REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE FRESHMEN'S AND LECTURERS' VIEWS ABOUT THE PREPARATORY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM OF A STATE UNIVERSITY

Muhyettin ACAR

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2021

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE FRESHMEN'S AND LECTURERS' VIEWS ABOUT THE PREPARATORY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM OF A STATE UNIVERSITY

Muhyettin ACAR

Supervisor **:** Prof. Dr. Hasan BEDİR

Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden İLİN

Member of Examining Committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Sezen ARSLAN

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2021

To Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences,

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

Chair **:** Prof. Dr. Hasan BEDİR
(Supervisor)

Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden İLİN

Member of Examining Committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Sezen ARSLAN

CONFIRMATION
I hereby certify that the signatures above are of the individuals listed.
… /… /2021

Prof. Dr. Serap ÇABUK
Director of Institute

ETİK BEYANI

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmasında;

- Tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi,
- Tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,
- Tez çalışmasında yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunarak kaynak gösterdiğimi,
- Kullanılan verilerde ve ortaya çıkan sonuçlarda herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı,
- Bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu,

bildirir, aksi bir durumda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim. … / … /2021

Muhyettin ACAR

ÖZET

BİRİNCİ SINIF ÖĞRENCİLER VE BÖLÜM HOCALARININ BİR DEVLET ÜNİVERSİTESİ HAZIRLIK OKULU İNGİLİZCE DİL ÖĞRETİMİ PROGRAMI İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİNİN BİR ARAŞTIRMASI

Muhyettin ACAR

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Hasan BEDİR
Temmuz 2021, 190 sayfa

Bu çalışmada, Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programının, programı tamamlayıp eğitim dili yüzde yüz veya kısmen İngilizce olan lisans programlarında öğrenimlerine devam eden birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin ve ilgili programlarda lisans derslerini İngilizce olarak veren öğretim elemanlarının görüşleri ışığında araştırılması ve bu görüşlerin karşılaştırılması amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmaya 2019–2020 eğitim-öğretim yılında üç fakülteden üç lisans programının birinci sınıflarında okuyan 100 öğrenci ve aynı programlarda ders veren dokuz öğretim elemanı dahil edilmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak, Köse (2012) tarafından geliştirilen ve dili Türkçe olan *"Fakülte Öğrencilerine Yönelik İngilizce Hazırlık Programı Değerlendirme Anketi"* ve *"Öğretim Elemanlarına Yönelik İngilizce Hazırlık Programı Değerlendirme Anketi"* kullanılmıştır. Bunlara ek olarak, öğretim elemanları ile birebir gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler ve öğrenciler ile bir odak grup görüşmesi yapılmıştır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, birinci sınıf öğrencilerine yönelik görüşlerini yazılı olarak beyan edebilecekleri ve öğretim elemanlarına yönelik görüşlerini sözlü olarak ifade edebilecekleri iki farklı açık uçlu soru seti araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanmıştır. Nicel ve nitel yöntemlerle analiz edilen veriler ışığında, programın güçlü ve zayıf yönlerinin belirlenmesine ve amaçlarının gerçekleşme düzeyinin tespitine çalışılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, bulgular programın bazı eksiklikleri olduğunu ve dolayısıyla öğrencilerin dil ihtiyaçlarını ve öğretim elemanlarının beklentilerini karşılamak için programda bazı düzeltmeler ve iyileştirmeler yapılması gerektiğini ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: EFL, İngilizce Hazırlık Programı, program değerlendirme

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE FRESHMEN'S AND LECTURERS' VIEWS ABOUT THE PREPARATORY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM OF A STATE UNIVERSITY

Muhyettin ACAR

Master's Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hasan BEDİR
July 2021, 190 pages

The aim of this study is to investigate the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages according to the views of the freshmen graduating from the program and continuing their studies in undergraduate programs where the medium of instruction is wholly or partially English and of the lecturers teaching undergraduate courses in English in those departments, and then to cross-compare their views. 100 students enrolled in the first grade of three undergraduate programs (Mechanical Engineering, Software Engineering, and English Language and Literature) of three faculties in 2019–2020 academic year and nine lecturers teaching in the same programs were included in the study. Developed by Köse (2012), two questionnaires—one for the students and one for the lecturers—were used as data collection tools. In addition to these instruments, one-to-one semi-structured interviews and a focus group meeting were conducted with the teaching staff and undergraduates, respectively. For this purpose, two different sets of open-ended questions had been prepared by the researcher so that the freshmen and lecturers could express their opinions in written form and verbally, respectively. In the light of the data analyzed by quantitative and qualitative methods, the strengths and weaknesses of the program were tried to be investigated and the realization level of its objectives to be determined. At the end of the study, the results revealed that there are some drawbacks of the program, and hence some revisions and improvements are needed in the program to meet students' language needs and lecturers' expectations.

Keywords: EFL, English Preparatory Program, program evaluation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is an honor for me to express my deepest appreciation to all those people who supported me during this process. I believe that without that great support I received from them, doing master's degree would be more challenging. First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Hasan Bedir for his continuous support, guidance, and wisdom all the time. I am deeply thankful to him for his great patience and tolerance. I will always be grateful to him. I would also like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden İlin for being in my examining committee and providing me with constructive feedback. She inspires me in many ways, and I feel genuinely fortunate to be a student of her. I should also thank to Asst. Prof. Dr. Sezen Arslan for being in my examining committee and being supportive throughout this process. Her invaluable suggestions and feedback have strengthened my study immensely.

I would like to extend my sincere obligation towards Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aysel Şahin Kızıl for contributing to the outset of this research. I also owe many thanks to Dr. Muhammed Emre Karaman for his support and feedback in the difficult times of data analysis.

Last but not least, I am deeply grateful to my wife, Yasemin Acar. I owe her my heartfelt apologies for the time I have spent studying for my master's studies and not with her. Her patience and emotional support mean the world to me. Feeling her support at all times kept me strong in difficult times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR : Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
CIPP : Context, Input, Process, and Product
CoHE : The Council of Higher Education
CPG : Classroom Performance Grade
CV : Curriculum Vitae
EAP : English for Academic Purposes
EFL : English as a Foreign Language
ELL : English Language and Literature
EMI : English-medium Instruction
EPP : English Preparatory Program
ESL : English as a Second Language
ESP : English for Specific Purposes
FLD : Foreign Languages Department
FU : Fırat University
GPA : Grade Point Average
IELTS : The International English Language Testing System
Lec. : Lecturer
ME : Mechanical Engineering
MLA : Modern Language Association
ÖSYM : Measurement, Selection and Placement Center
SE : Software Engineering
SFL : School of Foreign Languages
st. : Student
TOEFL : The Test of English as a Foreign Language
YDS : Foreign Language Exam
YÖKDİL : Foreign Language Exam for Higher Education Institutions

LIST OF TABLES

Page

LIST OF APPENDICES

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This chapter of the thesis begins with the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, and the research questions followed by the significance of the study. At the end of the chapter, the researcher's assumptions related to the study and limitations of the study are presented.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Language is a means of communication, and mother tongue acquired subconsciously from birth is not sufficient to be able to communicate with others around the world, which is also an obligatory requirement in today's world. Mother tongue (also called as first language) is acquired from family members or the environment which a person is born into while foreign language (also named as second language) is learned consciously and formally in schools or in another environment such as in a different country other than that person's hometown. In the 21st century, with the changing and evolving of science and technologies around the world (Çelebi, 2006, p.286) and with the effect of globalization as well, the necessity of knowing a foreign language has been undeniable. People acquire the knowledge and culture of the country they live in with their native language; however, they need to know a foreign language for the knowledge and culture of other countries (Köse, 2012, p.2).

Foreign language is seen as a requirement for people of all ages to be able to communicate with people speaking other languages. In Turkey, foreign language, particularly English, is accepted to be and works as a language that is valid to communicate with people all around the world (Tosun, 2006, p.37) from Africa to Antarctica. The importance of knowing foreign languages has been increasing in Turkey whose international relations are developing day by day, which values cooperation, wishes to join the European Union, and tries to fulfill the requirements for this membership (Bayram, 2011; Çelebi, 2006). For this reason, there is foreign language teaching at all levels of both state and private schools in Turkey. From some kindergartens to all high schools in Turkey, English is taught in a limited way—two, three, or four hours

of classes a week, which might not be adequate sometimes to provide a desired level of English to learners. Besides, a yearly compulsory English Preparatory Program (EPP) is provided to students of some certain high schools the number of which is really limited. When it comes to the tertiary level of educational institutions—universities, foreign language is taught as a compulsory class of two or three hours a week in two or four terms in all undergraduate departments of all universities in Turkey except for some specific departments in some universities which require undergrads to get a one-year compulsory EPP or offer students to get a one-year EPP optionally. When students enrolled in departments in which the education is partially or wholly given in English cannot succeed in the exemption exam, they are subject to a one-year foreign language teaching program in the preparatory programs of higher education institutions.

Universities teaching English as Foreign Language (EFL) in EPP—no matter whether it is optional or compulsory for undergraduates, have different teaching programs in terms of course hours, teaching materials, teaching methods, physical conditions, and focused language skills. The outcomes of the EPPs differentiate from each other, and their performance is evaluated according to students' achievement in the courses they take in English in faculties. Tosun (2006) claims that the students who study and succeed in EPPs do not understand the lessons given in English in faculties, cannot ask and answer questions correctly, cannot discuss a topic, cannot take notes correctly, cannot understand the questions in the exams, and so ultimately failure is inevitable (p.38). Despite one-year preparatory programs at universities and English courses throughout undergraduate education, university students are in search of language learning from different sources after their education finish (Karataş, 2007, p.1). The elimination of these problems of foreign language teaching at universities and the improvement of teaching quality might be possible with program evaluation studies to be carried out in this field (Bayram, 2011; Karataş, 2007).

Though the EPP at Fırat University (FU) School of Foreign Languages (SFL) has been serving since the 2012–2013 academic year, only two program evaluation studies (Eslek-Onur, 2019; Tümen-Akyıldız & Tayşı, 2017) have been carried out to date. It has not been investigated in-depth whether the ongoing program responds to the requirements. However, this program affects students' success in the departments they will follow later. In accordance with that reason, this study will investigate the effectiveness of the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages according to the views of the freshmen and lecturers in faculties.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages has been serving since 2012–2013 academic year. Though it has undergone two program evaluation processes (Eslek-Onur, 2019; Tümen-Akyıldız & Tayşı, 2017), it has not been evaluated thoroughly in terms of the purpose, content, learning and teaching processes, and assessment dimensions of the program. Additionally, it has not been investigated whether the continuing program meets the requirements of the freshmen and their lecturers. In this context, it is thought that conducting a study to investigate the foreign language teaching program will contribute to the students, instructors, lecturers, and program executives of Fırat University. With this purpose in mind, this research aims to determine whether the foreign language instruction given in the EPP at FU SFL meets the requirements of the faculties through exploring the views of freshmen and their lecturers in the departments (Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering; Department of Software Engineering, Faculty of Technology; and Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences) regarding the effect the program.

1.4. Research Questions

This study aims to find out answers to the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the freshmen from different faculties of Fırat University think that the EPP meets the pre-set requirements?
2. What, in freshmen's opinion, should be made to improve the outcomes of the programme?
3. To what extent do the lecturers from different faculties of Fırat University think that the EPP meets the pre-set requirements?
4. What, in lecturers's opinion, should be made to improve the outcomes of the programme?
5. Are there any differences and similarities between freshmen's and lecturers' perspectives?

