management (TQM) in education and the contributions of this new philosophy. Some schools had great success in their quality efforts and a few have already had the ISO 9000 documents to prove their educational change (Köksal, 2000).

Today, both private and public schools have been exploring and adapting business and industry management innovations for quality improvement (Jenkins, 2003) and many educational reforms today are derived from the TQM philosophy. However, there are educators who resist applying TQM principles to the education as they do not see efficient parallels between business and education. Nevertheless, those educators who believe in the success of TQM maintain that it is “directly applicable to quality in the classroom” (Eanes, 2006, 1).

These studies bring with it the concept of TQM defined by many writers. For instance, Bonstingl (2001) defines it as a process of continuous improvement within an environment of trust and cooperation. Eanes (2006) suggests it is a “set of general principles about the fundamental culture and norms of practice of a working organization dedicated to quality” (p.1). Moreover, quality refers to continuous satisfaction of customers’ expectations and needs and the achievement of Total Quality through everybody’s participation (Köksal, 2000).

The concept of Total Quality Management is process-oriented and it will be mentioned in more details later in this study.

1.1 Background to the Study

English language education has become one of the most crucial issues today for various reasons. In this information age the number of people using English language as their first and second language has increased. This led to an increase in the number of learners and in the number of instructors teaching this language. In fact, English is used as “the world’s lingua franca” today. In addition, there is a continuous and rapid change in the use of mass media and technology (Jenkins, 2003).

For these reasons, people in the business of English Language Teaching (ELT) want to achieve quality schools but they have various problems and difficulties which hinder their efforts for quality learning and teaching at both state and private schools. For example, some institutions do not have management support for implementing their own way of teaching which may result in more successful schools (Köksal, 2000). Some schools have failed to create quality programs because of the concepts of confusion for employees and customers. Thus, they could not provide “adequate planning and resources” for teaching and learning processes. Furthermore, some teachers do not know how to “design activities” that meet their customers’ needs as they are confused about the role of students (Zackowski and Buckley, 2003, 43). They are even unaware of the fact that students should be the focus of all the activities in the classroom.

Like many other ministries of education, the Ministry of Education in Turkey is trying to keep up with the innovations and implement new techniques in education at primary schools. One of these initiatives is the application of TQM principles in the administration in primary schools in Turkey. In this way, the Ministry of Education wants to make a change in the organizational structure of the educational system (Şişman and Turan, 2002).

Turkish Ministry of Education (TME) started to apply TQM principles and sent School Improvement Models (SIM) to all state schools for quality education in 1990s. This model derives from the Deming’s Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycle (Şişman and Turan, 2002). Through this model, TME aims to spread TQM philosophy in

all state schools. In order to reach this goal, all the principals have been trained through TQM seminars. They have been introduced how to carry out SIM at their schools. In this model, teachers form teams each of which takes on different responsibilities (Yıldırım, 2002). In order to fulfill the requirements of their teams, they have regular meetings accompanied by the principal. These teams are:

- Student-centered Education
- Use of technology and the improvement of physical resources.
- In-service Training
- Social Facilities
- Health and Cleanliness
- Testing and Assessment

SIM aims to improve the teaching-learning process making use of the school's physical and human resources. It involves everybody's participation, good planning and teamwork in schools. TME developed Curriculum Laboratory Schools (CLS) in which the teaching-learning process is based on the TQM philosophy. The teachers' experiences in these schools will later be used to make changes in the educational system in Turkey (Yıldırım, 2002).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Since TQM is a new approach, the state schools in Turkey have certain problems on the way to apply TQM principles. Some of them are (Yıldırım, 2002):

- Basic components of TQM such as continuous improvement, process-oriented approach, and complete participation are being neglected.
- Some schools lack equipment necessary for self- evaluation of the school.

- Concerning the TQM application process, some steps are not understood clearly.
- The assessment results of the process are not efficiently analyzed through statistical graphs.

With specific reference to the efforts to search for quality in ELT, there are some obstacles which must be overcome (Akyel, 2003). She lists the most important barriers for quality teaching and learning in ELT:

- There are crowded classrooms in state schools.
- Teachers cannot develop extra materials when the available materials are insufficient.
- They also cannot benefit from the educational technology which is very important today.
- There is still focus on grammar teaching, instead of contextualizing.
- Students are not provided with effective learning opportunities.

Another problem concerns the fact that the teachers' sole aim is to cover the curriculum or the textbook during an academic semester, rather than giving students different opportunities to develop their communicative skills in English. Covering the curriculum or covering a book is not a solution in ELT. Presently, students are required to finish a series of books and units. This rigid structured approach needs to be eliminated (Erdoğan, 2003).

There have also been problems relative to how students are being taught. For example, some state schools in Turkey, have not created a "democratic" and "collaborative" atmosphere in classrooms as they have implemented the traditional method of teaching (Yıldırım, 2002). Students have not been encouraged to express their ideas freely in ELT classrooms. As a result, students

have become passive and seen the teacher as the information giver (Jenkins, 2003). In fact the Turkish Educational System has been criticized for many years. The following problems in ELT classes have especially been observed (Özdemir, 1998):

- Some teachers are not encouraging students to work as a team.
- Teachers are unable to communicate with the class.

In addition to these problems, Demirel (2003) criticizes the way students are assessed in ELT. He claims that an isolated grammar test should be replaced by skill-based tests (listening, speaking, reading and writing tests). For him, this is what Total Quality is.

The competition for a better English language education was the starting point of this study. With this in mind, the aim of the study is two-fold: (1) to evaluate EFL teachers' classroom application of Total Quality Management principles in state primary schools and (2) through such evaluation, to make proposals for future TQM training undertaken in schools.

This study aims to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are EFL teachers' perceptions concerning the implementation of TQM principles in their classrooms?
 - a) Does taking in-service training have any influence on EFL teachers' perceptions of applying Continuous Improvement (CI) and Teaching – Assessment (TA) principles?
 - b) Does EFL teachers' years of experience have any influence on their perceptions of CI and TA?
2. How do EFL teachers actually reflect TQM principles and procedures in their classroom practices?

TQM as a management philosophy in the school administration is not in the scope of this study.

In order to find answers to the following questions, a scale was developed. This scale was adapted from Mukhopadhyay (2005, 83) teachers' questionnaire which has been widely used for eliciting teachers' perceptions of TQM (see Section 3.3 for detailed information).

1.3 Operational Definitions

In this study, following terms should be considered in their meanings below:

Total Quality Management (TQM): It is a system of continuous improvement employing participative management, training, problem solving teams, statistical methods, long-term goals and recognition that the system, not people, produces inefficiencies (Chaudron, 2000,14).

Continuous Improvement (CI): It is a process in which teachers discuss their ideas and find ways of improving individually and collectively in their work with each other and with the students (Bonstingl, 2001, 1).

Teaching and Assessment (TA): It is a process in which teachers focus on mastery learning and continuous improvement and use exams to modify teaching/ learning process (Fitzgerald, 2005, 4).

TQM Classroom Application Scale: It is a scale which elicits teachers' perceptions of the classroom applications of TQM principles (Mukhopadhyay, 2005, 83).

The abbreviations used in the study are as follows:

ELT: English Language Teaching

EFL: English as a foreign language

1.4. Limitations

The results gained from this study cannot be generalised due to the following limitations:

- The scale was administered to only 150 teachers working in the State Schools.
- The perceptions of the teachers working in the Primary Schools have not been investigated.
- The classroom observations were limited to only 10 teachers.
- The relationship between such variables as gender and age and teachers' perceptions of TQM has not been investigated.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. TQM Philosophy

2.1.1. Historical Background

During the 1930's, Dr. W. Edwards Deming, known as "the father of quality", with Walter A. Shewhart suggested to develop statistical control techniques which can be applied to management processes (J. S. Arcaro, 1995, 5). During World War II, Deming explained to the government how Shewhart's statistical quality control methods could be taught to workers. Later, Deming's quality control methods received greater attention in Japan. Japan's economic success is the result of the application of Dr. Deming's quality methodology (J. S. Arcaro, 1995). However, there have been some negative consequences of TQM on Japanese workers recent years. For example, some of them attempted to suicide because they had to work a lot for many hours (Sebastianelli & Tamimi, 2003).

In fact, some examples of unsuccessful TQM initiatives have made researchers to examine the obstacles on the implementation of TQM. The followings are the TQM barriers found by researchers (Sebastianelli & Tamimi, 2003, 45):

- inadequate human resources development and management
- lack of planning for quality
- lack of leadership for quality
- inadequate resources for TQM
- lack of customer focus

Inspite of these obstacles, some researchers believe that it leads to a better working environment and the aim is to achieve customer satisfaction. To illustrate, Chaudron (2000, 23) defines TQM as "consistently producing what the customer wants while reducing errors before and after delivery to the customer".

Juran, also recognized as one of the pioneering figures in quality, defines quality as “fitness for use” and states a clear mission of a school, that is, “to develop programs and services that meet the needs of the user i.e., students and society” (In J.S. Arcaro, 1995, 6).

Like Deming, Juran (in Jenkins, 1998) also focused on quality as the vital goal. Some of Juran’s principles are:

- The pursuit of quality is a never-ending process.
- Quality improvement is an ongoing process, not a one-shot program.
- Quality requires hands-on leadership by school board members and administrators (p.86).

Quality is actually to expect “the best from each and every individual, not just from the top”. It also means continuous improvement; “doing little and big things better, working together and taking the long-range view” (J. Arcaro, 1995, 6).

TQM, as a philosophy, was also defined by different writers. For instance, Oakland (2004) define TQM as “ a system of continuous improvement employing participative management and centered on the needs of customers” (Chaudron, 2000, 14). He also lists the key elements of TQM: employee involvement and training, problem solving teams, statistical methods, long-term goals and recognition that the system, not people, produces inefficiencies.

Borahan and Ziarati (2002, 261) describe TQM as a way of “managing to improve the effectiveness, flexibility and competitiveness of a business as a whole. It involves whole companies getting organized in every department, every activity, every single person, at every level” .

Oakland (2004) defines TQM as a collection of activities which answers the question of ‘Can we do the job correctly’ or ‘Are we capable of doing the job correctly’ instead of the question ‘Have we done the job correctly?’. In fact,

Oakland (2004, 262) tries to emphasize one of the major principles which is “PREVENTION, NOT DETECTION”. He also calls this principle “process capability” in which the following inputs are evaluated before getting the output (Oakland, 2004, 262):

- Materials
- Procedures
- Methods
- Information
- People
- Skills
- Knowledge
- Training

The outputs can be:

- Products
- Services
- Information
- Paperwork

Thus, in the view of TQM, the complete work is a process and one can improve the process only with data. In this way problems or “defects” are prevented at the beginning and thus quality is achieved by working on details, eliminating “unnecessary steps and assuring appropriate procedures” (Borahan and Ziarati (2002, 152).

The change for quality requires top-level commitment, effort, and willingness to change. This atmosphere should be created in order to “keep customers satisfied

by providing them with quality products”. Chaudron (2000) contributes to this argument, claiming that commitment to quality must start from the top of the organization. If the priority of people at the top is quality, priority of other workers will be the same. What is unique of TQM is “its call for a restructuring of management methods to create that quality.” Thus, managers have to be leaders who “not only work in the system but also on the system” (Chaudron, 2000, 45).