1.5. Significance of the Study

There has been an abundance of studies (Alıcı, 2004; Al-Nwaiem, 2012; Arap, 2016; Balcı, Durak-Üğüten, & Çolak, 2018; Balint, 2009; Bayram, 2011; Cengizhan, 2006; Chang, Kim, & Lee, 2015; Coşkun, 2013; Karakuş, 2013; Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Kırkgöz, 2009; Kiely, 2003; Marcinkoniene, 2005; Mede, 2012; Nam, 2005; Öner & Mede, 2015; Özdoruk, 2016; Özkanal, 2009; Özüdoğru, 2017; Peacock, 2009; Soruc, 2012; Şen Ersoy & Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, 2015; Tiryaki, 2009; Tsou & Chen, 2014; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz, 2011; Yükselir, 2018) in and out of Turkey related to the evaluation of foreign language education in English Preparatory Programs at universities. Most of these studies have focused on the context, input, process, and product of EPPs, and have obtained data mainly from students and instructors in EPPs. The literature on the evaluation of foreign language teaching programs has focused almost entirely on specific issues of methodology and measurement (Lynch, 1990, p.23). Additionally, most of these studies have included mostly quantitative data but inadequate qualitative data. Not many studies have included the students who studied in EPPs and then are in faculties and the lecturers in the same faculties. It can be for sure that cumulative studies inquiring the same or similar themes in a variety of settings contribute to the evaluation of foreign language teaching practices (Beretta, 1986b, p.151). For these reasons, the present study aims to contribute to the existing literature providing more statistical and practical data related to the effectiveness of EPPs at universities and their success level to meet the needs of the students enrolled in English-speaking departments and the expectations of the teaching staff in faculties. The quantitative and qualitative data to be obtained from both the students and lecturers in the faculties are significant for:

- developing the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages according to the requirements of the faculties,
- being an example for other universities' preparatory programs,
- being a source for the studies on the same subject.

1.6. Assumptions of the Study

It is assumed that the freshmen and lecturers in the faculties who participated in the study had positive attitude toward the evaluation of the EPP at FU SFL and responded to the "Questionnaire for Faculty Students" and the "Questionnaire for Lecturers"

sincerely and correctly. Besides, the students in the faculties were also assumed to be contributing to the research in written form and the lecturers in the faculties verbally.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations of the present study that should be underlined to avoid any over-generalizations and misinterpretations of the results. First and foremost, this study is limited to the responses of the undergraduates who studied and succeeded in the EPP at FU SFL in 2018–2019 academic year and then continued their studies in the faculties in 2019–2020 academic year and the teaching staff of those freshmen in the faculties. The students who were not included in the EPP at FU SFL passing the exemption exam at the beginning of 2018–2019 academic year or who studied in an EPP of another university in Turkey are excluded from this study. Also, foreign students who do not know the Turkish language well are excluded since the language of the questionnaire for students is Turkish and focus group interview with students is conducted in Turkish. The results, therefore, might not be comprehensive enough to draw general conclusions.

At the time of collecting data—two weeks before the end of the fall term in 2019–2020 academic year, the freshmen had been studying in the departments for just 12 weeks, which might have been a limited time for the students to see the level of their capabilities of studying undergraduate in English and for the lecturers to see to what degree their students have language skills to follow classes and their instruction. Another limitation is that the population of this study consists of nine lecturers in the faculties, which may not be high enough to make quantitative analysis and strong generalizations or claims. The last limitation is believed to be the lack of an external evaluator as involving an external evaluator could have added new dimensions to the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

In the present chapter, a brief framework of foreign language teaching is introduced as a starting point. Next, foreign language teaching in Turkey and under the same title, language education in EPPs in Turkey, especially and additionally at Fırat University, are presented. In the following section, program evaluation is explored. In the same section, different approaches to program evaluation and program evaluation types are detailed. Lastly, related studies previously done on the same subject in the global and local contexts are summarized.

2.2. Foreign Language Teaching

Mother tongue is a tool that reflects the identity, culture, and self of a nation. It begins with birth, develops naturally, and continues uninterruptedly while foreign language starts at a certain age—much later than the mother tongue—and develops artificially and discontinuously (Tosun, 2006, p.35). Foreign language teaching primarily requires a good mother tongue education. It is not possible for a person who does not learn his/her native language to learn a foreign language at the desired level (Çelebi, 2006, p.285). Tosun (2006) states that all languages other than native language are foreign languages (p.29), and foreign language teaching which can be seen as a kind of problem-solving activity, like social settings, is a phenomenon that frequently changes and challenges traditional thinking methods (Widdowson, 1990, p.2). Hancı-Yanar (2008) describes foreign language teaching as the whole of competence-making activities for using a language other than native language for a particular purpose (p.4).

There are various terms in the field of foreign language teaching, particularly English, that might be confusing for even English teachers/instructors. The one thing they all have in common is that English language teaching is involved, but they all represent different types of learners in different contexts (Alison, 2018). The term *English as a Second Language* (ESL) is usually used when English learners are learning English in an English-speaking country. These learners generally want to learn how to communicate in a community setting. This term is a bit problematic though because ESL students may

speak multiple languages, meaning that English could be their third, fourth, or fifth language. Cengizhan (2006) notes that in some countries such as Pakistan, Indonesia, and India, English is used as a second language by the government offices, the media, and the public (p.80). ESL programs are likely to be used in regions where the language minority population is very diverse and represents many different languages. There are students from different language backgrounds in the same class in ESL programs, and teachers do not need to be proficient in the mother tongue of their students (Rennie, 1993, p.3).

The concept *English as a Foreign Language* (EFL) is similar to ESL with the exception that the context is different (Alison, 2018). EFL is usually used when an English learner is learning English in a non-English speaking country such as Turkey, Spain, Egypt, or China. For example, students in China who are learning English are considered as EFL students because English is not the official language of the country. But if the same students were learning English in the United States of America, they would be considered as ESL students (Young, 2015). Within the ESL context, issues of cultural and linguistic pluralism versus access to English as a means of socio-economic advancement arise (Gaies, 1987, cited in Lynch, 1990, p.31). Within the EFL context, the need for English as the language of science and technology can be seen as a positive means for effecting economic growth in developing countries (Judd, 1984, cited in Lynch, 1990, p.31).

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) includes students who are learning English in a context of a certain field, profession, or topic such as learning legal English in China, in the context of law (Young, 2015). There are also other specific purposes such as *English for Academic Purposes* (EAP) which is a subcategory of ESP (Alison, 2018). EAP prepares learners to be able to succeed in an English-speaking university. There is a bigger emphasis on grammar, sentence structure, essay writing, and high-level vocabulary than might be seen in an ESL/EFL classroom. Education in a foreign language means that knowing all grammatical features of a language including grammatical structures, and trying to perceive, to understand, to learn, and to express the world with the structure, resources, and philosophy of that language (Tosun, 2006, p.32).

In circumstances where English is taught for specific purposes rather than for a more general communicative goal, the content of language can no longer be identified with the same grammar, vocabulary, notions, topics, and functions which serve the needs of *English for General Purposes* (EGP) or *Everyday English*. Rather, the specific linguistic requirements of the target language learners have to be determined as a basis

for syllabus design, and this is the philosophy behind ESP. This approach to language teaching is cost-effective and the one which promotes teaching only the content which particular groups of learners require. It begins not with an analysis of the language code but with a determination of learners' communicative needs. Only then can the learners' language needs be determined (Richards, 1984).

The needs for learning a foreign language and the contexts where learning occurs vary. Due to economic, educational, or political reasons, people in search of better work and educational opportunities have become increasingly mobile and started to migrate to different English-speaking countries (Tahaineh & Daana, 2013, p.166). However, no matter why and where a person needs to learn a foreign language, the need to know a foreign language as a common communication tool is increasing day by day since the knowledge of a foreign language has become a necessity of living in a globalized world and a necessity that supports personal development as well (Karakuş, 2013, p.15). In the globalized world where English is a common communication tool, teaching English is becoming a research field that is worth exploring within foreign language education. The need for teaching English intensively is the main concern of most of the national and international universities (Öner & Mede, 2015, p.209). English has become the main foreign language used as a mean of instruction at European universities as well, and internationalization has played a key factor in this process (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2011, p.345). The teaching in English has significantly contributed to the attractiveness of many European universities, and English has become the academic lingua franca in European higher education. The main reasons why European universities offer programs in English are "to attract international students, to prepare domestic students for the global labor market, and to raise the profile of the institution" (Doiz et al., 2011, p.347). In the research report published by British Council and the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey (TEPAV), it is clearly stated that with different developments in trade, tourism, and business, the importance of English has been increasing due to its role in ensuring communication and interaction, and this makes English the most common language of communication among non-native speakers of English (British Council & TEPAV, 2014). Despite the opposition against providing English-medium instruction in Turkey, the popularity and the number of English-medium universities with EPPs is increasing (Coşkun, 2013). Nearly all private and most of the state universities in Turkey provide compulsory EPPs to prepare students for their English-medium academic studies.

2.2.1. Foreign Language Teaching in Turkey

Foreign language education is considerably significant in the education system of Turkey as in the whole world. After World War II, the need for foreign languages increased due to the development of international relations, mass communication tools, and information exchange. Considering that foreign language learning can be realized by teaching in a foreign language, secondary and higher educational institutions that offer education in a foreign language have been opened in Turkey (Çelebi, 2006, p.286). In 1955, high schools called 'college' were established in Turkey, and many courses in these schools were taught in a foreign language. Since July 1975, these schools have been called 'Anatolian High Schools' (Manak, 2008, cited in Hancı-Yanar, 2008, p.7).

It can be truly expressed that efforts to improve foreign language education in Turkey continue both nationally and institutionally. According to the latest amendment, with the decision of the Ministry of National Education Presidency of Board of Education and Training, English classes were decided to be included in the national education system starting from the 2nd grade (Board of Education, 2013). Within the scope of the Regulation of the Council of Higher Education on "the Principles to be Complied with in Foreign Language Teaching and Teaching in Foreign Language in Higher Education Institutions", the aim of foreign language teaching in higher education institutions is defined as "to teach students the basic rules of a foreign language, to develop their vocabulary of foreign languages, to ensure their understanding what they read and hear in a foreign language and expressing themselves orally or in writing (Council of Higher Education [CoHE], 2016).

Neither a national nor an official language in Turkey, English is the most widely taught foreign language at all stages of the education system (Karahan, 2007, p.74). In Turkey, at all levels of education—starting from kindergarten up to university, foreign language teaching is maintained (Karakuş, 2013, p.16), but the desired level of proficiency either in comprehensive or productive skills or in both cannot be achieved (Karahan, 2007, p.74). Following the elimination of one-year preparatory programs in high schools, the division of English language teaching to be carried out in all four years of high school education and the fact that students pay great attention to other classes except for English in order to get into university makes English education in high schools inefficient (Karakuş, 2013, p.16). Apart from the high schools which attach great importance to language education, students cannot learn English adequately when they

graduate from high schools, and this increases the importance of preparatory programs of universities.