Similarly, depending on his work with Japanese managers and others, Deming outlined 14 steps (Deming’s 14 Principles) that managers in any type of organization can implement a total quality management program (Bonstingl, 2001, 54):

- Create constancy of purpose
- The new philosophy
- Cease dependence on mass inspection
- End lowest-tender contracts
- Improve any process
- Institute training on the job
- Institute leadership
- Drive out fear
- Break down barriers
- Eliminate exhortations
- Eliminate arbitrary numerical targets
- Permit pride of workmanship
- Encourage education
- Top management commitment and action

Deming realized that workers are able to “keep control charts of their own work and thus monitor the quality of the items they sent down the production line” (quoted in Bostingl, 2001, 9). He believed that if these workers are educated to manage their own processes, the quality of the outputs will improve. Shewart taught Deming a three-step cyclical process to maintain higher quality production. Shewart’s cycle of Specification-Production-Inspection was later changed into a four-step process by Deming. He called it the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) Cycle.

Mukhopadhyay (2005), currently the Director of the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration in New Delhi, sees quality as “a positive and dynamic idea achievable by design with meaningful investment and not a negative idea of absence of defect”. He also suggests that quality can be any of the following (Mukhopadhyay, 2005, 19-20):

- Perceptual (as perceived by the customer)
- Both process and product
- Perfection
- Fitness for purpose
- Relative, not absolute

Mukhopadhyay (2005) also defines quality as “to be the best and stay there: being the best means being the best among the better ones and staying there means other better ones are approaching the standard of the best and thus the best has to continuously move further” (p.19).

2.1.2. TQM in Education

The idea of applying the TQM philosophy in education was first introduced by Tribus (In Özdemir, 1994) who claims that adapting TQM to education is “central to the idea of developing flexible adults able to cope with a changing world” (p.15). He also suggests that the main feature at the heart of TQM is a problem-solving ability and problem solving requires an educational system, a social system, a technical system and a managerial system.

Bonstingl (2001) explains four vital factors of applying TQM in education and he calls these four characteristics “the Four Pillars of Quality” (p. 35):

- A customer-supplier focus
- Constant dedication to continuous improvement
- A process / systems approach
- Strong and consistent Total Quality Leadership

In TQM philosophy students and families are seen as customers and teachers are the suppliers. Both groups must work in an environment of “mutual support and a network of partnership to optimize the system’s effectiveness” (Bonstingl, 2001, 36). Besides, a school’s aim is to satisfy its customers looking at their needs and expectations.

In all schools of Total Quality, every individual must be committed to self-improvement continuously. This is what Japanese call “kaizen- a never ending journey of improvement for oneself, one’s family and friends, workmates, community and the world” (Jenkins, 2003, 4). Fitzgerald (2004) suggests students and teachers should form an improvement team and they continuously work on “the highest possible quality at each step in the development process” (2004, 1). In this way students are tried to be developed to their “fullest potential” (Fitzgerald, 2004, 2) . To achieve this, meetings with parents and school board members are held, and TQM elements are mentioned explaining that they need a clear commitment from the school board and the families (Fitzgerald, 2004, 2).

Apart from the awareness and commitment for everyone, a school must have a clear mission to manage continuous improvement towards higher quality standards. The standards that the school will define should focus on “developing students’ abilities to solve real-life problems rather than just memorizing subject matter” (Fitzgerald, 2004, 1).

Köksal (2003) applying Deming's quality principles in education suggests that these are 5 factors of TQM:

- Personal Leadership
- True Partnership
- System Focus
- Process-Orientation
- Commitment to Continuous Improvement (p.25).

Köksal (2003) suggests that Personal Leadership is the most important of the five essential features of quality schools because a teacher, as a leader, should be a model to students. For instance, a teacher should be an honest person so that they can learn to trust and to be trusted in all environments. Bonstingl (2001) states a leader must remove the fear out of the school. He/she should create an atmosphere where students can think "creatively, and build a partnership of mutual support for everyone's continuous improvement". In other words, a teacher is a coach helping and supporting students not "threatening, ranking or punishing" (Bonstingl, 2001, 45).

Deming (quoted in Zaczkowski and Buckley, 2003, 37) adds to this argument claiming that a leader should have the following roles:

- A leader's job is to help his people .
- A leader is coach not a judge; judging people does not help them.
- A leader must have knowledge.
- A leader must be able to teach.
- A leader must also determine, by objective methods, which employees are in need of help.

Using certain objective tools, a teacher can become an instructional leader having knowledge about the students in their classrooms. Furthermore, he or she can also help them solve their problems. As Zaczkowski and Buckley (2003) suggest “without knowledge, leaders cannot help their people and cannot identify whether the problems their organization faces are systemic or due to individuals” (p.57).

Deming also suggests that fear has no place in the school management and thus the school leader should eliminate the old fear –based system of control in the workplace (in Bonstingl, 2001).

Jenkins (2003) claims that education needs quality measurement. This does not appear on traditional organizational charts. It is mostly seen that principals assess their teachers but this is not enough; it is just a ranking which is not a quality measurement . Instead, state laws should require “school boards to orchestrate the collection of quality measurements from their customers and stakeholders (Jenkins, 2003, 25). Deming suggests measurement is very necessary and he lists seven key elements for statistical thinking (in Jenkins, 1998, 34).

- Variation is always present.
- Variation is the enemy.
- The purpose of statistics is to reduce variation.
- The key responsibility of management is to reduce variation.
- Through the use of statistical control charts, managers can determine whether variation is caused by special events outside the system or by common causes within the system.
- Ninety –seven percent of what occurs in organizations cannot be measured but must be managed anyway.

In TQM schools, continuous learning is patterned as a spiral-shaped PDSA (Plan-Do-Study-Act) Cycle. Moreover, continuous improvement is encouraged among teachers. For instance, at the Schools of Quality, teachers, the school leader, and

other staff members meet in Quality Circles to discuss their ideas and find ways of “improving individually and collectively in their work with each other and with the students” (Bonstingl, 2001, 1).

A Quality Circle is a management technique in which members set their own rules and priorities and choose the problems to be discussed. Although quality circles have their origins in industry quality circles have been used in education to “make students responsible for their own learning and increase class participation” (Moretz, 1993, 1). She also adds a detailed description of a quality circle:

A quality circle consists of a small group of people who perform the same jobs or tasks. This group meets voluntarily, on a regular basis, to discuss problems, seek solutions, and cooperate with management in the implementation of those solutions. Through the circle, members generate mutual respect and trust as they work on solutions to common, on-the-job problems (Moretz, 1993, 1).

A continuous improvement process started at Carder School in Corning, New York. It is called Koalaty Kid Project. It is now an important part of the schools throughout North America (Bonstingl, 2001). Keely (2003) suggests that this approach derives from the belief that “a child taking responsibility for his or her own learning process is powerful” (p.15). For this reason, students, in the Koalaty Kid process, learn how to use quality tools to control their own learning process. Besides, teachers and administrative staff are taught to implement the process approach, other quality principles, and continuous improvement methods to teach students to improve their own learning process. Keely (2003) also states that parents are actively involved in all aspects of the school through a Parent- Teacher Organization, Family Fun Nights and special programs.

In the Koalaty Kid approach, teachers, students, and parents are trained in six full-day sessions. They learn the following quality tools and to analyze data (Keely, 2003, 26):

- Affinity diagrams

- Brainstorming
- Fishbone diagrams
- Flowcharts
- Pareto diagrams
- PDSA Cycle

Stevens notes that because of statistical techniques and diagrams, TQM has a more structured approach to solving problems and finding solutions (in Lomax, 1996, p.65). Steven also puts forward that a leader should

- create and sustain the school's vision.
- help individuals to achieve personal and institutional goals.
- ensure that individuals have the knowledge and skills to work effectively.
- provide guidance on their performance.
- give recognition, reward and feedback (p.65).

School-wide improvement can be maintained through continuous improvement (Jenkins, 2003). Principals should take on the following responsibilities for the continuous improvement:

- Help the teacher implement continuous improvement in his or her classroom.
- Organize time for teachers to reach consensus on aligned expectations.
- Add up the totals of each week for essential information.
- Celebrate how well the students are doing with pure joy (p.37).

In fact, TQM is not a technology but an approach- a new way of looking at the school environment in which students are accepted as important individuals having social, emotional, and intellectual needs. J. Arcaro (1995) suggests

“education is personalized according to individual learning styles and the best is expected from each student (p.19).

There have been many explanations for the quality of education (Mukhopadhyay, 2005):

- Defect avoidance in the education process
- Excellence in education
- Value addition in education
- Fitness of educational outcome and experience for use
- Conformance of education output to planned goals (p.15).

Bonstingl (2001) states that Deming motivated teachers and school teachers to create such a school environment in which “strong relationships of mutual respect and trust replace fear, suspicion and division; and in which leadership from administrators empowers students and teachers to make continuous improvements in the work they do together” (p. 19). Thus, in Schools of Quality the development of every student’s “yearning for learning” is more important than grades, as Deming suggests “when graded, pupils put emphasis on the grade, not on learning” (p.19).

Bonstingl (2001) also defines TQM as a new way of thinking. It requires “consistent effort by the entire team working together toward common objectives based upon an accepted vision and mission and using quantitative and qualitative data to measure how well the system is meeting the needs of all people of the stakeholders inside and outside of the organization” (p.32). Besides, he claims “the traditional fear –ridden environment of compliance control and command must be replaced by an environment of encouragement, nurturing and collegiality”(p.52).

2.1.3. Quality in ELT

The concept of quality in English Language Teaching (ELT) rarely occurs in the educational literature. However, there has been an increase in the number of conferences and research on the quality in ELT in the past five years. For example, the October 2001 conference of the British Association for State English Language Teaching (BASELT) had a focus on quality (Thomas, 2003). As the English language is seen as an international lingua franca, it is now significant to have quality in ELT as in any other field of education. This diverted the focus on quality not only to the teaching methodology and assessment, but also to the total experience of learners. Thus, it is as important to create a high quality of real learning environment to motivate students and teachers with relevant materials as high quality teaching (Demirel, 2003).

These ideas led to the establishment of a number of associations in the field of ELT. For example, in 1991 the European Association for Quality Language Schools (EAQUALS) was founded and it aimed to “promote and guarantee quality in modern language teaching institutions” (Thomas, 2003, 237). The other associations include Advisory Council for English Language Schools (ACELS), The Association of Language Schools (NYESZE) and International Association of Language Centers (IALC) (Demirel, 2003).

These institutions of inspection have regular visits to language schools and they look at administration, recruitment, employment, training of staff, qualifications of staff, the teaching resources, the teaching in action, the size of classes, and other facilities. In fact, it is the inspection of everything and everybody involved in English teaching in institutions (Thomas, 2003). These quality standards searched for by such associations describe what is “fit for the purpose of teaching English as a foreign language” (Thomas, 2003, 238).

Similarly, the role of a language teacher in the classroom has become a “facilitator of learning” and, now, the language teacher must “manipulate much more information in several different areas of knowledge” (Köksal, 2000, 286). Moreover, he/she should require these personal skills:

- be able to communicate: talk and listen
- be persuasive
- be assertive, but not aggressive.
- be able to build teams and be a team player
- be able to lead and motivate with understanding of intrinsic psychological needs of students.
- be able to understand and apply basic statistical techniques.
- be enthusiastic about the application of TQM to learning

Although the concept of quality has been looked at a lot in commerce, and in general education, it has been discussed less in the ELT literature, and the least of all in English language teacher education. The references for the application of TQM principles to English language school management include the use of quality circles and action research (White, 1998).^{*} However, there have been some researchers suggesting that quality circles can sometimes fail because of the following reasons (Tuttle, 1996, 4):

- inadequate training
- members who are unsure of their purpose
- members who are reluctant to believe that participation is truly voluntary

Furthermore, educators tend to focus on individual achievement and personal importance, which may be contrary to group participation. Tuttle(1996, 5) also states, “highly educated circle members tend to become over philosophical about the purpose of the circle and may hamper circle progress”.^{*}

White (1998) discusses the meaning of quality in English language teacher education and he defines quality as the effective management of human and material resources which includes clarifying objectives, agreeing on quality standards between

customers and providers and working together in effective teams which are characterized by high levels of mutual trust and co-operation.

White (1998) also suggests if trainees are not given any opportunities to improve their professional judgement, their teaching will remain at the “level of craft which will not provide a sound basis for quality in English language teacher education” (p.138).

Carey and Dabor (1995), in their study on an in-service teaching initiative in West Africa, focus on different areas of English language teaching. With a series of seminars and workshops, they gave the heads of English departments some guidelines on how to manage themselves and their staff when creating quality in the work environment. Moreover, they used various techniques to discover the problems English teachers had with the administration and to improve their professional skills. At the end of the seminars, the participants discovered the importance of leadership, communication, effective team-work and non-threatening atmosphere in the working environment.

Similarly, Jenkins (1998) states that English language learners have made great use of continuous improvement strategies . In California, a teacher called Mary Miller uses continuous improvement strategies. For example, she has the list of English commands, terms and directions she expects her students to know at the end of the year. She gives weekly quizzes to students on that list. Then, she makes her students draw a graph of their own progress and also draw it of the whole class’s progress (p.108). Jenkins (1998) suggests the idea of continuous improvement is mostly the same as in general education.

By the same token, the people in the business of ELT in Turkey are trying to make great efforts to reach quality. To illustrate, a project called European Language Portfolio started and seminars about this project were being held for English teachers in Turkey. It encourages the idea that learning to learn is a lifelong process and education should not be limited to only the classroom (Sevil, 2003).

2.1.4. TQM in the Classroom

The success of quality in education depends on the quality of classroom management. The active participation of each student in the classroom is a vital factor in the students' learning process (Yıldırım, 2002). Robert Winter, implementing TQM in his classrooms suggests that involving students in the teaching and learning process creates cooperation and an increase in student participation in the lesson. He explains that he asks students what they expect from the lesson and what they want to learn and accordingly he forms student teams for each topic (in Yıldırım, 2002).

Arcaro suggests “adapting TQM to your unique style and circumstances is the way in which you truly become a “quality teacher in a quality classroom” (1995, 88). In fact, quality starts with knowing your students' needs and interests as Cafoğlu (in Yıldırım, 2002) states that teachers should obtain this data about students:

- the level of students' knowledge and talents
- the attitudes and expectations of parents.

As a result, the roles of a teacher have changed through TQM philosophy. First, the teacher should have an individual mission and develop a classroom mission together with the students. The teacher should continuously improve himself/herself. He/she should track students' progress continuously and should also know to implement TQM techniques in the classroom (Çoruh, 2001). The basic quality improvement techniques are (Jenkins, 1998):

- Plan-Do-Check-Act (Problem Solving) Cycle
- Stating the vision and mission statement
- Brainstorming
- Fishbone diagram (Ishikawa diagram)

These graphs are the Tools-Statistical Process Control(SPC)- which measure how well students are doing.(Jenkins, 1998). In fact, a quality teacher knows and uses

certain quality techniques and charts, such as brainstorming flowcharts, checksheets, histograms, experimental designs, focus groups, user surveys, scatter diagrams, and histograms facilitating decision making (Şişman and Turan, 2002).

A TQM teacher should focus on mastery learning in the classroom (Fitzgerald, 2005). In traditional classrooms, teachers usually teach following this sequence:

1. Plan.....> 2. Teach.....> 3. Test

However, in TQM classrooms, teachers follow this sequence:

Plan.....> 2. Teach.....> 3. Check.....>
4. Revised teaching.....> 5. Test

This means that the teacher should always track student progress identifying which learning some students have failed. Then, he/ she reteaches the missing subject in a different way. Meanwhile, the successful students go on to “enrichment learning or assist with instruction of those who have not achieved mastery”(Fitzgerald, 2005, 4).

Similarly, Jenkins (1998) states that the teacher in a TQM classroom should check student progress by giving small quizzes to students at least once a week and draw histograms (a technique used in TQM to measure student progress) for each course. Besides, they get feedback from students in their lessons and make use of the histograms showing percentages of student mistakes. Finally, they draw a histogram at the end of the year to be used later.

Stanko claims that the teacher is like “a group guide providing the learning experiences but allowing students to experiment, question, observe and manipulate the environment at their own pace (In Bonstingl, 2001). Köksal (2000) thinks that the teacher’s personal attitude is very important. “Flexibility, openness, and creativity are hallmarks of the TQM teachers” (p.283). In short, a teacher should break the old habits of dominating the classroom.

The student is very important in the TQM classroom as well. Thus, a student profile or checklist (including their addresses, phone numbers, their strengths and weaknesses in their learning process, areas for improvement and significant behaviours) is a significant

resource in documenting improvement. Arcaro suggests it is a good way “to keep track of modifications” (Arcaro, 1995, 64). Furthermore, student ownership and responsibility for learning is very important and this is achieved through cooperative projects and having students aware of their own behaviour in the classroom. For example, an Ishikawa diagram can let students observe themselves with the following items on the teacher’s checklist (Arcaro, 1995, 88):

- shares work
- good eye-contact
- courtesy
- shares ideas
- test solutions

For quality schoolwork Glasser (in Fitzgerald, 2005) lists six conditions which should be maintained in the classroom:

- There must be a warm , supportive learning environment.
- Students should be asked to do only useful work.
- Students should be asked to do the best they can do.
- Students should be asked to evaluate their own work and improve it.
- Quality work should always feel good.
- Quality work should never be destructive (p.2).

In line with this idea, the traditional treatment of students as in the following items are eliminated (Özdemir, 1998):

- Bad treatment (hitting, swearing, and punishing)
- Discipline: various punishments identified in The Student Discipline Regulations.

- Describing a student as unsuccessful and lazy and taking him/her away from school.
- Ignoring students all the time and not giving importance to students' ideas.

Finally, in a TQM classroom, using time effectively is necessary for quality education. Thus, teachers should do classroom activities planned beforehand as Yıldırım(2002) suggests that the teacher reaches his/her educational aims by doing daily plans regularly and using time efficiently.

Although there have been many successful initiatives for the application of TQM in education, implementing the TQM principles in the classroom is seen as a challenging task by some critics. They present certain barriers to applying TQM in the classroom and discuss the role of administrators in facilitating TQM. Schauerman and Peachy, Heverly and Chaffee and Sherr (in Andrews, 1997) describe some of the difficulties in practicing TQM principles in classrooms:

- Faculty resistance to the notion of the student as customer or beneficiary;
- Faculty resistance to interference in their disciplinary and teaching expertise;
- Differences between faculty and TQM reward and recognition systems;
- Threats to academic freedom;
- Costs of TQM training, which take away from direct classroom support (p.18).

Despite these barriers, some schools have designed models for implementing TQM in the classroom. In 1993, Angelo and Cross (in Andrews, 1997) developed a classroom assessment techniques (CAT) model. CAT was used by the faculty members to assess the quality of teaching and learning in their own classrooms.

Another technique was Baugher's LEARN (Locate-Establish-Assess-Research-Nominate) model developed at Stanford University. It requires a meeting between faculty members and a student quality team to search for opportunities for improving student learning in a specific class (in Andrews, 1997).

2.1.4.1. Continuous Improvement in the Classroom

TQM philosophy places its emphasis on continuous learning and improvement and focuses on learner-centered education. In order to create the appropriate atmosphere for this, it is necessary to focus on making learning enjoyable and to uncover the full potential of the students (Çoruh, 2001). TQM shows that this can only be achieved through a defined process; thus, learning and teaching should be based on a process-approach.

In line with the process-oriented approach, students are given more responsibilities for their own development and success in TQM classrooms. They are required to evaluate their own work rather than to simply "absorb spoon-fed knowledge" (Çoruh, 2001,336). As a result, students are first introduced to quality and then taught how to assess their own progress. To accomplish this, teachers teach their students how to use quality tools to improve learning. The basic tools are:

- fishbone diagrams
- affinity diagrams
- scatter diagrams
- cause-effect diagrams
- histograms (p.336).

Fishbone diagrams are used to communicate the common goal of all students working together headed in the same direction. The affinity diagram is used to brainstorm ways to improve their learning. The students write their ideas on the board and categorize them and give headings for each category. In fact, students' ideas on the fishbone diagram are hypotheses to test a new way of learning. (Jenkins, 2003). To illustrate, at Buena Vista Elementary School, students and teachers use quality tools for instruction; they use fishbone diagrams to identify the cause and

effect of any given situation or problem. They together write a mission statement which is created by everyone in the classroom. Another quality tool is the consensogram which shows students' perception of their knowledge, understanding or desires. Moreover, students use lotus diagrams to organize their thoughts before writing or to brainstorm ideas (Keely, 2003).

By the same token, a TQM teacher focuses on "learning to learn rather than just covering the curriculum"(Arcaro, 1995,16). Arcaro (1995) suggests that getting a mark of 100 out of 100 or covering a book completely does not show quality work and defines quality in classroom as expecting "the best from each and every student, not just from top-level students". He also suggests that quality requires continuous improvement and it means "doing little and big things better, setting and achieving higher standards, working together and taking the long-range view" (p.16).

Likewise, Jenkins (1998) claims that through continuous improvement in the classroom, students' learning becomes much more important than grades. In the approach of continuous improvement students are tested weekly and their quiz results are shown in charts and they see how well they are moving on. Jenkins states, "students love seeing that they are growing"and he adds some insights from the school in Cincinnati (p.91-92):

- Students have accepted responsibility for the learning goal.
- Students are ready and anxious to help one another reach the common goal.
- Students have become active teachers of one another.
- Teachers have a clearer picture of where they need to intervene.
- Students have a much more accurate sense of their progress.

In a similar line of thought, in the TQM philosophy, teachers should not assess student progress only looking at their exam and quiz results. The students' marks are

not as important. Instead, they should be evaluated through the teaching and learning process. Moreover, students should be encouraged to participate actively in this assessment (Yıldırım, 2002). In fact, there is a conflict between the two aspects of TQM: student assessment and the use of statistics. Though statistics is an important factor in TQM philosophy, students' marks are not perceived as important as statistics. (Yıldırım, 2002).

Similarly, schools that implement TQM principles do not use standardized tests and grades but evaluate student progress regularly throughout the year. As a result, they see students' problems earlier and try to solve them when it is not too late (Cramer, 1996). Thus, a TQM teacher should focus on the educational period or duration in order to track student progress; they should not wait for the end to see student failure. Instead they must take the necessary precautions (Özdemir, 1998).