Educators in Turkey have long been discussing the reasons for the poor foreign language skills of students though they are exposed to English instruction for a long period at different levels. Considering the time, labor, and cost of foreign language teaching from primary education to higher education in Turkey, it is seen that the targets cannot be reached, and students who have been included in foreign language education, unfortunately, do not know any foreign language at intended level (Çelebi, 2006; Karataş, 2007). The reason for this negativity is the lack of necessary conditions for foreign language learning and the existence of negativities affecting the foreign language teaching process. It is stated that certain difficulties are experienced in the teaching of English at higher education level. Despite the thousands of hours of lessons, students fail to speak and understand English at a desired level after graduating from high school. In Turkey, the level of success in teaching English is emphasized to be under the desired level. The main reasons for this failure are reported to be that (British Council & TEPAV, 2014):

- grammar-oriented rote approach is dominant,
- grammar-based assessment practices guide the teaching and learning process,
- the two-seat seating available in most schools cannot be used efficiently for communicative language applications,
- current textbooks and curricula do not differ according to learner needs,
- there are deficiencies in the inspection system,
- the same curriculum repeats over the years,
- teachers are obliged to follow the curriculum.

The final stage of foreign language teaching in Turkey takes place in higher education institutions. Given the fact that increasing numbers of undergraduate students prefer to study in English rather than Turkish, a large number of students receive an EAP program due to inadequacy in the proficiency level of English (Kırkgöz, 2009, p.81).

2.2.1.1. Language Education in English Preparatory Programs

Turkey, as a non-English speaking country, introduced English-medium instruction (EMI) at higher education with the establishment of universities such as the Middle East Technical University in 1956 due to the global impact of English as "the language of international communication, business, technology, and science" (Kırkgöz, 2009, p.81). As the demand for an EMI at tertiary level has increased, the issue of EMI and questions related to effective learning of one's professional knowledge have constituted an important part of the planning of education policy in Turkey. Following the policy statement issued by CoHE in 1996, each university providing EMI was required to establish a foreign language center which would offer a one-year EAP curriculum to students whose English proficiency was insufficient to enable them to pursue their English-medium classes (Kırkgöz, 2009, p.81).

In Turkey, both state and private universities offer English Preparatory Programs (EPP) to students in the first year of their undergraduate studies. Foreign language teaching at university level is given in the Schools of Foreign Languages (SFL) or Foreign Language Departments (FLD). In EPPs, universities present preparatory education according to their needs and structures. Cengizhan (2006) explains the aim of the EPPs as providing students with the ability to follow the lectures given in English in undergraduate programs, to read studies and all kinds of publications related to their undergraduate programs, to attend seminars and discussions, and to communicate in a foreign language (p.4). Karataş (2007) defines the aims of foreign language teaching at universities as to provide students with the abilities to follow scientific sources written in that language, to write scientific papers, or to follow foreign publications. The main aim of these programs is to improve students' structural and lexical knowledge and to develop their language skills to better meet the demands of professional, scientific, and technical service sectors (Arap, 2016, p.14). Students are expected to acquire the necessary language knowledge and skills to follow their courses in English within their departments. EPPs have been designed to meet the general language needs of students before they begin their undergraduate program at various disciplines. Specifically, their objective is to enable students to follow their departmental courses with a sufficient language proficiency level and to use English in their professional lives (Öner & Mede, 2015, p.209). The general characteristics of these programs are as follows:

- the number of students in each class does not exceed 25 or 30,

- the medium of instruction is either in English or in Turkish depending on the level of students,
- the language exposure varies between two and eight hours per day,
- two or three instructors work in collaboration to teach students in one class,
- supplementary materials and worksheets are prepared by instructors for language practice and reinforcement,
- students get evaluated through quizzes, mid-terms, and finals at a regular basis,
- students are provided with extra opportunities of practice in language laboratories as well as extracurricular activities (Arap, 2016, pp.14–15).

At universities in Turkey, the curriculums of preparatory programs are developed for teaching English language intensively (Kayapınar, 2006, p.2). The models generally adopted in EPPs are the program model where language skills are given separately and the program model where language skills are given together. Özkanal (2009) states that there is a transition from the program model where skills are given separately to the program model where skills are given together in recent years (p.170). One of the most important reasons for this is that the individuals who try to learn English by the program model where language skills are given separately are able to perceive the language elements given in each skill as different from each other because they get each skill from different materials, and they cannot combine the information they have obtained. Short (1993) claims that the integration of language skills and the introduction of field-related courses have been popular in recent years (cited in Özkanal, 2009, p.171). It is stated that along with integrated language skills, teaching field-oriented English included in the context of the program improves students' academic language skills, facilitates their transition to departments, and increases the students' motivation for language learning.

Undergraduate students are required to take a language proficiency exam after being placed at different universities according to their university entrance exam scores. If they pass the proficiency exam with an average of 60 out of 100 (it is 70 in some universities), they have the right to continue their education in their prospective departments. However, if they fail the exam, they take a placement exam which determines their level of English proficiency (Öner & Mede, 2015, p.209). Language

education implemented in the EPPs generally continues for a full-year of two semesters (28–32 weeks and 20–30 hours per week). In these intensive programs, the emphasis is on four macro skills (writing, reading, listening, and speaking) and other micro sub-skills (grammar and vocabulary). The integrated-skills instructional materials such as the four-level (beginning, elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate) coursebooks and other additional materials like hand-outs aim to cover these macro and micro skills.

As an alternative to the teaching a foreign language—mostly English—throughout a full-year (fixed preparation program), some state and private universities apply a modular system in which students learn foreign languages going through some modules—usually four or five. Though it is not widely applied in higher education institutions except private universities and foreign language courses, modular system is flexible, open to changes, and allows students to reach their targeted language skills at the end of the modules at a certain level (Karakuş, 2013, p.17). The modules include teaching/learning experiences with a beginning and an end, which are integrated in themselves and arranged in a systematic framework. This system allows students to progress at their own speed and to be instantly informed of their success. On the contrary to the modular system, in the fixed preparation program, students with different levels of English are studying in the same classes. In the modular system, students begin their education by being grouping according to their English level. One of the important aspects of the modular system is its measurement and evaluation approach. According to the different measurement and evaluation results applied to students throughout the process, students continue their learning process. Teaching process is shaped according to the results of measurement and evaluation. Each learner proceeds in accordance with his/her individual performance. It is generally improbable for a student to continue to the next level without learning. In the modular system in which students are assessed throughout the process, not only traditional exams such as mid-terms, finals, and quizzes but also alternative modes of assessment such as portfolios, presentations, and projects are conducted during and at the end of both each module and full-year. The modular system usually includes four modules of consecutive language levels. It is compatible with the language levels (A1, A2, B1 and B2) defined by Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). If learners cannot successfully complete a module, they have to take the same level of courses (module) second time. If no success is achieved for the second time at the same level, they continue to an upper module. The

requirement to graduate from foreign language preparatory programs is to successfully complete B1 or B2 level of a language.

2.2.1.2. The English Preparatory Program at Fırat University

Founded in 2011, FU SFL consists of two departments: *(1)* Foreign Languages and *(2)* Translation and Interpretation. There are two units in the Foreign Languages Department: *(1)* Preparatory Education and *(2)* Distance Learning. The Distance Learning Unit is responsible for the common compulsory foreign language courses in all departments of the university and teaching English at various levels. All students of faculties, colleges, state conservatories, and vocational schools (of associate's and bachelor's degrees) except for those who have attended the Compulsory English Preparatory Program have to take compulsory English courses which are taught 2, 3, or 4 hours a week in two or four semesters. The aim of these courses offered by the Distance Learning Unit is to support the language learning processes of students by the courses programmed according to their needs. Students are given courses that focus on developing language skills, teaching the use of a language in a specific professional field, enhancing translation skills, or teaching a language's culture. In addition to developing the language skills of students with different needs, creating learner-centered learning environments, providing students with high-level thinking skills, contributing to raising cultural awareness, and also increasing self-confidence as well as the language learning techniques and approaches they need to sustain lifelong language learning (Fırat University School of Foreign Languages [FU SFL]). The objectives of the courses are expected to be providing students with the foreign language skills they need in their academic studies and business life; developing their language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and teaching them how to use the topics included in the course content. The learning outcomes of the classes are listed on the website of the school (FU SFL) as follows: A student can

- comprehend the basic sentence structures of English.
- use the elements of the sentence correctly.
- start using English as a daily communication tool.
- use basic grammar structures in communication.
- use appropriate words when speaking/writing on different topics.
- recognize the spoken language used in daily life.

- react by identifying verbal instructions.
- use the necessary discourse markers, connectors, and transition words.
- make research in English on the internet.
- read and understand texts at elementary/pre-intermediate level
- answer questions about a text created with simple sentence organizations.
- use the subjects given in the course in four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing).

As one of the two units within the Foreign Languages Department at FU SFL, the Preparatory Education Unit has been providing the English Preparatory Program for undergraduate students who are enrolled in the departments in which the medium of instruction is wholly or partly English since the 2012–2013 academic year. The aim of this program is to prepare students for the classes that they will take in English during their majors as well as their academic and post-academic lives. The program teaches English at B1 or B1+ level according to CEFR. And, in the present study, the curriculum and practices of the EPP provided by the Preparatory Education Unit is evaluated. Since the 2017–2018 academic year, a modular system has been introduced in the EPP, and the program consists of four modules in an academic year. Each module lasts for 8 weeks and consists of a 26-hour-a-week curriculum. All students who are not successful in the exemption exam held at the beginning of each academic year are compulsorily included in the EPP, and they begin to take classes from the first module. According to Fırat University Foreign Language Education and Training Regulation, the following students do not have to take the proficiency exam and are exempted from the compulsory EPP (Resmî Gazete, 2015):

- Those who have successfully completed a foreign language preparatory program at a higher education institution in the last 3 years,
- In a country where the foreign language designated as the language of instruction is spoken as the mother tongue, those who have studied at least in the last three years and completed their education in secondary education institutions where the citizens of that country continue.
- Students who get at least 70 points from the Foreign Language Exam (YDS) held by Measurement, Selection, and Placement Center (ÖSYM).

The EPP follows a 32-week program during an academic year. The syllabus includes a course named *"Main Course"* covering four skills in an integrative approach in the first three modules. In the last module, language skills are presented in a separate way through *"Listening and Speaking"* and *"Writing"* courses. In the *"Listening and Speaking"* course, a coursebook which has activities in a unified theme is covered. In the *"Writing"* course, a textbook which aims to improve students' writing skills from the very beginning is covered. In all modules, students additionally take the class of CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) in which they practice and consolidate the learnt subjects through the codes that they obtain from original coursebooks. In this class, interactive exercises and activities are done by using the codes that students get from original coursebooks they purchase. This course has several objectives as can be seen below:

- to provide students with the opportunity of self-learning and progress on their own through studying individually.
- to provide students with personal computers and access to the Internet to go online for more studies.
- to allow students to spend more time on English doing different activities such as playing games, watching videos, or listening to music, etc.
- to encourage extracurricular studies.
- to ensure that students concentrate more on their classes during an intensive course program (24–26 lessons per week), move away from the classroom environment, to make them relax, and to keep them alone for a while.
- to ensure that students buy original coursebooks—as it has to be.
- to ensure the active use of two computer laboratories allocated to the SFL.

The coursebooks used in the EPP vary according to the needs, requirements, and expectations of students and the departments. The set of coursebooks for the students who are registered to engineering departments is different from those for the students enrolled in English Language and Literature Department. The students who fail a module and have to repeat the same module are offered a different set of coursebooks aiming to achieve the same or similar objectives.