Continuous improvement technique which Japanese call "kaizen" is not only used for improving classroom instruction but also for staff development. Mukhopadhyay (2005, 171) mentions an example of the "kaizen in staff development" and the improvement in classroom instruction:

The principal of a college of education in Mumbai in India arranged for a few audio-cassette recorders and some blank cassettes. He told his academic staff that he wished to develop a collection of audio lessons in the library. He asked the teachers, whosoever was willing, to take a cassette recorder and blank cassettes to the class and record their lectures. The teachers were also asked to take the cassette and the recorder, if needed, home and listen to the recorded lecture. Should the teacher himself/herself be satisfied, the cassette could be deposited with the librarian. If the teacher were not satisfied he/she would erase it and re-record the next class (p.171).

This example of kaizen is, in fact, simple but has long-term goals in terms of staff development and improvement of the quality of classroom instruction.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

This chapter focuses on the methodology of the research as well as the participants, the instruments, and the data collection procedures.

3.1. Introduction

This descriptive study aims to evaluate EFL teachers' classroom applications of Total Quality Management principles in state primary schools and thus, to make proposals for future TQM training undertaken in schools. Descriptive research designs involve collecting data regarding the present status of subjects of the study rather than trying to explain the relationships or making implications (Ekmekçi, 1997). Thus, the EFL teachers in Seyhan and Yüreğir districts of Adana were given a TQM classroom application scale and observed during their English lessons.

In line with the design of the study, a qualitative approach to data collection was used. As Creswell (2003), suggests, qualitative approach differs from the traditional, quantitative approaches in that it depends on the collection of open-ended data, analysis of text, or personal interpretation of the findings. Similarly, this study provides data about the perceptions of teachers by analyzing their responses given to both closed and open-ended questions in the scale.

3.2. Participants

The participants in the study were 150 EFL teachers delivering English courses to the 6th, 7th, and 8th graders (123 female and 27 male), and teaching in State Primary Schools in Seyhan and Yüreğir districts of Adana. 54 schools were visited to administer the TQM classroom application scale. Out of 54, 23 are the schools located in Seyhan District and the other 31 are those in Yüreğir. However, the classroom observation was done on the basis of willingness. Thus, in the end, 10 teachers in 5 schools were observed during their English classes. No variables, such as educational background of teachers, gender or years of experience, were taken into consideration in choosing the teachers in the study.

As for administering the TQM classroom application scales, the researcher first visited the Directorship of Education in Adana and got the official permission to submit the scales in the state primary schools in Seyhan and Yüreğir, Adana. Then, with this approval document, the researcher visited the schools and negotiated with either the principal or vice-principal in those schools. Then, all EFL teachers were asked to answer the questions as detailed as possible. Two or three days later, the researcher revisited the schools to get the scales back and asked the teachers for permission to observe their classes.

3.3 Instrumentation

As stated before, two data collection tools, TQM classroom application scale and observation, were used to collect data. Classroom observation was used to support the data acquired from the scale to reach more valid results as Frankel & Wallen (1993) state, when a conclusion is supported by data collected from a number of different instruments, its validity is thereby enhanced.

3.3.1 The TQM Classroom Application Scale

In qualitative approaches, the researcher seeks to establish the meaning of a phenomenon from the point of view of the participants (Creswell, 2003). Thus, in order to identify the teachers' perceptions, a scale (see Appendix 1) was adapted and used in the initial step of the data collection. The scale used to elicit the perceptions of teachers (Mukhopadhyay, 2005) guided the preparation of the scale used in this study. His scale comprises 11 areas that are considered indicators of quality:

- Leadership
- Teacher quality
- Linkage and interface communication with the environment
- Students: academic and non-academic quality
- Co-curricular activities
- Teaching: quality of instruction
- Office management
- Corporate life in the institution

- Material resources
- Examination
- Job satisfaction (p. 83).

It also consists of 110 items, 10 on each are mentioned above. Out of the 10, five are positively keyed and five are negatively keyed. For each respondent, for each area, the scores in positively keyed items are adjusted against the responses to the negatively keyed items. Respondents are asked to respond to each and every item by checking out one of the five possible responses, namely, Very True (VT), Largely True (LT), Partly True (PT), Not Sure (NS), or False (F). (Mukhopadhyay, 2005).

The scale used in the study was piloted twice. First, it was conducted with 30 teachers. Then the factor analysis was done with SPSS program. Necessary revisions were made before it was used. This time the scale with 42 items (see Appendix 2) was piloted with 10 teachers and their suggestions were considered to clarify some items in the scale. The factor analysis was also done for the last version of the scale (see Appendix 3). This final version of the scale consisted of 33 items concerning the TQM concepts, continuous improvement, and teaching and assessment. In the scale, there were also open-ended questions aiming to find the teachers' years of experience, the nature of their in-service training, and their opinions about TQM.

3.3.1.1 Developing the TQM Classroom Application Scale

One of the aims of this study was to evaluate EFL teachers' classroom application of TQM principles. Based on the teachers' scale proposed by Mukhopadhyay (2005), the researcher developed a 33-item TQM classroom application scale to elicit the teachers' perceptions of their classroom applications of TQM principles. A number of steps were taken to devise a valid and reliable TQM classroom application scale for teachers. Initially, all pertinent literature was reviewed. Next, considering the literature and through informal conversations with eight English teachers working at different state primary schools, the researcher drafted a preliminary version of the TQM classroom application scale with a total of 50 items (see Appendix 1). Each item was designed to prompt a Likert scale response using a five-tier system of answers: Very True, Largely True, Partly True, Not Sure or False.

The first version of the scale was edited for content by 4 instructors from the ELT Department of Cukurova University 2 instructors from the Primary School Education Department and 1 instructor from the ELT Department of Marmara University. These assessors concluded that the scale was precise. The introduction text of the scale stated the purpose of the assessment and certain points that needed the respondent's special attention. As a pilot study, this version of the scale was administered to 30 EFL teachers at state primary schools. Factor analysis of the data showed that the scale was reliable but not valid. Furthermore, after the factor analysis, 25 items remained on the scale. Thus, the researcher improved the first version of the scale.

To create a valid and reliable scale, the existing 25 items were re-worded to create a total of 42 items (see Appendix 2). The 42 items were scrambled and re-numbered before a pilot study was done, so that items related to the same topics would not be located close together. This time, the scale was administered to 150 EFL teachers, and reliability and validity were assessed again. The factor analysis revealed that two major factors were operating within the scale. The analysis yielded twenty-three items loaded strongly on factor 1; ten items on factor 2. The other 9 items did not load together with sufficient strength to be considered as a factor (see Appendix 3 for the 33 item-the TQM classroom application scale used in the study).

The researcher performed the following analytical steps to establish the final version of the scale:

1. In the first phase, to determine the factor structure of the scale, the principal components analysis was done. 14 factors with Eigen values above 1.00 accounted for 66.05 % of the variance.
2. In the next phase, the researcher investigated whether it was possible to reach a solution after conducting principle components analysis with Varimax rotation on 14 factors. Varimax analysis was performed without limiting factors, but a solution with 14 factors did not yield a consistent solution.

3. Then, the varimax analysis was done limiting factors. This time analysis was conducted with varimax rotation on two factors. Factor loads were then analyzed for this two – factor solution. Items with factor loads of .35 or lower were dropped from the scale. Also, if there was a difference of .15 points between factor loads attached to more than one item, those items were dropped from the scale too. These steps yielded a solution with two readily interpretable factors. This same factor load analysis procedure was repeated three times, and then the items that did not meet the criteria were determined.
4. After the above repetitions were complete, 33 items that met the criteria that were set beforehand and two factors that entailed these items emerged. The other nine items were dropped from the scale since they did not load on any factors.
5. Of the thirty-three items that remained in the solution, 23 were loaded on the first factor and then ten were loaded on the second factor.
6. Assessment done according to content revealed that the first factor was loaded named “Continuous Improvement” (CI) . The second factor was loaded with the with positively-keyed items related to continuous improvement, so this factor was negatively-keyed items that were originally intended to be related to teaching and assessment so this one was named “Teaching and Assessment” (TA).

Table 3.1 lists the factor loads, anti-image correlation values of the items, common variance values of the items, the items’ subscale correlations, the differentiating powers of the items, the mean and standard deviation values for the items, the Eigen values of the factors, percentages reflecting the variance among factors, ranges of, and the individual item number for the items that were loaded on the two factors in the final solution that was obtained. Items were listed from the largest to the smallest, according to their factor loads. The adequacy of the sample was tested with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test. For this solution, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sample adequacy was .72.

As Table 3.1 shows, the items’ common variance values ranged from .13 to .51, and the total items’ subscale correlations ranged from .35 to .67. The item mean values

ranged from 2.75 to 4.71, and the standard deviations ranged from .61 to 1.29. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were .89 for the first factor (continuous improvement), and .69 for the second factor (teaching and assessment).

Table 3.1 Factor Analysis Results

Items	Factors		Anti-image Correlation Coefficient	Communality	Mean	Standart Deviation	Item subscale correlation	Minimum-Maximum 27% of Groups t-value
	1.	2.						
23	.68	.22	.84	.50	4,09	.76	.67	8,75 *
20	.63	.29	.82	.48	4,00	1,09	.63	8,75 *
17	.57	.20	.79	.36	4,02	.84	.54	7,41 *
29	.56		.81	.32	3,77	1,00	.54	8,26 *
25	.55		.78	.31	3,74	.88	.53	6,35 *
12	.54	.17	.77	.32	3,72	1,14	.58	7,30 *
11	.54		.80	.29	2,76	1,29	.57	8,19 *
27	.52		.77	.28	4,01	.97	.50	5,86 *
6	.50	.18	.83	.28	3,90	.80	.50	5,04 *
31	.48	.19	.31	.27	4,39	.83	.46	4,30 *
42	.48		.77	.23	4,43	.78	.46	6,29 *
33	.47		.33	.23	4,01	1,02	.47	4,79 *
15	.45		.83	.20	3,33	1,22	.48	5,64 *
13	.44		.67	.20	4,71	.61	.40	4,22 *
34	.36		.69	.13	4,53	.67	.35	4,65 *
18	.44	.25	.80	.26	3,26	1,27	.48	5,12 *
38	.40		.63	.17	2,97	1,24	.43	5,07 *
35	.39		.63	.15	4,44	.80	.37	3,82 *
9	.38	.18	.72	.18	4,29	.78	.41	4,55 *
37	.39	.22	.63	.20	2,75	1,33	.40	5,35 *
30	.35	.16	.66	.15	3,37	1,28	.37	3,81 *
39	.35		.65	.14	3,84	.86	.39	5,46 *
2	.35		.67	.14	4,11	.89	.40	4,29 *
22		.71	.54	.51	3,14	1,27	.67	11,74 *
5	.16	.69	.51	.50	3,18	1,20	.64	9,80 *
24	.30	.52	.73	.37	4,00	1,09	.58	8,13 *
16		.47	.61	.24	4,64	.82	.48	4,18 *
3	.15	.45	.60	.23	4,70	.85	.46	3,81 *
4		.47	.62	.22	4,27	1,04	.51	6,23 *
28	.21	.42	.63	.22	4,17	1,10	.51	6,15 *
36	.23	.41	.79	.22	4,55	.89	.43	4,90 *
8		.38	.49	.15	4,63	.86	.41	3,66 *
41		.38	.48	.15	4,33	1,04	.40	5,51 *
Eigen Values	5,89	2,68						
% of Variance	17,86	8,13	Cumulative 25,99 %					
Range	35-68	38-71						
Number of items	23	10						
Cronbach alpha	.89	.69						

Note: To make results more legible, factor loads below .15 were not included in the Table, N= 150; * significant at the level of .0001. Factor 1 means “continuous improvement”, Factor 2 means “teaching and assessment;” * Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sample adequacy= .72.

3.3.2 Observation of the Lessons

To support the data collected from the scales, 10 teachers who had previously filled in the scales, were observed during their lessons. The teachers observed were those who volunteered to be observed and whose teaching schedule allowed for such observation. The teachers were asked for permission to be observed, but they were not informed about the exact day on which they were going to be observed so that it could be possible to observe the lesson in its natural atmosphere without distorting the data. During the observation, the researcher placed herself at one of the back rows in the class in order to take field notes and audio-record the lesson. The researcher stepped into and left the class with the teacher and did not interfere with anything else. As a result, a total of 10 observations, each of which lasted 40 minutes, was recorded and a total of 400 minutes of observation were conducted and recorded for data analysis purposes.

The observation checklist (see Appendix 4) used in this study was prepared by incorporating specific items which were drawn from the scale. While selecting the items to be put into the checklist, additional care was taken to include those related to observable behaviours of teachers and students in the classroom. In addition, Stronge’s (2002) study on the qualities of effective teachers and Akarca’s (2002) study on teachers’ roles according to TQM approach were other sources utilized in preparing this observation checklist. The checklist included 12 items related to the observable behaviours and a section for “other comments” of the researcher. During the observations, the researcher ticked the appropriate category (Yes, No, Undecided). She also took field-notes for the section titled “other comments”.

3.4 Data Analysis

Data analysis of this study includes the analysis of TQM classroom application scales and the transcripts of classroom observations. Regarding the analysis of the scale, the first section of the scale was analyzed through one-way anova, t-test and creating codes for the open-ended questions. In order to search for the influence of teachers' year of experience on their perceptions of TQM, one-way anova analysis was done using SPSS. As for the effect of teachers' in-service training on teachers' perceptions of TQM, t-test was done. In both analyses, means, standard deviations, and significance values (p) were calculated. The open-ended questions in this section were classified through the process of reading and re-reading. Thus, it involved creating qualitative codes for each response. These open-ended responses were all written down on the computer. Then, these codes were all loaded into the SPSS program and subjected to descriptive statistics. Some responses contained almost exactly the same expressions, so they were put in the same category. However, there were some expressions uttered by only one teacher. In this case, that specific response was written down in a separate category.

The second part of the scale was analyzed through descriptive statistics, namely calculating the frequencies of the teachers' responses to 33 items about CI and TA. In the presentation and discussion of data, the percentages were sometimes calculated by adding up the percentages concerning the respondents' answers given to for example, "Very True, and Largely True". Having analyzed the content of the scale, the data acquired from the classroom observation checklists were analyzed by taking the frequencies of ticks put. To support the data obtained from the checklists, 10 lessons (400 minutes) were transcribed and read and reread to create themes. From the themes identified, those which were relevant to the principles of CI and TA included in the scale and incorporated into the observation checklist were selected. Then, the classroom excerpts illustrating these themes were specified and used as representative samples of teachers' and students' behaviours in the classroom.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA FINDINGS

This chapter of the study presents the results of the findings obtained from the scales and observations.

4.1 Introduction

This descriptive study aims to evaluate the EFL teachers' classroom applications of TQM principles and through such evaluation, to make proposals for future TQM trainings undertaken in the schools. In line with this purpose, the EFL teachers in state primary schools were administered a TQM classroom application scale. To support the data collected from the scales, ten EFL teachers were observed during their English lessons. In order to have reliable and valid data, the scale was piloted and the factor analysis was done respectively.

4.2. Findings from the TQM Classroom Application Scale and Classroom Observations

As stated earlier, to seek answers to the research questions, two main data collection tools were combined; namely TQM classroom application scale and classroom observations. This section will present the data findings acquired from both data sources. The scale used in the study consisted of 33 questions. Responses of 150 EFL teachers, 123 female and 27 male, to these questions are presented below. The first question in the scale concerns some personal information, specifically teachers' years of experience. Table 4.1 displays the relationship between the participants' views of continuous improvement (factor 1) and their years of experience. In addition, the data regarding the participants' perceptions of teaching - assessment (factor 2) and their years of experience can be seen in the table.

Table 4.1 One Way Anova Analysis of the Relationship between CI and TA and the Teachers' Years of Experience

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Factors	The year of experience					
CI	1-5	32	84,28	10,04	2,675	,034
	6-10	37	87,08	11,05		
	11-15	39	89,62	9,44		
	16-20	22	92,36	10,39		
	21+	20	91,20	11,77		
	Total	150	88,47	10,67		
TA	1-5	32	41,84	4,92	1,161	,331
	6-10	37	42,62	5,22		
	11-15	39	41,67	4,35		
	16-20	22	39,59	6,45		
	21+	20	41,60	6,14		
	Total	150	41,63	5,29		

The first question in the scale asked the respondents about their year of teaching experience. As presented in Table 4.1, the teachers having 16-20 years of experience are more inclined to apply continuous improvement techniques than the teachers having less than 16 years of experience and more than 20 years (the oldest ones) ($p=.034 > 0.05$). Concerning teaching and assessment (factor 2), there is not a considerable difference among all the teachers ($p= .331 > 0.05$).

The second question in the scale was about their in-service training. ("Have you ever attended inservice training?")

Table 4.2. T-Test Results of the Relationship between CI and TA and the In-service Training

	The Inservice Training	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
CI	Yes	70	88,29	9,49	.194	148	.847
	No	80	88,63	11,67			
TA	Yes	70	42,09	4,84	.994	148	,322
	No	80	41,23	5,65			

Table 4.2 shows the relationship between their views of TQM classroom applications and the inservice training. As seen in Table 4.2, there is not a significant difference between the factors, continuous improvement ($p= .847 > 0.05$) and teaching-assessment ($p= .322 > 0.05$) and the teachers' receiving some sort of training.

The teachers were also asked for what type of inservice training they had received.

Table 4.3 shows the findings concerning nature of training they had.

Table 4.3 The Nature of In-service Training Taken

The Nature of In-service Training	f	%
TQM	6	10
Computer and technology	10	17
Training on the official procedures in the Ministry of Education	7	12
European language portfolio	10	17
Classroom management	1	2
Teaching maths	1	2
Student-centered education	2	3
Psychology of learning	1	2
Teaching English in primary schools	2	3
Methodology	16	28
The use of educational equipments	2	2

N= 58

As displayed in Table 4.3, only 10 % of the teachers received TQM training. The others attended different kinds of training. This means that although the teachers were required to know TQM and its classroom application, only a small number of teachers had had TQM training.

In addition to this, although some teachers claimed not to have taken any in-service training on TQM, their perceptions of applying CI and TA in classroom were

affected positively by other sorts of in-service training such as the use of educational equipments and European Language Portfolio. It implies that EFL teachers tend to increase quality in their classroom unconsciously though they did not have a TQM training.

In order to find out whether they really knew what TQM was or not, the participants were asked “Do you have any information about TQM?”. Table 4.4 shows their responses to this question.

Table 4.4 Teachers’ Awareness of TQM

	f	%
Yes	53	47
No	59	53

N= 112

Out of 150 teachers, 112 responded to the question, “Do you have any information about TQM?”. It is interesting to see that while only 10% of the teachers claimed to receive TQM training (see Table 4.3 above), Table 4.4 shows that 47% stated to have an idea about TQM.

As shown in Table 4.5 below, 27 % of the teachers believed that TQM was necessary and 14 % of them said that it was useful if used correctly.

However, 16 % of them thought that it was difficult to apply . Moreover, 5 % of them claimed that it was necessary, but they could not apply it due to insufficient teaching hours, crowded classrooms and some environmental factors. The most striking response was that schools were not interested in TQM. Another 2 % of the teachers suggested that it should be explained to the staff in detail and clearly. 2% of them believed that it did not work.

Table 4.5 Teachers' Views about TQM

TQM is ...	f	%
to make quality better	2	5
effective	4	9
useful, if used correctly	6	14
difficult to apply	7	16
leadership of the administration	6	14
very necessary	12	27
necessary but can't be applied...	2	5
to increase quality but schools are not interested	1	2
to decide on standards at a school and providing its continuity	1	2
should be used gradually at schools	1	2
should be explained in detail and clearly	1	2
doesn't work	1	2

N= 44

The questions in the second part of the scale include items about continuous improvement and teaching-assessment in the classroom (the two factors). After the factor analysis, there were 33 items left in the scale. The Table 4.6 below displays the responses of the EFL teachers to the items related to CI.

Table 4.6 Teachers' Views about the Classroom Applications of CI Principles

Items	Very True		Largely True		Partly True		Not Sure		False	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
2	59	39.3	56	37.3	30	20	3	2	2	1.3
6	35	23.3	70	46.7	41	27.3	3	2	1	0.7
9	67	44.7	63	42	18	12	-	-	2	1.3
11	18	12	23	15.3	48	32	27	18	34	22.7
12	45	30	46	30.7	41	27.3	8	5.3	10	6.7
13	116	77.3	28	18.7	4	2.7	1	0.7	1	0.7
15	29	19.3	41	27.3	49	32.7	13	8.7	18	12
17	47	31.3	66	44	30	20	7	4.7	-	-
18	30	20	32	21.3	57	38	9	6	22	14.7
20	62	41.3	49	32.7	23	15.3	10	6.7	6	4
23	46	30.7	77	51.3	22	14.7	5	3.3	-	-
25	29	19.3	66	44	46	30.7	6	4	3	2
27	57	38	49	32.7	36	24	5	3.3	3	2
29	34	22.7	68	45.3	33	22	9	6	6	4
30	29	19.3	52	34.7	35	23.3	13	8.7	21	14
31	83	55.3	48	32	15	10	2	1.3	2	1.3
33	60	40	47	31.3	33	22	5	3.3	5	3.3
34	92	61.3	48	32	9	6	-	-	1	0.7
35	86	57.3	52	34.7	8	5.3	1	0.7	3	2
37	23	15.3	15	10	47	31.3	31	20.7	34	22.7
38	17	11.3	32	21.3	60	40	11	7.3	30	20
39	37	24.7	58	38.7	51	34	2	1.3	2	1.3
42	87	58	45	30	15	10	2	1.3	1	0.7

As mentioned earlier, the teachers were asked to respond to 33 items related to CI and TA in the second part of the scale.

First, the teachers were asked whether they had close friends within the school or not (item 2). As it is shown in Table 4.6, more than half of the teachers (76%) thought that they had close friends within the school.

Concerning the item 6, 69% of the teachers thought that they used the most appropriate quality equipment available. However, during classroom observations, only 2 out of 10 teachers used the most appropriate equipment in the classroom. The other 8 teachers just followed the book during their lessons. As a result, the researcher could not see the most appropriate equipment available such as audio-visual aids in most of the classrooms.

More than half of the teachers (86%) stated that they did get prepared before teaching (item 9). Likewise, the majority of the teachers (7 out of 10), during classroom observations, used some notes or books to follow the steps in their teaching.

As for the item 11, 59 % of the teachers claimed that they used statistical tools, like graphs and diagrams, to analyze students' problems, whereas only 22% of the teachers thought that they did not use any statistical tools to analyze students' problems, but during classroom observations, the researcher did not see any graphs on the walls or in the teachers' files.