The students in the EPP are required to attend 80% of the courses for each module. The students who do not fulfill the attendance requirement for each module are considered unsuccessful, and repeat the same module. Those who fail a module because of inattendency cannot take the proficiency exam at the end of academic year; however, they can take the proficiency exam at the beginning of the following academic year. The proficiency exam held at the beginning of an academic year replaces the make-up exam for the students who study in the EPP the year before and fail. Students are evaluated by various measurement methods. In each module, students are graded according to a mid-term exam, a final exam, an oral exam, three pop quizzes, a portfolio of writing tasks, an online assessment (conducted in the class of CALL in computer laboratories), and class performance grade (CPG) in which scoring of oral presentations are included as well. Students must collect at least 60 points in each module in order to move to the next module. The impact of each module on the year-end achievement score is 10% (it makes maximum 40% if a student succeeds in all modules), and of the proficiency exam held at the end of the year is 60%. The students failing at the end of a module cannot get any points and misses 10% of grading for that module. Also, those who fail two modules in an academic year for any reason cannot take the proficiency exam at the end of year and considered failed. The proficiency exams are held at the beginning and end of each academic year in order to determine the foreign language proficiency of the preparatory program students.

2.3. Program Evaluation

Program evaluation practices in higher education institutions has increased with the intention of improving the quality of education and management over recent years. A significant function of the evaluation is believed to be providing information about the weaknesses and strengths of a program by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of students (Wolf, 1987, cited in Beretta, 1992, pp.12–13). It is not just focused "on final stage judgements on students by teachers (i.e. test results) or on teachers by students (i.e. questionnaire feedback), but on a range of information types and information gathering processes, drawn together to develop and improve the program" (Kiely, 2003, p.293). Giving a detailed feedback on how a particular curriculum is perceived by all stakeholders of a program, evaluation has gained much attention in language education (Öner & Mede, 2015, p.205). However, there are many definitions of evaluation in the literature, all of

which differ in their scope, abstraction, and restriction (Al-Nwaiem, 2012, p.38). Similarly, Karcı Aktaş (2018) underlines that since the evaluation involves different methods for each program evaluator, it is possible to encounter different definitions, so it would be misleading to make a single definition of the concept of evaluation (p.34).

Evaluation is a part of the inexperienced teacher's checklist to guide the development of teaching practice, a process of determining students' achievement or satisfaction, and a dimension of the analysis of data in a formal evaluation or research study (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005, p.5). It refers to the judgements about students by teachers and external evaluators; the performance of teachers by their students, program managers and institutions; and programs, departments and institutions by internal evaluators, external observers and inspectors. Evaluation is about the relationships between different program components, the procedures and epistemologies developed by the people involved in programs, and the processes and outcomes which are used to show the value of a program accountability development (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005, p.5). Evaluation is, furthermore, a form of enquiry, reneging from research to systematic approaches to decision-making. In the context of an innovative language program, evaluation might include periodic reviews of the budget, staff appraisal and decisions relating to professional development, recurred classroom observation for professional development of teachers or for quality assurance purposes, narratives of experience from participants, as well as a one-off study to inform on the success of the innovation. (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005, p.6).

Lynch (1990) states that it is a systematic attempt to determine what happens in and at the end of language programs, and typically serves as the basis for judgments and decisions about these programs (p.23). Karataş (2007) summarizes evaluation as a multi-faceted concept that includes features such as selecting the information to be measured, obtaining, analyzing, transmitting, using the obtained information, deciding the quality and efficiency of the applied program (p.13). Evaluation is first and foremost an applied research. The choice of methodology, to some extent, flows naturally from this fundamental perspective. It is suggested (a) to conduct investigations in the field rather than in artificially controlled 'laboratory' settings, (b) to consider the effect of total programs rather than isolated components of them, (c) that the duration of the studies be long-term rather than short-term, and (d) randomization is not always practicable or crucial (Beretta, 1986b, p.145).

Ertürk (1979) defines program evaluation as the process of determining the realization of the educational objectives. Gültekin (2005) states that an education system should continuously evaluate its programs to ensure that the success of the system and the programs it implements meet the demands of the community and reflect the results of the evaluation in program development studies (cited in Bayram, 2011). Whether or not a program achieves its purpose is understood by the evaluation process which is the final stage of an education program. In an education program, appropriate evaluation processes should be selected, and the results obtained at the end of the program should be determined (Küçükahmet, 1998, cited in Bayram, 2011). The methods followed in program evaluation, the selected models, the measurement tools used, the regulation to be made in any dimension of the program at the end of the evaluation process affect the other dimensions of the program, and hence the success of the program (Bayram, 2011). The more the setting of an evaluation process resembles a regular classroom, the greater the degree of ecological representativeness and the more confidently it can be generalized to other settings (Bracht & Glass, 1968, cited in Beretta, 1986b, p.147). By contrast, a study which takes place in projected conditions has no credible relationship with what might happen in real classrooms. What happens in an unnatural environment may not parallel what occurs in the field.

If one program has a linguistic curriculum and another does not, there is not likely to be much commonality in either content or measurable objectives. Thus, the common/unique strategy may not offer a way of comparing them fairly (Beretta, 1986a, p.440). Program evaluation is only as good as the criterion measures used; that standardized tests are inappropriate tools for comparing programs; and that, at the very least, the claims of each specific program must be considered in test construction if competing interests are to be represented fairly (Beretta, 1986a, p.441). Evaluation must not be static and crystalized but be continuous and recurring, reflecting rates of gain rather than gain itself (Henning, 1982, p.468).

As a central component of the educational process, evaluation is the process of "delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decisions alternatives" (Stufflebeam, 1971, p.4). Periodically evaluating and revising existing language education programs are of great value for stakeholders as the ongoing program evaluation paves the way for developing effective curricula (Soruc, 2012, p.36). It is important for language education programs to have a structured evaluation system which aids to improve the quality of instruction (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005; Peacock, 2009). It

can be seen from the discussion that program evaluation can play a range of different roles. For instance, it can help to understand, verify, and increase the impact of materials on students. It can help in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a program. In addition, it can help stakeholders and administrators to verify whether the program is running as originally planned. The increased interest in program evaluation in recent years highlights its importance (Al-Nwaiem, 2012, p.41). This debate about definitions is arguably problematic to the reputation of program evaluation. Sawin (2000) argues that there are serious problems and issues in the field, and defining the term 'evaluation' comes first on the list. He asserts that:

> There seems to be an urgent need to solve the definition problem as we clarify the boundaries of the field. In the context of certification, how can we attempt to test prospective practitioners without some consensus about how evaluation should be practiced? More fundamentally, how can we claim that evaluation is a profession if we cannot agree on such matters? (Sawin, 2000, p.233).

Given the multiplicity of definitions, it is reasonable to suggest that the definition of the term 'evaluation' depends on the definer's particular perspective. When evaluation in education began, researchers tended to define it from a single perspective of determining whether or not objectives had been met. Recently, researchers have started to look at it from a different angle: evaluation could also mean investigating the process to find room for improvement (Al-Nwaiem, 2012, p.40). Parallel to these common definitions, Cronbach (2000) classifies the following three types of decisions that require evaluation (p.236):

1. Course improvement: deciding what instructional materials and methods are satisfactory and where change is needed.

2. Decisions about individuals: identifying the needs of the pupil for the sake of planning his instruction, judging pupil merit for purposes of selection and grouping, acquainting the pupil with his own progress and deficiencies.

3. Administrative regulation: judging how good the school system is, how good individual teachers are, etc.

The matter of program evaluation objectives and purposes, though, is quite broad. Generally speaking, a program's objectives provide guidance for achieving the program's purposes; Lundberg (2006) classifies three main groups of objectives:

- Evaluation for development: aimed to improve institutional performance.

- Evaluation for accountability: aimed to provide information to decision makers.
- Evaluation for knowledge: aimed to generate understanding and explanation (cited in Al-Nwaiem, 2012, p.43).

Posavac and Carey (2003), on the other hand, propose six purposes of program evaluation, all of which help to plan and improve programs, to assess their worth, and to make corrections in on-going service:

- To assess unmet needs
- To document implementation
- To measure results
- To compare alternative programs
- To provide information to maintain and develop quality
- To detect negative side effects (cited in Erozan, 2005, p.24).

Based on the discussions above, whatever the purpose underlying the evaluation process is, in order to understand how the program works, how teachers reflect it in their daily practices and whether it addresses students' needs, it is essential that programs be evaluated regularly and that informed policy decisions be made based on research (Öner & Mede, 2015, p.206). Evaluating existing foreign language programs on a regular basis is essential because program evaluation leads to more effective programs (Coşkun, 2013, p.1).

Following its increased use in the general education context, learner feedback of courses including instruction quality and the overall educational experience has become a significant part of the quality assurance process. While evaluations of educational curricula in general are still commonly based on outcomes, test scores, or some other forms of assessments that show that the subject matter has been learned, learner feedback has become another tool by which to view educational processes in a larger context (Balint, 2009, p.1)

2.3.1. Approaches to Program Evaluation

Different approaches to evaluation have been proposed since the beginning of evaluation studies in the 1930s (Beretta, 1992; Lynch, 1990). These different views are

rooted in philosophy and beliefs about program evaluation. Various researchers have introduced approaches with some similarities and differences over the years. Therefore, a single categorization layout for all approaches or all types does not exist, and researchers choose which approaches and/or types to follow according to their program evaluation objectives, limitations, and desired outcomes. As mentioned earlier, approaches to program evaluation have been termed and classified differently by different researchers. Since the aim of this study is not to present the program evaluation models, different approaches are handled in general. In the literature, there are different classifications related to program evaluation approaches. However, formulating a single approach, a model, or a type that is capable of serving the wide range of potential evaluation context might not be possible (Lynch, 1990, p.23). More recently, the perception has surfaced that no single type of evaluation can possibly do service for the wide range of programs that evaluators must address and the wide range of evaluation purposes (Beretta, 1992, p.18).

One classification of approaches to program evaluation was developed by Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004), and they classified approaches to program evaluation into six categories: *(1)* Objectives-oriented Evaluation Approach, *(2)* Management-oriented approach, *(3)* Consumer-oriented Evaluation Approach, *(4)* Expertise-oriented Evaluation Approach, *(5)* Participant-oriented Evaluation Approach, and *(6)* Adversary-oriented Evaluation Approach. To be more detailed, the most commonly used approach for program evaluation, the objectives-oriented approach focuses on goals and is concerned with determining to what extent they are accomplished. Focusing on management needs, the key point of the management-oriented approach is to meet the informational needs of managerial decision-makers in education such as administrators, policy-makers, and teachers by providing them evaluative information (Mede, 2012, p.48). Commonly used by government agencies and consumer advocates who compile information to evaluate a product's effectiveness, the consumer-oriented evaluation approach aims at educational consumers and produces evaluation products to meet their needs besides developing evaluative information on educational products to assist decisions about educational purchases (Mede, 2012, pp.48–49). The focus of this approach is on the cost of the program and the data obtained and evaluated accordingly. One of the oldest and most frequently used approaches, the expertise-oriented evaluation approach uses professional expertise to evaluate educational programs, products or activities and their quality (Mede, 2012, p.49). Stressing the significance of firsthand

experience and the participant involvement in the data collection and evaluation process, the participant-oriented evaluation approach requires involvement of stakeholders and naturalistic questioning of participants as the main focus (Mede, 2012, p.49). Lastly, the adversary-oriented evaluation approach utilizes a judicial process in examining a program. Including a hearing, defense, jury, charges, and rebuttals, the primary focus of this approach is to gain results through the examination of opposing views. The plus and minuses of an issue are examined by two teams who participate in a debate to defend their positions and reach an agreement (Hogan, 2007, p.8).