Of 150, 132 teachers said that they work with their colleagues as a team (item 12). Only 10 teachers mentioned that they did not work with their colleagues as a team. In line with this, 7 teachers were observed while exchanging their worksheet materials and asking for opinions at the break. This showed that the teamwork, which is essential for TQM, is present among the teachers.

The majority of the teachers (95 %) believed that they were honest people (item 13).

Concerning to the item 15, the majority of teachers (79 %) stated that they held meetings to motivate their students to reach a common goal. Only 21% of the teachers claimed that they did not hold such meetings with students. To sum up, more than half of the teachers had a true partnership with their students which motivated the students to attain their common goals.

The majority of teachers (95%) noted that they were very dynamic in the classroom (item 17). During the classroom observations, on the other hand, 6 out of 10 teachers

were not energetic in the classroom. For instance, one of the teachers preferred to stand at the blackboard from the beginning till the end of the lesson and did not walk around the desks. Only 2 teachers seemed to be moving around to communicate with the students and to answer their questions.

More than half of the teachers (79%) claimed that they used audio-visual aids while teaching but only 1 out of 10 teachers used some flashcards while teaching adjectives (item 18). The researcher did not see any other audio-visual aids such as tape-recorders, televisions or CDs.

Seventy-four percentage of the teachers claimed that they encouraged parents to discuss their children's performances with them (item 20). Only 11 % of the teachers said that they did not do this.

As for the item 23, more than half of the teachers (82%) believed that they guided students on how to assess their own progress. Only 4 % of the teachers were not sure about it.

More than half of the teachers (63%) noted that they planned their lessons again through self- reflection and evaluation (item 25). Only 2% of the teachers said that they did not self-evaluate themselves after teaching hours.

Another statement in the scale was about being a coach in the classroom (item 27). Seventy-one of the teachers thought that they were the coach of the students in their learning process. However, during classroom observations, only 2 out of 10 teachers seemed to adopt as facilitators or coaches in the classroom. The other 8 teachers acted the role of a traditional teacher by explaining grammatical rules and making students to write them down silently. The teacher in the following classroom excerpt, for example, wrote the names of some occupations on the board and wanted the students to write them down silently in their notebooks. Then, she said the Turkish meanings of each, one by one, and meanwhile the students just took notes (sentences with asterisks show that the utterances are in L1, Turkish and the statements in italics refer to those uttered in L2, English):

Excerpt 1:

T- Now, let's write the meanings of these jobs (*). We said *doctor*, “doktor” (*).

S- Can we write them (*)?

T- You can write, yes (*).

T: *Dentist*, “dişçi”.

T- *Nurse*, “hemşire”.

T- *Butcher*, “kasap”.

T- *Engineer*, “mühendis”.

T- *Teacher*, “öğretmen”.

T- *Mechanic*, “tamirci”.

T- *Driver*, “şöfor”.

T- *Barber*, “berber”.

She went with a few more jobs and made them repeat the new words aloud. Until the end of the lesson, she performed similar activities, for instance:

T – *Doctor*.

Ss- *Doctor*.

T- *Dentist* .

Ss- *Dentist*.

T- *Nurse*.

Ss- *Nurse*.

One of the indicators of TQM in the classroom is having a classroom mission identified by the teacher together with the students (Arcaro, 1995). Nearly all of the teachers (90%) claimed that they made their students identify their classroom mission. This indicates that the majority of the teachers apply one of the components of continuous improvement in the classroom (item 29).

The majority of the teachers (77%) thought that they used exams to improve their teaching whereas 14% of the teachers said that exams were not used for improving teaching in their classrooms (item 30).

Köksal (2000) suggests that a student should not feel scared and should feel free to ask any questions without being afraid in the classroom. Thus, the teachers were asked whether they created a warm atmosphere in the classroom or not, and the majority of them (82%) believed that they had a warm atmosphere and their students were not afraid to ask questions (item 31). Similarly, during classroom observations, 9 out of 10 teachers were observed to create a warm atmosphere in their classrooms.

Concerning the item 33, the teachers in the state schools are required to follow a schedule showing their plans for the two semesters (İlköğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği, 2003). Accordingly, 93% of the teachers were found to be in line with their annual plan. Only 3% of the teachers said that they did not follow the schedule.

An overwhelming majority (99%) thought they were objective while awarding students' marks in exams (item 34). Similarly, they were found to be objective in their classrooms during observations. For instance, 9 out of 10 teachers were observed to become fair in distributing the questions and praising students.

Apart from only 3%, 97% of the teachers said that they criticized themselves honestly (item 35).

The responses for the item 37 were scattered. Only 25% of the teachers believe that they make the decision of what to teach together with their students while 23% of the teachers claimed that they did not discuss what to teach with the students. Moreover, 31% of the teachers were found to do this partly.

As it was the case in the previous item, there were totally different answers again in the item 38. Thirty-two percentage of them claimed that they pretested their students before each unit but 40 % of them noted that they partly did this. Only 27 % of them thought that they did not pretest them before starting a new unit.

The majority of the teachers (98%) noted that they encouraged cooperation instead of competition in the classroom (item 39). In line with this, 7 out of 10 teachers were observed to encourage cooperation in their classrooms. For example, one of the teachers used peer-correction making one particular student choose a partner from

the class to help her correct his mistake. The following classroom excerpt illustrates this:

Excerpt 2:

S1: *My mother is name is Nurgül.*

T: OK. Who can help him (*)?. (*A lot of hands go up*). OK, Engin, choose one of your friends and correct it together (*).

S2- (*She makes some explanations in Turkish*)

T: Ok, well done, you two (*).

However, in the other classes observed, the teachers made the students compete instead of cooperate.

In one classroom, for instance, the teacher made the students repeat some adjectives to teach how to pronounce the words, but when one of the students misread a word, she told him to choose one to stop and chose a volunteer to restart reading:

Excerpt 3:

T: Sultan.

S1: *Small, big, tall, short....*

T: Sultan, wait (*). As we do it before, if you misread any words, we will go on with another student (*). Now, let's see how many words will you be able to read (*).

S1: *Small, big, tall, short, long, cold, young, easy, difficult, expensive ... (she misreads the adjective "expensive" and sits down)*

T: OK, wait (*). Menekşe.

S2: *expensive, cheap, cold, dangerous, high, difficult ... (now she misreads the word "difficult" and sits down)*

T: Menekşe, wait (*). Okan.

As for the last item (item 42), 88% of the teachers believed that they tried to improve themselves continuously in their profession.

Table 4.7 Teachers' Views about the Classroom Applications of TA Principles

Items	Very True		Largely True		Partly True		Not Sure		False	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
3	2	1.3	6	4	8	5.3	3	2	131	87.3
4	1	0.7	10	6.7	30	20	15	10	94	62.7
5	14	9.3	25	16.7	61	40.7	20	13.3	30	20
8	3	2	3	2	10	6.7	15	10	119	79.3
16	1	0.7	5	3.3	12	8	11	7.3	121	80.7
22	15	10	33	22	51	34	18	12	33	22
24	1	0.7	15	10	37	24.7	26	17.3	71	47.3
28	4	2.7	9	6	28	18.7	25	16.7	84	56
36	3	2	4	2.7	10	6.7	23	15.3	110	73.3
41	1	0.7	13	8.7	19	12.7	19	12.7	98	65.3

The majority of the EFL teachers (87%) thought that they shared their materials or ideas with their colleagues (item 3). These teachers' responses imply that as many teachers have close friends within the school, the number of teachers who share materials or ideas is high. In summary, teachers tend to apply one aspect of continuous improvement by being real partners.

More than half of the teachers (62%) claimed that they did not only give lectures but also performed different activities in the classroom (item 4). However, during classroom observations, only 1 out of 10 teachers was observed to use varied activities. However, the majority of them (9) only gave lectures. Similarly, in the scale, 41 teachers accepted that they just gave lectures. This indicates that the majority of teachers did not use any additional materials, which would make the lesson interesting and fun. For example, one of the teachers greeted the class and started teaching immediately. The following excerpt from the classroom illustrates this:

Excerpt 4:

The teacher, in a very serious manner, started the lesson by making the students open their books as follows:

T- Open your students' books to p. 77. We finished the first part last week; now we will do the second part (*). Now I am reading number 2. Then, I will make you read. OK (*).

T- Here, the salesman is talking to Mrs. White (*). We wrote the new words last week. What did the salesman tell to Mrs. White (*). We used the structure of *how much* and *how many* in questions(*).

S- How much cheese did you want (*)?

T- Yes, we have learned this structure (*).

T- Now, page 20, unit 8, workbook. You will complete the blanks using *too* or *enough* (*).

The teacher went on giving grammatical explanations, and it was the teacher who spoke most of the time in the classroom.

The teachers were asked how they perceived exams (item 5 and item 22). 25 % of the teachers thought exams were merely a routine. Moreover, 40% of them said that they partly saw exams as a routine. However, only 20 % of the teachers believed that they were not only a routine, but also a way of assessing themselves and improving the teaching-learning process.

More than half of the teachers (89%) thought that they let their students talk about the quality of their own work (item 8). Nevertheless, in classroom observations, only 1 out of 10 teachers let students talk about their project homework. In that class, the teacher took the students' project homework and showed them to the students one by one and made them assess each project letting them explain what they thought about the projects. Other teachers (9 out of 10) just said their own ideas about the students' work disregarding students' responses.

The majority (88%) of the teachers claimed that they cared about their students' suggestions during the learning process (item 16). However, 8 of the teachers

observed did not give any response to the students' suggestions during the learning process. Here is an example to illustrate this:

Excerpt 5:

S- Can't we use *enough* as well(*)?

T- (*No response*)

S- Can't we use *enough* as well, ma'am(*)?

T- (*No response*)

The student asked the same question twice but the teacher did not give any response.

Almost 34% of the teachers thought that they did not make any significant efforts to build up materials (item 24). However only 47% of the teachers claimed that they made efforts for creating materials. Considering that another 17 % stated not to be sure, we can say that a remarkable number of teachers still do not try to enrich their lessons through building up material resources.

Some other group of the teachers (28%) accepted that they did not update their personal library books about their profession (item 28). On the other hand, half of the teachers (56%) believed that they tried to buy and read the latest books about ELT. This reveals that more than half of the teachers keep abreast of the innovations in ELT, and they try to have much more quality in their classrooms.

Only 12% of the teachers claimed that they did not take any interest in solving students' problems (item 36). However, the majority (73%) noted that they talked to their students and helped them solve their problems.

The majority of the teachers suggested that they did not group their students according to their marks (item 41), but 22% of the teachers said that they grouped them. Thus, it seems that most teachers did not rank their students according to their marks as it should be the case in a TQM classroom.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the research findings, implications, and recommendations.

5.1. Conclusions and Implications

The purpose of this descriptive study was to evaluate EFL teachers' classroom applications of Total Quality Management principles in state primary schools and through such an evaluation, to make proposals for future TQM training undertaken in schools. Thus, the study aimed to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are EFL teachers' perceptions concerning the implementation of TQM principles in their classrooms?
 - a) Does taking in-service training have any influence on EFL teachers' perceptions of applying CI and TA principles?
 - b) Does EFL teachers' years of experience have any influence on their perceptions of CI and TA?
2. How do EFL teachers actually reflect TQM principles and procedures in their classroom practices?