Another example of a classification of approaches to program evaluation was suggested by Wilkes and Bligh (1999), who advocated that different evaluation methods should be used to gather the maximum possible information and developed four categories for approaches as follows: (1) Student-oriented approach, (2) Program-oriented approach, (3) Institution-oriented approach, and (4) Stakeholder-oriented approach. More recent classification of evaluation approaches was presented by Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) who classified 26 approaches under five categories: (1) Pseudo evaluations promoting invalid or incomplete findings contains five approaches such as Politically Controlled Studies and Pandering evaluations; (2) the Questions and Methods Oriented category includes 14 approaches such as Objectives Based Studies and Case Study Evaluations; (3) the Improvement and Accountability Oriented category includes three approaches such as Decision and Accountability Oriented approaches, and Consumer Oriented Studies, (4) the Social Agenda and Advocacy Approaches category includes three approaches such as Responsive evaluation and Constructivist evaluation, and finally the (5) Eclectic Evaluation Approaches category has just one approach, namely Utilization Focused evaluation. Since the number of program evaluation approaches proposed in the educational literature are great, all these are placed by Brown, (1989) into one of four categories (cited in Gerede, 2005, p.5): Product-oriented approaches, static-characteristic approaches, process-oriented approaches, decision-facilitation approaches.

2.3.2. Program Evaluation Types

The choice of which evaluation approach to use mostly depends on each specific situation or particular program. Some evaluators adopt or adapt a certain approach in their designs, but many evaluators conduct evaluations without strict loyalty to any specific

approach (Gerede, 2005, p.5). Besides the program evaluation approaches which exist in the educational literature, there are two common program evaluation types which are formative evaluation and summative evaluation.

2.3.2.1. Formative Evaluation

In the literature, there are two major types of language program evaluation: formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation takes place during the development of a program with the purpose of gathering information to be used for the improvement of the program (Gerede, 2005, p.5). Carried out to determine the quality of a program, the aim of formative evaluation is to develop the program and find answers to questions such as "What can be done to improve the program? And how?" (Ertürk, 1979). Formative evaluation (also termed as *process evaluation*) is "the systematic observation of classroom behavior with reference to the theory of second or foreign language development which underlies the program being evaluated" (Long, 1984, p.415). It focuses on what is going on during the implementation of the program (process) to determine if the objectives have been met and to improve the processes involved (Muşlu, 2007). Formative evaluation is carried out in order to reveal students' learning difficulties and increase the effectiveness of the program. It is generally conducted by evaluators in the organization. In the implementation phase of the program, deficiencies—if any—should be identified and necessary corrections must be made. This can only be done by receiving feedback from teachers who are program practitioners and students. To improve and make the program more effective, necessary precautions should be taken and a control system should be established. In foreign language program evaluation, student feedback has been viewed as being particularly useful for formative evaluation purposes where this feedback is constructively used to make changes to the program (Balint, 2009, p.9). This form of evaluation has coincided with an increasing role of administrators or teaching stuff being involved in conducting the evaluation. Not only is there an advantage of inside knowledge of the program when teaching stuff is directly involved, but implementing any necessary changes can usually be completed more efficiently. In formative evaluation, the aim is to make decisions on whether to continue or stop the program. It is usually conducted by external observers, but experts in the institution are also consulted (Ertürk, 1979). It is a type of evaluation that is used to determine the extent to which students have achieved the expected objectives at the end of the program. A

judgment can be made about the effectiveness of the program by applying achievement tests or proficiency exams (Ertürk, 1979).

Though formative evaluation and process evaluation are usually used interchangeably in the literature, Long (1984) clarifies the difference between formative and process evaluations. The difference between the two is expressed to include focus, theoretical motivation, timing, and purpose (Long, 1984, p.422). Process evaluations offer several benefits for teachers and administrators alike. The most important benefit is that they can document what is actually going on in classrooms compared to what is thought to be going on.

2.3.2.2. Summative Evaluation

Most product-oriented evaluation approaches are summative. It usually relies on testing, grading, classifying, marking, and measuring students' achievements. However, less attention is given to determining the effectiveness of a program or its appropriateness in meeting learners' particular needs (Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis, 1981, cited in Gerede, 2005). Summative evaluation (also termed as *product evaluation*) focuses on what a program produces, mainly in terms of student learning and changes that the program brings about in teachers' and students' attitudes, students' self-concepts, and related intellectual skills (Long, 1984, p.409). Similar to product evaluation, the primary aim of summative evaluation is to make decisions whether the objectives of a program have been achieved or not (Muşlu, 2007). Long (1984) underlines that it attempts to summarize the results of a program, once implemented (p.417). It is done at the end of the program to collect information to determine whether the program has been successful and effective, resulting in important changes like continuation or cancellation of the program (Gerede, 2005, p.5).

Though summative evaluation and product evaluation are usually used interchangeably in the literature, they tend to differ most frequently in two areas: scope and content (Long, 1984, p.418). Summative evaluations are typically broader in scope, often assessing attitudinal or cost issues in addition to student achievement. On the other hand, product evaluations tend to be more restricted, focusing on student achievement as the most important concern. Summative evaluations also differ from product evaluations in that they often do not address language development issues at all whereas language acquisition is primary focus of product evaluations. Other than the specified difference

between summative and product evaluations, it is highly stressed by Long (1984) that though necessary, only product evaluations are not sufficient, but process evaluation (p.422). Utilizing process and product evaluations in combination can help determining not only whether a program really works, or works better, but if so, why, and if not, why not.

In relation with the present study, it can be said that this study has some product-oriented features, namely a summative nature, due to the fact that the research takes place after the program is completed and its focus is on the views of the graduates of EPP at FU SFL and their lecturers in the faculties and whether the language needs of these graduates are met with the curriculum—without focusing on what is going on in the program process.

2.4. Related Studies on Program Evaluation

Related studies on evaluation of foreign language teaching programs in different educational contexts have been introduced in two sections, namely the studies carried out in Turkey and in other countries.

2.4.1. Program Evaluation Studies on Foreign Language Teaching Abroad

This section summarizes the previous studies conducted abroad on foreign language teaching programs in higher education institutions from the most recent to the oldest. Chang, Kim, and Lee (2015) carried out a study to develop and evaluate the programs of the courses taught in English. Based upon the results of preliminary needs and syllabus analysis studies, a language support program was developed to help Korean students follow foreign professors' courses through equipping them with necessary English writing, communication, and presentation skills. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques were used in the study and questionnaires and interviews were administered. It was concluded that the program was ineffective in improving the target language skills of students. It was proposed to change the program environment, course hours and duration. In addition, it was stated that a language support program was needed to minimize the language and educational inequalities of the students.

The study conducted by Tsou and Chen (2014) aimed to evaluate the usefulness of an ESP program of a university in Taiwan. Besides integrating recent findings from emerging research on ESP learning and teaching including topics such as authenticity,

learner autonomy and learning transfer, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) model and Watanabe, Norris, and Gonzalez-Lloret (2009) model were combined as an evaluation model for higher education ESP program. Determination of the needs and objectives of the stakeholders, course evaluation, meeting the needs, assessment of materials, activities and assessment tools, assessment of learner autonomy were carried out by applying tests, questionnaires to students and interview forms for teachers. In this study, not only the evaluation of certain variables, but also the variables beyond the course were evaluated, which is the most powerful aspect of this study.

Alameddine (2013) investigated engineering students' attitude towards learning technical English. The study examined students' motivation for learning technical English, particularly the source of their motivation, and explored whether factors such as gender and academic level affect their motivation to learn technical English. The study included a conveniently chosen sample of 24 engineering students of ENGL 212-Technical Writing of Summer I 2013. A questionnaire to test their attitudes and motivation was used as a tool for data collection. A focused group interview was also carried out to supplement the questionnaire. Findings revealed that the respondents had positive attitude towards technical English and believed it would further their status and employment chances. Although there was not any difference in attitude or motivation between two genders, there was a difference of attitude relating to academic level.

In the study of Al-Nwaiem (2012), it was aimed to evaluate the basic language skills component in the English Language Teaching program at a university in Kuwait from the perspective of the participants. Writing, Reading, and Speaking courses that the prospective teachers take in the first semester were evaluated. The research design was determined as a mixed method case study in which the Bellon and Handler evaluation model was adapted. 3 lecturers and 55 first graders were selected as the study group. Qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques such as questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, diaries, and written documents related to the program were used in the research. Quantitative data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and qualitative data were analyzed using descriptive content analysis. As a result of the findings, the school building and its environment were emphasized to be physically old and bad besides the emphasis on the limited number of classrooms, the lack of teaching and learning materials, and the lack of library resources. With regard to the goals and objectives of the program, it was understood that the objectives should be revised. The students were not satisfied with the content of the program and the materials

including boring, simple, and out-of-date coursebooks. They also stated that both teaching methods and measurement tools were traditional. The measurement tools were expressed to be based on memorization. The study concluded by making some recommendations for improvement of the program. First, the readiness of the students should be measured. Then, needs analysis should be done. Following that, there is a need to evaluate the program constantly. Also, there must be a separate grammar lesson since students' lack of grammar was observed by the researcher.

In the study conducted by Yılmaz (2011), it was aimed to evaluate the Turkish program at a university in Krakow. The study was conducted by taking the opinions of students. The needs and expectations of 33 students were determined by a 4-point Likert-type questionnaire. There were 53 items in the survey. The first 10 questions were related to students' perceptions of the program, 16 questions were related to their perceptions of skills, 11 questions were directed for their perceptions of method, 16 questions were related to their perceptions of materials. As a result of the findings, it was understood that the program was mostly for exams, communication skills were not given much importance and students had less opportunities to communicate outside the classroom. Secondly, it was concluded that students would learn the language better through non-traditional activities such as group work and role-playing. Finally, it was stated that the use of up-to-date and various materials instead of a limited number of out-of-date materials would meet the needs of the students by increasing their motivation.

Balint (2009) aimed to assess the level of satisfaction of different stakeholders about the current English program. For this purpose, a two-year program of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) of a university in Japan was examined by including different learner factors. With this object in my mind, the study was carried out with 440 students. The students were applied a survey including items about their opinions of the instructors, the content of the program, and the expectations of the learner. No relationship was found between the achievement level of the students, their grades in the courses in the program and their improvement in the English language, and their satisfaction levels. However, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the program satisfaction in terms of gender.

Peacock (2009) presented a new procedure for the evaluation of EFL teacher-training programs based on the principles of program evaluation and foreign language teacher education. Focusing on program strengths and weaknesses and the extent to which the program meets students' needs, the procedure was tested by the evaluation of a

program, collecting data from 166 third-year students, 8 program teachers, and graduate students of the program, and the coordinators of all 35 courses in the program through interviews, questionnaires, essays, and analysis of program materials. The program was revealed to have had several strengths, including the teaching of pedagogic skills and assisting reflection and self-evaluation, but also deficiencies. The amount of teaching practice and input in particular areas such as knowledge of teaching within the local socio-cultural context and classroom management were suggested to be increased.