The participants of this study were 150 EFL teachers, 123 female and 27 male. In order to collect appropriate data, a scale, an observation checklist and audio-recordings of the lessons were used as data collection tools.

The results obtained from the first section of the TQM classroom application scale revealed that attendance to any in-service training does not influence the teachers' classroom applications of the TQM principles. In line with this sort of finding, Akyel (2003) found that the EFL teachers both in private and state primary schools have doubts that they can be trained efficiently through those trainings. In addition, she

suggests that they believed that in-service training programs were being prepared regardless of their poor classroom conditions. Thus, it is important to note here that in-service training programs may not be well-prepared or ineffective and they are not influential factors which will affect EFL teachers' application of the TQM principles.

As for the nature of training taken, it is clear from the findings that only a small number of teachers had TQM training. However, almost half of the teachers have some information about TQM. It seems that those who claimed to have information about TQM may have learned about it through school meetings held by their principals. To the researcher knowledge, the principals are the immediate people who are subjected to TQM training. Then, they are expected to transfer their knowledge to their staff in schools.

Concerning the teachers' views about TQM, it is clear that they think TQM is very necessary and useful if it is applied correctly. On the other hand, they find the TQM efforts at schools insufficient due to the lack of detailed explanations of what TQM is and a few find TQM difficult to apply due to crowded classrooms and insufficient teaching hours.

Although the factor of in-service training does not influence teachers' perceptions of TQM at all, the findings show that teachers' years of experience affect their classroom applications of TQM principles. Teachers having less than 16 years of experience and more than 20 years do not seem to apply TQM principles as much as those having 16-20 years of experience. Therefore, it can be said that younger EFL teachers (having 1-5 and 6-10 and 11-15 years) and the oldest ones (having more than 20 years of experience) need to receive a comprehensive training on TQM principles.

The results obtained from the data collection tools revealed that EFL teachers participated in the study are inclined to implement most of the CI principles of TQM included in the scale. First of all, data collected from the scales and observations showed that the EFL teachers apply C I principles in their classrooms, even though half of the teachers who participated in the study claimed to have no information about TQM. For example, the majority of the teachers are found to have close friends

and share their materials or ideas with their colleagues, which builds up teamwork among them as Bonstingl(2001) claims “teachers work as teammates and partners in removing the obstacles to student and teacher successes; they work together to build success with each other and with a number of students” (p.102).

In addition, they mostly have a true partnership which supports the continuous improvement in the classroom. To illustrate, the majority of the teachers hold meetings with their students to motivate them to reach their common goal and to fulfill their classroom mission. More than half of them also encourage parents to discuss their children’s performances with them. Related to this, Bonstingl (2001) notes that TQM requires “helping students by providing vision and support toward the aim and mission of the school” where parents are “integral part of the student’s progress from the very beginning through the end of the schooling process”(p.101-103).

Moreover, a great number of teachers have a warm atmosphere and cooperation in the class which enables students to participate in the lesson freely. In traditional classrooms, lessons are linear and there is a one-way communication which Bonstingl (2001) calls “competition-based” (p.101). However, in a TQM classroom, learning is like a spiral with off-shoots, with energy directed toward cooperation” (p.101).

However, in some aspects of CI, the teachers were found to become insufficient to apply the principles. First of all, although they claimed that they used the most appropriate quality equipment available, the classroom observation data showed that the majority of the teachers did not use such equipment as audio-visual aids. Moreover, though they suggested that they were energetic, the classroom observations revealed that more than half of the teachers were not dynamic which might affect students and the learning process negatively.

It was also obvious from the classroom observations that the majority of the teachers were not coaches although they thought that they acted as facilitators during lessons. Köksal (2000, 284) emphasizes the importance of the language teacher’s

position in a TQM classroom noting “the role of the teacher is to be a coach rather than an active player”.

Finally, almost half of the teachers stated that they did not use statistical tools like graphs or histograms to analyze students’ progress. However, no such tools were shown to the researcher on her request after the observations. This implies that nearly half of the teachers lack sufficient knowledge about basic statistics which is considered very necessary by TQM principles to track students’ continuous improvement. However, a language teacher in a TQM classroom must be able to “understand and apply basic statistical techniques” (Köksal, 2000, 286).

As for the teachers’ perceptions of their applications of TA principles, the findings show that the majority does not apply these principles in their classrooms. For instance, even though a great number of teachers claimed that they did not only give lectures in the classroom, findings from the observations revealed that the majority of the teachers just gave lectures making grammatical explanations using only the textbook and board. However, Köksal (2000) suggests that the TQM classroom should become “more interactive, with less lecture time and better use of student teamwork” (p.105).

With regard to the teachers’ attitudes to their students during lessons, it was found that many teachers did not care about the students’ suggestions during the learning process and did not let their students talk about the quality of their own work. However, a TQM teacher should be “the most enthusiastic and dedicated learners in the classroom” (Mukhopadhyay, 2005, 34). Besides, he /she should be “willing to innovate, and learn, from and with her students” (Köksal, 2000, 286).

Regarding their responses to the question about building up new materials, the majority of the teachers claimed that they made efforts to create some, but during the observations, many teachers were observed not to use extra materials apart from the textbooks. Furthermore, a considerable number of teachers accepted that they did not update their personal books in ELT. This result is not surprising, considering the finding showing that they did not attempt to enrich the learning process in their classroom by using different materials and activities. Similarly, İspınar (2005) found

that the majority of EFL teachers in the state primary schools were not observed to use varied materials to make teaching more effective although they claimed to use extra materials in their lessons.

Moreover, a considerable number of teachers perceived the exams only as routines. However, another majority consider exams as a way of improving their teaching, which is a very essential point in TQM principles. In fact, an exam is “a means of modifying (improving) the teaching/learning process in a TQM classroom” (Bostingl, 2001, 103).

To sum up, the EFL teachers did not seem to be in line with the TQM principles about CI and TA although they claimed that they applied those principles in their classrooms. Besides, their in-service training courses, except for their years of teaching, did not influence their classroom applications at all. Thus, in the light of the data gathered, the study revealed that the EFL teachers need a comprehensive training to implement TQM principles of Continuous Improvement (CI) and Teaching-Assessment (TA) in state primary schools.

5. 2 Implications for ELT

This descriptive study revealed that a vast majority of teachers have difficulty in applying TQM principles in the classroom although they claim that they implement most of those principles (CI and TA). Thus, if the purpose is to reach quality by eliminating the rigid structure of teaching and assessment and encourage continuous improvement among the teachers, the EFL teachers should have in-service training courses and also these courses should be given in small groups in order to be effective. There should be group discussions and surveys of some real cases from schools so that teachers will really learn how to implement the TQM principles in the classroom. In order to enable EFL teachers to have such training courses, the Ministry of Education should collaborate with the universities and first train the people in the administration (principals). Then, teachers should be trained through organized and systematic meetings held by the principals. This implies that these in-service training courses should be given by TQM experts who know effective communication skills. For example, the concerned instructors from universities can be invited to give courses and in this way the teachers will be able to explore the

new ideas and improve themselves.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

In this study, the teachers were observed to support the data collected from the scales. The observation results proved that the number of teachers observed is not enough to have a clear picture of the classroom atmosphere. Further studies including more participants in classroom observations and the use of videotaping the lessons are likely to yield more reliable data. Furthermore, the teachers can also be interviewed for further questions or comments.

After classroom observations and administration of the scales, it would be helpful to conduct a further research, taking into account different variables such as teacher motivation, and the school profile (state versus private schools) to see whether these variables influence EFL teachers' perceptions of TQM principles as well as their classroom applications. Moreover, based on the data findings acquired from the TQM classroom application scale, some teachers who were found to apply TQM principles and those who were not can be subjected to a longitudinal study through which their classroom applications can be observed and compared.

Finally, it would be very worthwhile to conduct a further study in which the classroom practices of the teachers who have taken TQM in-service training can be observed and compared with those who are deprived of such training.

REFERENCES

Akarca, M. (2002), “Eğitimde Toplam Kalite anlayışına göre öğretmen rolleri ve bu rollere ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri”, *Unpublished Master Thesis*, Çukurova University,-Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Akyel, A. (2003), “Yabancı bir dil olarak İngilizce eğitimi ve öğretiminde yaşanan sorunlar, çözümler ve gelişmeler”, In İ. Erdoğan (Ed.). *Türk eğitim sistemi'nde yabancı dil eğitimi ve kalite arayışları* (pp.97-103). İstanbul: Özyurt Matbaacılık.

Andrews, H. A. (1997), “TQM and faculty evaluation: ever the twain shall meet?”, Eric Digest: ED408004.

Arcaro, J. (1995), *Creating quality in the classroom* , USA: St. Lucie Press.

Arcaro, J. S., (1995), *Quality in education*, USA: St. Lucie Press.

Bonstingl, J.J. (2001), *Schools of quality*, USA: ASCD.

Borahan, N.G. & Ziarati, R. (2002), *Developing quality criteria for application in the higher education sector in Turkey: total quality management*, İstanbul: Özyurt Matbaacılık.

Burnham, J. W. (1998), *Managing quality in schools, a TQM approach*”, London: Longman.

Carey, J. and Dabor, M. (1995), “Management education: an approach to improved English Language Teaching”, ELT Journal, 49/1, 37-43.

Chaudron, D. (2000), *TQM vs re-engineering: a tale of three villages*, New York: Elsevier Publications.

Creswell, J.W. (2003), *Research design qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage Publications.

Çoruh, M. (2001), “A methodology in higher education training-Baskent University experience”, Avrupa Kalite Teşkilatı (EOQ) 45.Yıllık Kongresi.

Demirel, Ö. (2003), “Avrupa Birliği ve dil eğitimi”. In İ. Erdoğan (Ed.). *Türk Eğitim Sistemi'nde yabancı dil eğitimi ve kalite arayışları* (pp.51-56). İstanbul: Özyurt Matbaacılık.

Eanes, R. (2006), Total Quality Management [On-Line]. Available: <http://stedwards.edu/cte/resources/tqm.htm>. Accessed: April, 5, 2006.

Ekmekçi, F.Ö. (1997), *Research manual for social sciences*. (Vol:1). İstanbul: Sürat English Language Teaching.

Erdoğan, İ. (2003), “Kapanış Konuşmaları”. In İ. Erdoğan (Ed.). *Türk eğitim sistemi'nde yabancı dil eğitimi ve kalite arayışları* (pp.143-146). İstanbul: Özyurt Matbaacılık.

Fitzgerald, R. (2004), “Total Quality Management in education”[On-Line]. Available: <http://www.totalqualitymanagement.htm>. Accessed: November 14, 2005.

Frankel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (1990), *Introduction to research*, New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Glasser, W. (1998), *The quality school: managing students without coercion*, the USA: Harper Paperbacks.

Heverly, A. (1994), “Applying Total Quality to the Teaching/ Learning Process”, Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (34rd New Orleans).

İlköğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği (2003, August 27). Resmi gazette. pp. 7,8.

İşpınar, D. (2005), "A study on teachers' awareness of teaching English to young learners", *Unpublished Master Thesis*, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Jenkins, L. (1998), *Improving student learning*, İstanbul: Kalder Yayıncılık.

Jenkins, L. (2003), "Data-based decisions". In F.C, Johnson and R. Katman (eds.). *Successful applications of quality systems in K-12 schools* (pp.1-14). USA: Quality Press.