Nam (2005) evaluated the university-level English program in South Korea by taking the opinions of Vocational High School students and teachers about the Communication-Based English Program. The study aimed to identify future program design and the possible needs of developing programs in South Korea. Apart from these, there are three main objectives of the study: assessing and criticizing the English program at the Pusan National University, depicting the views of university students and teachers in Korea on the program being implemented, and determining the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The study included 600 students and 20 teachers. In the study, quantitative survey method was used and qualitative interviews were conducted to test the implementation of the program at Pusan National University as an example of the changing perspective in English in Korea. According to the findings, although there are negative opinions of the students about the efficiency and quality of the new program, the teachers gave a positive opinion. Students stated that the methods and materials used in the program were inefficient and that time was not enough. According to another finding, due to some weaknesses of the program and the limitations of the institution, the existing communication-based English program did not exactly match the students' wishes. At the same time, research has emphasized the importance of needs analysis for a more effective implementation and evaluation of the new program.

In the study carried out by Marcinkoniene (2005), the ways of improving course programs and promotion of language acquisition at Kaunas University of Technology through taking the theoretical background of educational evaluation traditions, course-specific aspects and assessment criteria into consideration were emphasized. Administered to 234 first and second-year students to evaluate their expectations, achievements and attitudes towards the program along with the role of course materials, a questionnaire was used to obtain data. The results of the study supported the participants to be more critical and motivated the learners and teachers to take evaluation more seriously.

Kiely (2003) adopted a group discussion approach to program evaluation and aimed to evaluate a 36-hour EAP course at a British university. This process of assessment, called the Nominal Group Technique, included fifteen participants who were requested to write in a descriptive or evaluation-oriented statement of their learning needs or experience from the program. These data were then read, listed and clarified by the researcher. This process continued until a full list was formed. Then, the indexing process, where each point corresponds to a unit, was created. At the end of this process, the outcome of the program was determined as a list of prioritized activities aimed at improving the program.

Sharp (1990) discusses some of the techniques that are available for course evaluation, with special reference to 'illuminative' evaluation, illustrated by an evaluation program undertaken at the University of Brunei Darussalam. The evaluation described in the article emphasizes the usefulness of summative evaluation, outlines the conclusions of the evaluation process, and indicates the constraints met during that process more accurate diagnostic testing; a greater emphasis on oral and written skills; greater use of authentic materials drawn from students' future academic studies; closer consultation with lecturers who will teach the students on future courses; and increased study of student needs in the target situation.

2.4.2 Program Evaluation Studies on Foreign Language Teaching in Turkey

In this section, previous studies related to foreign language (English) preparatory programs in higher education institutions in Turkey are summarized from the most recent to the oldest. Karcı Aktaş (2018) evaluated English preparatory curriculum of Aydın Adnan Menderes University School of Foreign Languages according to Bellon and Handler model. 310 students in the EPP, 26 English instructors, 24 students in other departments, and 26 lecturers teaching in those departments participated in the research. The quantitative data were gathered through a scale of Motivation Towards Learning English, Student and Lecturer Questionnaires while the qualitative data were obtained through interviews with 13 English instructors, 18 students in the EPP, 26 lecturers of other departments, and 24 students in other departments; class observations; and document analysis. The results of the study showed that the curriculum lacked specific goals. The instructors did not have many responsibilities, and some of them were observed to apply various activities opposed to the sense of standardization of school. As

a result of interviews, students' views with regard to motivation towards learning English were different form each other. All participants mentioned that the students could not reach to the desired level of achievement at the end of the program. In the analysis of organization, the communication between students and instructors was evaluated as positive while the communication between administration and some instructors was negative. In the analysis of operations, the inefficacy of activities was emphasized by all participants. Insufficient practice was reported to be the common reason of students' having difficulties in improving language skills. All lecturers in other departments also emphasized that students' knowledge of English was inadequate. To the end of the study, some suggestions were made to improve the quality and effectiveness of the EPP. Needs have to be determined through needs analysis, and objectives of the program should be generated in detail. Academic English should be included in the program. The employment of foreign instructors, the usage of various materials, the improvement of facilities, sufficient involvement of instructors, students, and graduates in decision making process, identifying specific objectives of the program, the review of the curriculum, the cooperation with other departments of university, the utilization of various activities, the usage of process-oriented assessment techniques should be applied after evaluation process.

Balcı, Durak-Üğüten, and Çolak (2018) investigated the effectiveness of compulsory English Preparatory Program at Necmettin Erbakan University School of Foreign Languages. A mixed-method research design was employed in which both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. In the quantitative part of the study, the proficiency test administered at the beginning of the academic year was used as the post-test to assess the students' progress in English. A total of 70 students participated in the quantitative phase of the study. Also, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews were conducted with 20 students in the program in the qualitative part. The results of the quantitative data showed that students' scores improved significantly throughout the academic year. The EPP was claimed to have improved students' proficiency in English though some deficiencies were noted. As a result, it was found that the program significantly improved students' level of English proficiency; the program had more positive effect on writing and reading skills, and less positive effect on listening and speaking skills; and the students were satisfied with the program in general. Besides, the program was stated to have had shortcomings especially in terms of speaking and listening skills.

In the study conducted by Yükselir (2018), the expectations of Turkish students in a one-year optional preparatory program were examined. In this study, designed as mixed method, an adapted needs analysis questionnaire and unstructured interviews were employed. A sample of 110 students graduated from the program and in the different departments of a state university were included. The results revealed that the majority of students thought that the program is essential; however, they lost their motivation due to learning processes, systems, or subjective factors. Besides, they expressed that materials had not been appropriate enough to improve their level of English, and the program failed to meet their expectations in relation to program content and language learning processes. Regarding four language skills, they underlined that productive skills should be given much more importance rather than receptive skills.

Özüdoğru (2017) aimed to evaluate the voluntary English Preparatory Program at Uşak University. In this study, the Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) evaluation model developed by Stufflebeam was used. As a data collection tool, a questionnaire was applied to 208 preparatory students and semi-structured interview questions were asked to two lecturers in the academic year of 2015–2016. As a result of the content analysis, it was found that both students and instructors were not satisfied with the physical conditions of the SFL; there was a lack of emphasis on speaking, writing, and vocabulary teaching; process evaluation was ignored; and that teacher-based instruction was implemented in the classroom; however, the students were generally satisfied with the instructors. In the light of the findings, it was emphasized that the content of the program was suggested to cover all language skills, especially speaking, writing, and vocabulary teaching; and the educational setting was noted to need improvement.

Arap (2016) examined the effectiveness of the EPPs at higher education institutions in Turkey through the perceptions of students and instructors, using the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, and Product) evaluation model designed by Stufflebeam (1971). The data were obtained from 1117 students who were attending in the EPPs at four state universities in the 2013–2014 academic year and 218 instructors who were teaching in these programs in the same academic year. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews and questionnaires. The results revealed that the EPPs at four state universities in Turkey partially met the needs and expectations of the students and instructors. However, it was stated that the perceptions of the students were less positive than those of the instructors. It was noted that some revisions and

regulations should be done in the program in order to meet the needs and expectations of the students and instructors.

Özdoruk (2016) evaluated the English Preparatory Program at Yıldırım Beyazıt University School of Foreign Languages from the point of view of the instructors, students, and instructors working in the program and testing office. The program was evaluated by using CIPP model developed by Stufflebeam (1971). The quantitative data were collected by a questionnaire applied to 243 prep students studying at intermediate level while the qualitative data were collected through interviews with 10 instructors, two of whom were responsible for preparing the assessment materials. The findings of the study revealed that the EPP had been planned to improve students' English language skills, but it needed to be developed in order to improve the skills necessary for students to follow departmental courses. The findings of the study showed that the Independent Learning Center, the physical conditions, the materials used in the courses, instructors, and portfolio studies had a positive effect. On the other hand, the results also revealed problems related to students' listening and speaking skills. The students stated that they were pleased with the instructors, but the lack of English for the department was one of the major shortcomings. They stated that group discussions and presentations would be useful in the lessons of their departments. Such activities would contribute to the students' command of both departmental terminology and speaking skills. It was stated that speaking and listening skills should be given more importance than others.

Şen Ersoy and Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu (2015) investigated the voluntary English Preparatory Program at Dumlupınar University Foreign Languages Department according to the opinions of students and instructors. 109 students who began studying in the program in 2011 and 12 instructors participated in the study. The data of the study, which adopted the qualitative research design, were collected through an open-ended questionnaire and semi-structured interview form; and content analysis method was used in the analysis of the data. According to the opinions of the students and instructors, the goals of the students to participate in the program were primarily personal and career development; they were expected to get an education that would enable them to use the language effectively; and the program mostly met the expectations. However, the expectations of learning Professional English and getting educated by foreign teachers were not met. The program was stated to have contributed to the development of some students' level of English while others said did not agree with that view. Within the framework of the structure and implementation of the program, it was determined that

the opinions of students and instructors mostly focused on course hours and times, weekly course schedule, and exams; and the opinions differed both within the participant groups and between the groups. It was also stated that speaking class should be given more importance. Finally, although the instructors thought that the voluntary program was effective on students' motivation, absenteeism, attendance, and academic achievement, it was seen that these factors could vary from student to student, as well as different factors such as classroom dynamics, teacher, and student communication.

Öner and Mede (2015) investigated the perceptions of the students, instructors, a level coordinator, and a program administrator in an English Preparatory School concerning their perceptions of the A1 (beginner level) program designed for repeat students at a foundation university in İstanbul, Turkey. 47 students repeating A1 level program, 5 EFL instructors, 1 level coordinator, and 1 program administrator were included in the study. The students were administered a needs analysis questionnaire while semi-structured interviews were carried out with all stakeholders of the program. The findings of the study showed that there were certain components that needed to be revised though the program was perceived to be effective in general. In the light of the findings, they made certain curricular recommendations to be taken for consideration.

Coşkun (2013) evaluated the modular intensive general English language teaching program at a state university in Turkey by investigating students' and English instructors' perceptions of different program dimensions such as the materials, teaching process, and assessment. 381 students who came to class on the day when the data were collected participated in this evaluation study. In addition, 22 English instructors at the preparatory program attended the focus group interviews. The data were collected via questionnaires filled out by students and interviews with the English instructors at the preparatory program. The findings showed that the modular system needs to be discontinued as it has certain drawbacks and should be replaced by a more manageable and feasible system considering specific contextual constraints such as the number of instructors, classrooms, and teaching resources. Also, it was found that there are certain aspects of the curriculum that need to be improved in order to develop a more effective program.

In the study carried out by Karakuş (2013), the measurement and evaluation dimension which is an important part in the application of modular system in foreign language teaching, which is generally not applied much except for foundation universities and foreign language courses, is examined. The study group of the research consists of 10 instructors working in a state university where modular system is applied. Interviews

were held with the participants about the measurement and evaluation in the modular system applied in the preparatory classes and the results were evaluated. According to the research findings; it is seen that the modular system divides students into modules according to their English level. In addition, the importance of meticulous and objective assessment and evaluation of the modular system is emphasized. From the point of view of trainers, being systematic and planned are the positive aspects of the modular system. it is thought to be motivating for students to be non-monotonous and to change classes. The lecturers stated that speaking and listening skills were difficult to test, and that these skills were important and needed more attention. Portfolios are stated to be very useful. Portfolio studies are thought to increase motivation as they encourage out-of-class teaching activities.

Soruc (2012) investigated the context and program of a preparatory school of an English-medium university in Turkey in the second semester of 2010–2011 academic year and recommended new ways and rationale for making curricular decisions. A needs assessment survey and interviews were administered with randomly selected 105 EFL learners. The results revealed that the program was proved to be sufficient for students' language skills. Moreover, language levels (e.g A1, A2, B1, B2) were found to have a significant effect on the extent to which students perceive their competence in skills. Materials, methods, and assessment were positively viewed whereas the inefficacy of teachers was criticized. This study revealed that needs analysis can play an important role in making curricular decisions or renewing language programs. To the end of the study, several suggestions were presented to language teaching schools and curriculum designers.

Mede (2012) aimed to develop and evaluate a language preparatory program at Yeditepe University, which provides education in a foreign language. 88 prospective teachers and 10 lecturers from Yeditepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching participated in the study. The study consists of two parts: program development and program evaluation. In the first part of the study, quantitative data were obtained through a pre-needs analysis questionnaire and qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews about the perceptions of prospective teachers about language needs. In the second part, quantitative and qualitative data were obtained through a needs analysis questionnaire for the presumed learning needs of prospective students, a final-needs analysis survey for perceived language needs of prospective students, semi-structured interviews, pre-test and post-test results of the

language proficiency exam of prep students and prep students and prospective teachers directly transferred to the department. The findings of the study showed significant results for the development and evaluation of the language preparatory program. In the evaluation of the program, it was stated that especially course hours of speaking skills should be increased.

Tunç (2010) evaluated the effectiveness of the Preparatory School Program of Ankara University from the point of view of instructors and students. For this purpose, the CIPP assessment model developed by Stufflebeam (1971) was used. The sample of the study consists of 406 students attending prep school in 2008–2009 academic year and 12 instructors. Data were collected through a questionnaire and interview forms. Document analysis was also used to obtain more detailed information. While descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used in the analysis of quantitative data, qualitative data were analyzed with content analysis technique. The findings showed that Ankara University Preparatory School Program partially achieved its objectives. It was revealed that conditions for transportation to school were insufficient, the objectives of the program were not well defined, and a detailed program was needed. In addition, it was concluded that the students found themselves inadequate in their speaking and listening skills and that the difficulty of the exams was not consistent. In this sense, the program was noted to be developed in terms of physical conditions, content, resources, and evaluation.

Bayram (2011) aimed to determine the opinions of the teachers and the students at Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği University of Economics and Technology (TOBB UET) Department of Foreign Languages regarding the English Preparatory Program. The evaluation is based upon Stufflebeam's context, input, process and product method. 366 students studying at the English Preparatory Program at TOBB UET during 2009–2010 academic year, and 39 teachers are included in the study. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher, and included 55 items in total eleven of which are about the context, twenty of which are about the input, ten of which are about the process, and fourteen of which are about the product evaluation. The results of the study showed that teachers' opinions regarding the context, input, process, and product of the program tend to be more positive than that of the students.

Özkanal (2009) conducted a study to evaluate the English Preparatory Program at Eskişehir Osmangazi University Department of Foreign Languages according to program dimensions, to find out whether the program has achieved the desired qualifications and

to propose a new program model depending on the evaluation results. In the study conducted in 2006–2007 academic year, screening model was used. In this research, the students studying in the English Preparatory Program, the students who have completed the program, and the instructors in the English Preparatory Program are included. Research data were obtained by survey and interview techniques. Two questionnaires developed by the researcher were applied to the students who were studying in the English Preparatory Program and those who completed the program. The interview was conducted with the instructors teaching in the program. The results of the study showed that there were problems in almost every aspect of the EPP, the program provided some qualifications to some extent, but there were deficiencies in the technical English. Depending on the results of the study, an English Preparatory Program model proposal has been presented to eliminate the problems and to increase the qualifications of the program.

Tiryaki (2009) aimed to evaluate the English Preparatory Program at Ankara University School of Foreign Languages from the point of view of program coordinators, instructors, and students. The sample of the study consisted of 65 instructors, 6 coordinators, and 300 students in the SFL in 2008–2009 academic year. The data of the study was gathered by a questionnaire and an interview form. The questionnaire consisted of 68 items and was designed to determine the views of instructors and students regarding the language descriptors, content characteristics, teaching-learning activities and testing situations of the EPP. In the interview form, six questions were prepared to determine the views of instructors and coordinators regarding the planning, implementation, evaluation and development of the curriculum. When the results of the research were examined in general, there was no significant difference between instructors' opinions about the preparatory program, the department they had graduated from, gender, and work experience while there was no significant difference between students' opinions about the program, their university exam scores, and score types but there was a significant difference between their opinions and gender. According to the findings of the questionnaire, there was no significant difference between the views of instructors and students in general. The data obtained from the questionnaires revealed that the focus on speaking and listening skills was left behind in the program and that they could not be developed sufficiently at the end of the year. As a result of the interviews, there were some deficiencies in the areas of curriculum development and measurement and evaluation.

Drawn upon a discourse community perspective, in the study reported by Kırkgöz (2009), regarding students' academic needs, the effectiveness of the English language teaching program in a university in Turkey that students had previously been through was evaluated according to the views of first-year undergraduates and lecturers. 15 lecturers and 220 students were included in a target situation needs assessment to determine students' academic needs, their perception of challenges while meeting those needs, and the extent of the relevance of the students' previous language education in meeting their academic needs. The findings of the study surfaced that a skills-based EAP curriculum was noted to be insufficient in preparing students effectively for their academic life. Multi-dimensional nature of needs analysis was highlighted, besides proposing several innovative recommendations within the discourse community framework to improve the EAP curriculum.

Karataş (2007) investigated the syllabus of English II instruction program applied in Modern Languages Department at Yıldız Technical University according to the opinions of the teachers and students by using context, input, process and product model. The universe of the research was composed of 35 teachers implementing English II program and 415 students in 2005–2006 academic year. The data was gathered with the two forms of a questionnaire consisting of 46 items for the teachers and students. One of the significant results of the study showed that the syllabus was not adequate to provide the students with necessary English knowledge for various fields of business according to the teachers. Besides, requirements of the students' departments and English knowledge for business life enforce the objectives of the syllabus to be revised according to the students participated in the study.

Muşlu (2007) aimed to find out the instructors' views on the writing curriculum in terms of the materials, the process-genre approach, journal writing, portfolios, project work and the writing competition at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages. 48 writing course instructors working at different proficiency levels were included in the study. A questionnaire was designed to identify the instructors' views on the writing curriculum. In addition, a semi-structured interview was conducted with 40% of the instructors to get their further thoughts. According to the results of the study, there were problems with the course packs and supplementary materials. They were inappropriate for the students and needed to be revised. As for the process-genre approach, most of the instructors stated that the genre and the approach taught in the program were parallel to the students' needs. Additionally, the grammar syllabus was considered to be crucial

while preparing the writing syllabus particularly in the lower levels. As for journal writing, portfolios, and project work the instructors believed that it was a good communication opportunity between the instructors and students.

Kayapınar (2006) aimed to reveal the quality of the measurement instrument used as the final exam which was implemented at Mersin University School of Foreign Languages at the end of 2002–2003 academic year considering its psychometric characteristics such as item difficulty index, item discrimination index, and test reliability. The reliability of the measurement instrument was found as 0,89, which is adequately reliable.

Şahin (2006) aimed to investigate the in-service training program (Certificate in English Language Teaching) carried out jointly by the Department of Modern Languages and the Department of Basic English at Middle East Technical University in terms of its effectiveness to achieve its goals and to make suggestions for the following years. The model used in the study was proposed by Kirkpatrick in 1959 and included four stages: Response, Learning, Behavior, and Results. Four different groups participated in the study. The most important data source was noted as the instructors participating in the program. Another group was the trainers of the program. The third group consisted of the heads of both departments. And the fourth group included the students of the instructors who participated in the program and those who did not. The data were obtained through questionnaires applied to the instructors and students participating in the program; individual interviews with instructors, trainers and department heads; observation of the program and the lessons of the participating instructors; and the examination of various documents related to the program. According to the findings, the Certificate of English Language Teaching program was effective in achieving its objectives. However, in some parts of the program changes, additions, and subtractions were proposed. Another result of the study was the observation of some difficulties in the application of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model for the English Language Teaching Certificate program. The biggest problem was that the model was a nonlinear model. For this reason, a more linear and specific model was suggested in the evaluation of the Certificate of English Language Teaching program.

Cengizhan (2006) has done a study for the need to develop a foreign language program to provide a better foreign language teaching in the EPPs. The researcher prepared a survey including 33 items for the students and a survey including 49 items for the instructors in the EPPs at three state universities (Erciyes, Gazi, and Osmangazi) each

of which is in a different geographical region of Turkey, and had face-to-face interviews with the teaching staff in these schools about the curriculum and teaching process. The EPPs at these universities were compared with each other. The results of the study showed that all three EPPs have similarities and differences in comparison. There is no program development office in the EPPs of all three universities. However, the course materials used in the EPPs are communicative. Besides, English instructors are young, dynamic, and know new methods and techniques. The teaching program of the EPP at Erciyes University is more productive than the EPPs at Gazi University and Osmangazi University. Also, the student assessment at Erciyes University is done in such a way that it can measure four language skills.

In a study conducted by Alıcı (2004) at Yıldız Technical University in the 2002–2003 academic year, the qualifications and shortcomings of the EPP were determined by obtaining the opinions of students in the School of Foreign Languages about the quality of the teaching program. The universe of the research was the preparatory class students, and 259 students formed the research sample. General screening model was used in this study. The data were obtained through a questionnaire developed by the researcher and consisting of 47 questions about the general characteristics, objectives, content and assessment process of the EPP. According to the results of the research, Prep class students found the total duration of the teaching, the number of Course Book and Writing courses in the program sufficient. However, they did not think that the number of Grammar and Reading courses was sufficient. They think it is necessary to study foreign language. The students stated that they had acquired reading and writing skills, but were unsure of their proficiency in listening and speaking. According to the findings obtained from the research, it is necessary to revise the textbooks used in the preparatory program with student feedback, to enrich the lessons with visual and audio materials, to improve the students' listening and speaking skills, and to reorganize the course content and teaching in line with the learner-centered and communicative teaching principles.

In summary, according to the results of the studies on the evaluation of English language teaching programs at higher education institutions in Turkey, speaking skills is given less importance, but should be given more significance. It is extensively stressed that in-class activities should be done in which students can be more active and develop their language skills. It is also understood that required content related to departmental courses should be presented in these programs. It is strongly recommended to make some changes in the assessment tools and procedures.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter, research design, setting, and participants of the research are presented in detail to give a general scope of the study. Then, data collection instruments and data collection procedures are explained. Finally, data analysis tools and data analysis procedure are noted.

3.2. Research Design

This research is designed to be a mixed-method study. The data of the study is gathered through using both quantitative and qualitative measurement techniques since no single design can find answers to a wide variety of questions that are asked about language teaching programs. The use of both methods provides a more complete understanding of research problems than does the use of either method alone (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011, p.557). It is emphasized that mixed method studies are used for a fuller picture and deeper understanding of a phenomenon and interpretation of collected data (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007, p.122). The need for mixed-method design also arises from the ethical consideration to confirm the validity and reliability of the process (Tellis, 1997). Fraenkel et al. (2011) defines several strengths of mixed-method research three of which are that it can help to clarify and explain relationships found to exist between variables, to explore relationships between variables in depth, and to confirm or cross-validate relationships discovered between variables as when quantitative and qualitative methods are compared to see if they converge to a single interpretation of a phenomenon.