Keely, S. (2003), "Process". In F.C, Johnson and R. Katman (eds.). *Successful applications of quality systems in K-12 Schools* (pp.15-35). USA: Quality Press.

Köksal, H. (1998), *Kalite okullarına geçişte toplam kalite yönetimi*, İstanbul: Globus Dünya Basımevi.

Köksal, H. (2000), "The role of teachers at the movement of TQM in Turkey", *Enstitü Dergisi*, e-dergi ISSN: 1304-8899.

Köksal, H. (2003), *Kalite gerçeği*, İstanbul: Akademi Yayınevi.

Langford, D. & Clearly, B. A. (1999), *Orchestrating learning with quality*, İstanbul: Kalder Yayıncılık.

Lomax, P. (1996), *Quality management in education*, USA: Hyde Publications.

Moretz, H.L. (1993). "Quality circles in the community college"[On-Line]. Available: [http:// www.ericdigests.org/1993/quality.htm](http://www.ericdigests.org/1993/quality.htm) Accessed: June 23, 2006.

Mukhopahyay, M. (2005), *Total quality management in education*, India: Sage Publications.

Oakland, J.S. (2004), *Oakland on quality management*, New York: Elsevier Publications.

Özdemir, G.K. (1994), "A study on the effect of the teachers' perceptions regarding their roles on the organizational system at Yadim", *Unpublished Master Theses*, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Özdemir, S. (1998), *Eğitimde örgütsel yenileşme*, Ankara: Pegem Yayınevi.

Sebastianelli, R. & Tamimi, N. (2003), "Understanding the obstacles to TQM success", *Quality Management Journal*, 10/3, 45-46.

Sevil, N. (2003), "Okul öncesinden ortaöğretime Türk Eğitim Sistemi'nde yabancı dil eğitimi". In İ. Erdoğan (Ed.). *Türk eğitim sistemi'nde yabancı dil eğitimi ve kalite arayışları* (pp.74-80). *İstanbul: Özyurt Matbaacılık*.

Şişman, M. & Turan, S. (2002), *Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi*, Ankara: Pegem Yayınevi.

Stronge, J.H. (2002), *Qualities of effective teachers*, Virginia: ASCD.

Thomas, H. (2003), "The arguements for and the meaning of quality", *ELT Journal*, 57/3, 234-241.

White, R. (1998), "What is quality in English language teacher education?", *ELT Journal*, 52/2, 133-139.

Yıldırım, H. A. (2002), *Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi*, Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Zackowski, J. & Buckley, E.K. (2003), "Leadership in reading improvement". In F.C, Johnson and R. Katman (eds.). *Successful applications of quality systems in K-12 schools* (pp.35-57). USA: Quality Press.

Section II

Dear Colleagues,

Please mark your answers using a cross(x) for one of these statements: “I Completely Agree, I Agree, I Partially Agree, I Don’t Agree, I Don’t Agree At All”.

	I Completely Agree	I Agree	I Partially Agree	I Don't Agree	I Don't Agree At All
1. I'm an honest person.					
2. I see all the students, parents and colleagues as my partners.					
3. My students and I work together to create a list of standards to be followed to have the best environment.					
4. Students' marks are not so important for me.					
5. I constantly seek to improve my approach to learning and the techniques I use.					
6. I see communication with my students as an important factor to the success.					
7. I don't tell my students in the beginning what I expect them to learn in the end.					
8. I blame the education system.					
9. I assess my students through their exams and quizzes.					
10. I invite parents to seminars at school.					
11. I criticize myself honestly.					
12. I replan my lessons on the basis of self-reflection and evaluation.					
13. My students take active roles in their own learning progress.					
14. I assess my students' learning through processed-based tools.					
15. I seek the most appropriate quality supplies and equipment available.					
16. I encourage my students to be friendly and respectful to other students.					
17. I pay attention to my students' interests and learning types while planning lessons.					
18. I form student-teams to solve the potential problems in the classroom.					
19. I always follow a schedule showing my plans for the two semesters.					
20. I encourage parents discuss their children's performances with me.					

	I Completely Agree	I Agree	I Partially Agree	I Don't Agree	I Don't Agree At All
21. I create a warm atmosphere in classes so that my students can study without feeling scared.					
22. I see people as the reason of educational failures.					
23. My students and I discuss the homework they have done together.					
24. I use my time and talents to improve myself everyday.					
25. I encourage my students to work in unity to reach their common goal.					
26. I suggest modifications to the current education system.					
27. At the beginning of the term, my students and I make an agreement on the certain rules to be followed for success.					
28. I inform the parents about the agreement for success.					
29. I guide students about how to assess their own progress.					
30. Minor improvements in students' learning are not important for me.					
31. I punish students when they show disruptive behaviour.					
32. I actively encourage parents to become involved in some aspects of school.					
33. I don't care my students' suggestions for the learning process.					
34. I use quality tools to analyze and solve problems.					
35. Joy in my work and pride in my product keep me focussed on quality.					
36. I give two or three progress reports (during each term) to my students.					
37. I'm the coach of students in their learning process.					
38. I usually hold meetings to motivate my students to reach a common goal.					
39. I draw charts showing each student's weekly progress and hang them on the classroom's noticeboard.					
40. I don't attend seminars quite often.					
41. I don't let my students fail at any level.					
42. I monitor students' improvement efforts only during the exam weeks.					

	I Completely Agree	I Agree	I Partially Agree	I Don't Agree	I Don't Agree At All
43. I make my students use peer evaluation in some tasks.					
44. I don't treat mistakes as opportunities for improvement.					
45. I don't allow my students to take risks in learning.					
46. I don't share my materials or ideas with my colleagues.					
47. I don't let my students say anything about the quality of their own work.					
48. I allow students to take responsibility for their own learning process.					
49. I make my students know the nature of connection between the school members including themselves.					
50. I encourage my students to identify their individual and classroom mission.					

What else would you like to include ?

.....

.....

.....

Section II

Dear Colleagues,

Please mark your answers using a cross(x) for one of these statements: “Very True, Largely True, Partly True, Not Sure, False”.

	Very True	Largely True	Partly True	Not Sure	False
1. My students and I create a list of standards for the best environment in the classroom.					
2. I have close friends within the school.					
3. I don't share my materials or ideas with my colleagues.					
4. I only give lectures.					
5. I see exams as a routine.					
6. I use the most appropriate quality equipment available.					
7. My students get opportunities to discuss their performances with me.					
8. I don't let my students say anything about the quality of their own work.					
9. I do prepare before teaching.					
10. I don't make my students use peer evaluation in some tasks.					
11. I use statistical tools like graphs and diagrams to analyze students' problems.					
12. I work with my colleagues as a team.					
13. I'm an honest person.					
14. I don't review my teaching from time to time.					
15. I hold meetings to motivate my students to reach a common goal.					

	Very True	Largely True	Partly True	Not Sure	False
16. I don't care my students' suggestions during the learning process.					
17. I'm very dynamic.					
18. I use audio-visual aids while teaching.					
19. I don't attend seminars quite often.					
20. I encourage parents discuss their children's performances with me.					
21. I avoid taking important decisions about the classroom.					
22. I see exams as a routine.					
23. I guide students about how to assess their own progress.					
24. I don't make significant efforts to build up material resources.					
25. I replan my lessons through self-reflection and evaluation.					
26. I don't take any interest in activities related to curriculum like, drama, music and sport.					
27. I'm the coach of students in their learning process.					
28. I don't update my personal library books about my profession.					
29. I make my students identify their classroom mission.					
30. I use exams to improve my teaching.					
31. I create a warm atmosphere for students to study without feeling scared.					
32. I don't use various test items like completions, short-answer type etc.					
33. I always follow a schedule showing my plans for the two semesters.					

	Very True	Largely True	Partly True	Not Sure	False
34. I try to be objective in awarding marks in examinations.					
35. I criticize myself honestly.					
36. I don't take any interest in solving students' personal problems.					
37. I decide about what to teach together with my students.					
38. I pretest students before each unit.					
39. I encourage co-operation instead of competition.					
40. A written exam is my tool for assessing students.					
41. I group my students according to their marks.					
42. My mission is to improve myself continuously in my profession.					

5. If yes, what is your opinion about it?

.....

.....

.....

Section II

Dear Colleagues,

Please mark your answers using a cross(x) for one of these statements: “Very True, Largely True, Partly True, Not Sure, False”.

	Very True	Largely True	Partly True	Not Sure	False
1. I have close friends within the school.					
2. I don't share my materials or ideas with my colleagues.					
3. I only give lectures.					
4. I see exams as a routine.					
5. I use the most appropriate quality equipment available.					
6. I don't let my students say anything about the quality of their own work.					
7. I do prepare before teaching.					
8. I use statistical tools like graphs and diagrams to analyze students' problems.					
9. I work with my colleagues as a team.					
10. I'm an honest person.					
11. I hold meetings to motivate my students to reach a common goal.					

	Very True	Largely True	Partly True	Not Sure	False
12. I don't care my students' suggestions during the learning process.					
13. I'm very dynamic.					
14. I use audio-visual aids while teaching.					
15. I encourage parents discuss their children's performances with me.					
16. I see exams as a routine.					
17. I guide students about how to assess their own progress.					
18. I don't make significant efforts to build up material resources.					
19. I replan my lessons through self-reflection and evaluation.					
20. I'm the coach of students in their learning process.					
21. I don't update my personal library books about my profession.					
22. I make my students identify their classroom mission.					
23. I use exams to improve my teaching.					
24. I create a warm atmosphere for students to study without feeling scared.					
25. I always follow a schedule showing my plans for the two semesters.					
26. I try to be objective in awarding marks in examinations.					
27. I criticize myself honestly.					
28. I don't take any interest in solving students' personal problems.					
29. I decide about what to teach together with my students.					

	Very True	Largely True	Partly True	Not Sure	False
30. I pretest students before each unit.					
31. I encourage co-operation instead of competition.					
32. I group my students according to their marks.					
33. My mission is to improve myself continuously in my profession.					

APPENDIX IV

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Teacher: District: Subject:

School: Number of Pupils: Date:

	YES	NO	UNDECIDED
1. The teacher lets students talk about the quality of their own work.
2. The teacher cares students' suggestions for the learning process.
3. The teacher is full of energy.
4. The teacher uses audio-visual aids.
5. The teacher is the coach of students.
6. The teacher creates a warm atmosphere for students to study without feeling scared.
9. The teacher uses the most appropriate quality equipment available.

	YES	NO	UNDECIDED
10. The teacher prepares before teaching.
11. The teacher encourages cooperation instead of competition.
12. The teacher tries to be objective while evaluating students' responses.

OTHER COMMENTS:

.....

.....

.....

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Esra ÖZBEBEK
Place and Date of Birth: Tufanbeyli-16 January 1976
E-mail: esraozbebek@yahoo.com

Educational Background

2006 (MA) Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences
English Language Teaching Department
1993-1998 (BA) Middle East Technical University
Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department
1990-1993 Adana Baraj Lisesi

Experience

2003-..... Arif Nihat Asya İlköğretim Okulu Yüreğir- Adana
1999-2003 Özel Çukurova Bilfen Okulları Seyhan-Adana
1998-1999 Kök-Dil Yabancı Dil Kurumu Seyhan-Adana
1997-1998 Ankara Ted Koleji (Student Teacher)

Courses Attended

13-20 August 2001 Creative Teaching at Hilderstone College in England
8-15 May 1998 Drama in ELT at British Council in Ankara