3.3. Setting

This study is conducted at Fırat University, a state university in the city of Elazığ which is located in Eastern Turkey. Fırat University School of Foreign Languages (FU SFL) is an academic institution preparing undergraduates for their future studies in the departments of various faculties where the medium of instruction is wholly or partly English. The SFL teaches General English and develops students' language skills. To be

exempted from the program, students are required to get 60 or above out of 100 from the proficiency test they take at the beginning of an academic year before the English Preparatory Program (EPP) starts. If they get the required score, they begin studying in their departments immediately. The ones who get a score of below 60 start studying in the EPP, and get 24–26 hours of English classes a week throughout an academic year of 32 weeks in total. After an academic year of language education, students who are able to succeed in the EPP continue their undergradute studies in the departments requiring a B1 or B1+ level of English in terms of CEFR to be able to continue their studies in their majors. The participants of this study are the first graders studying in the departments of various faculties and their lecturers, so the study is conducted in the departments but not in the SFL.

3.4. Participants

A hundred freshmen studying in three undergraduate programs of three faculties in 2019–2020 academic year and nine lecturers in the same programs have been included in the study. The participants of the study are from the Department of Mechanical Engineering (ME)-Faculty of Engineering, the Department of Software Engineering (SE)-Faculty of Technology, the Department of English Language and Literature (ELL)-Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Students who were exempted from the EPP in 2018–2019 academic year and those who are foreign and do not have Turkish language proficiency are not included in the study. Besides, students in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades are not involved due to the newly applied modular system and time factor. Ultimately, since the universe of the study is not large and it is possible to reach the whole universe—freshmen and their lecturers, no sampling has been made to conduct questionnaires and get written and verbal responses through open-ended questions. However, students included in focus group interview are selected purposefully from 70 students in engineeing departments. The aim of purposeful sampling is to select information-rich cases to illuminate the questions under study. Information-rich cases are those which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research (Patton, 2002, p. 46).

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

As this study is intended to be a mixed-method research, various data collection tools including both quantitative and qualitative are utilized. Studies using just one method are more vulnerable to errors linked to that certain method such as loaded interview questions, biased or untrue responses than studies using multiple methods in which different types of data provide cross-data validity checks (Patton, 2002, p.248). Instruments that are used to gather data for this study are questionnaires including standardized items and open-ended questions, focus group interview, and semi-structured interviews.

3.5.1. Questionnaire for Faculty Students

The questionnaire applied to the first-year students of the faculties is designed by Köse (2012) and originally consists of two parts. In the first part of the questionnaire (For the Questionnaire for Faculty Students, See Appendix 1 and Appendix 2), students' demographic information and language skills they have and find significant are asked. In the second part, there are 25 standardized items in the format of 4-point Likert about the level of achievement of the objectives of the English Preparatory Program. In the third and last section prepared by the researcher, five open-ended questions aiming to determine students' views on the EPP at FU SFL are included. Responses to open-ended questions enable researchers to understand the world as seen by the respondents. The purpose of gathering responses to open-ended questions is "to enable the researcher to understand and capture the point of view of other people without predetermining those point of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories" (Patton, 2002, p.21). Students are kindly requested to give written answers to these open-ended questions about whether they are successful in the courses given in English in their departments and whether English language teaching in the EPP is useful and effective.

3.5.2. Focus Group Interview with Students

A focus group interview with students in engineering departments was seen necessary and obligatory after some time the questionnaire had been conducted. It was recognized that students of Software and Mechanical Engineering Departments had given short and insufficient answers to the open-ended questions. To have more detailed answers from the students in those departments, a focus group interview was conducted

with nine participants, three students from Software Engineering Department and six students from Mechanical Engineering Department. Patton (2002) states that rules for sample size in qualitative inquiry change according to what is known, the purpose of the research, what's at stake, what will be beneficial, what will have credibility, and what can be done within available time and resources. In a focus group, participants hear other participants' responses and can make additional comments, which enables the researcher to get high-quality data (Fraenkel et al., 2011, p.457; Patton, 2002, p.386). Additionally, some other advantages of focus group can be listed as (Patton, 2002, 386):

- Data collection is cost-effective.
- Interactions among participants enhance data quality.
- The extent to which there is a relatively consistent, shared view or great diversity of views can be quickly assessed.
- It tends to be enjoyable to participants

The students were asked whether they were willing to do the interview and selected purposefully among the volunteers. The aim of the focus group interview was to double check the questionnaire answers and had an emergent fashion. Thus, the interview questions directed to the students were the same with questions placed in the questionnaire with further questions of "why" and "how" (For Focus Group Interview Questions, See Appendix 3).

3.5.3. Questionnaire for Lecturers

Another questionnaire which was designed by Köse (2012) and includes close-ended questions about the effectiveness of the EPP is applied to the lecturers in the faculties. In the first part of the questionnaire (For the Questionnaire for Lecturers, See Appendix 4 and Appendix 5), demographic information of lecturers and language skills they find significant for their students are asked. In the second part, there are 18 items in the format of 4-point Likert about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP. The lecturers are requested to indicate their views about the level of ownership of their students to the specific language skills.

3.5.4. Semi-structured Interviews with Lecturers

As the most significant data collection technique, interviewing enables one to find out what is on people's minds—what they think or how they feel about something (Fraenkel et al., 2011, pp.450-451). Fraenkel et al. (2011) defines different types of interviews, structured and semi-structured in which there are a series of questions designed to elicit answers from respondents. In this way, the researcher can compare and contrast the high-quality data later probably at the end of the study. Semi-structured interviews are done one by one with lecturers in the faculties. An interview form is prepared by the researcher for this purpose (For the interview questions addressed to the lecturers, See Appendix 6). In the interview form, semi-structured open-ended questions aiming to get lecturers' views regarding the EPP are included. Open-ended questions indicate "an area to be explored without suggestions to participants how it should be explored" (Fraenkel et al., 2011, p.455).

3.6. Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaire for students has been conducted to freshmen in three departments at different times by the researcher a short time before fall term ends in 2019. Long before the application, the necessary permissions were received from the Rectorate of Fırat University and the head of the related departments (For the Approval from the Rectorate of Fırat University and the head of the related departments, See Appendix 7). All of the questionnaires for students have been conducted face to face during an actual ongoing class getting permission and support from lecturers teaching at the time of application, and the importance of objective and honest response were discussed with students. After the questionnaires had been conducted, they were given a quick check by the researcher. Following quick check process, the necessity of doing a focus group interview with students in engineering departments was emerged to obtain more data as they did hurry to do the questionnaires.

Focus group interview was conducted with nine students to whom the questionnaire had been conducted before. Participants were selected among voluntary students purposefully. At a pre-agreed time, students were welcomed and hosted in an office in the SFL. Their consent was requested again and they were informed about the form, content, and purpose of the interview. The interview was videotaped by an assistant of the researcher who kept quiet and did not interfere in any way any time. During the

interview, each question was answered by the participants one by one in an order, and the session lasted for more than an hour (62 minutes).

As for semi-structured interviews with lecturers, a series of questions similar to the open-ended questions asked to the students are prepared. After the questions in the interview form were finalized, they were ordered in accordance with the purposes of the interview, and it was decided that the questions would be addressed to each lecturer in the same order. All interviews were conducted one-to-one by the researcher. The questionnaires for lecturers and interviews are conducted to the same lecturer together in one meeting. After each lecturer had read the interview directive and done the questionnaire, interviews were started. Interview questions were directed to each lecturer in the order specified in the interview form. All of the lecturers were addressed with their names during the interviews; however, they were coded with numbers rather than their names when it is written out a quote from them in the study.

During each interview session, there was no one other than the researcher and the lecturer interviewed. Interviews were conducted in lecturers' offices. In order to prevent the effects of the external factors, mobile phones and the fixed phones in the offices were switched off, and the door was locked by hanging a sign of 'Meeting in Progress'. All interviews recorded with a voice recorder and a mobile phone in case of any mishap. In the interviews, five questions were directed to the lecturers. The interviews lasted for about 15–30 minutes.

3.7. Data Analysis

In the present study, quantitative data were obtained through the administration of a questionnaire for students and a questionnaire for lecturers whilst the qualitative data were obtained through open-ended questions included in the questionnaire for students, focus group interview with students, and semi-structured interviews with lecturers. Thus, the data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. A multiple analysis strategy can strengthen the evaluation of data to be gathered by avoiding the possibility of bias related with any particular technique (Lynch, 1990). Questionnaires for students and lecturers were analyzed on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) v22. The data obtained from open-ended questions which students had responded to in written form and from the interviews with lecturers were transcribed and analyzed qualitatively implementing content analysis.

Frequency tables of both students' and lecturers' responses to all the items were generated so as to gain a detailed description of the phenomena, which would enable thereafter the interpretation of the questionnaires. The data obtained in the study were analyzed by calculating *frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean,* and *standard deviation* values in accordance with the characteristics of the data obtained. *Independent t-test* was also used for statistical analysis.

Included in the first part of the questionnaire for students, the statistics of their gender, faculty and department they are enrolled in, high school they graduated from, language level they had prior to the beginning of the EPP, language skills they find significant and level of ownership of these skills were transferred to the tables as *frequency* and *percentage*; and the data obtained were interpreted as percentage. In the second part of the questionnaire, statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP were included, and students' opinions about these statements were transferred to the tables as *frequency, percentage, standard deviation,* and *arithmetic mean*, and arithmetic mean was used in the interpretations.

Included in the first part of the questionnaire for lecturers, the statistics of their gender, years of experience, faculty and department information, language skills they find significant were transferred to the tables as *frequency* and *percentage*, and the data obtained were interpreted as percentage. In the second part of the questionnaire, statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP were included, and lecturers' opinions about these statements were transferred to the tables as *frequency, percentage, standard deviation,* and *arithmetic mean,* and arithmetic mean was used in the interpretations.

Since the rating for each item in the questionnaires is *'strongly agree', 'agree', 'disagree',* and *'strongly disagree'*; the response codes for each item in the questionnaires vary between 1.00 and 4.00 from negative to positive respectively. In order to evaluate the data—which were obtained from the participants—according to averages and to determine the levels at which the averages fall under, the item rating values (1–4) are taken to the center; and the four categories (Limits of Options) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Limits and Levels Regarding the Options of the Questionnaires

Options		**Limits of Options**	**Levels**	**Limits of Levels**
Strongly Agree	(4)	3,26 – 4,00	Sufficient Level	2,51 – 4,00
Agree	(3)	2,51 – 3,25		
Disagree	(2)	1,76 – 2,50	Insufficient Level	1,00 – 2,50
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1,00 – 1,75		

As can be seen in Table 1, if the arithmetic mean of values obtained from the responses given to an item in the scale is 1,75 and below, it means that one strongly disagrees with that item; if it is between 1,76 and 2,50, it means that one disagrees with that item; if it is between 2,51 and 3,25, it means that one agrees with that item; and if it is 3,26 and above, it means that one strongly agrees with that item. In addition to that, the ratings under *'strongly agree'* and *'agree'* or *'disagree'* and *'strongly disagree'* are combined and expressed in order to state whether the participants agree *(Sufficient Level)* or disagree *(Insufficient Level)* with the statements in the questionnaires.

As a result of the pilot applications, Köse (2012) has found the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire for students as 'Cronbach Alfa: ,91' and the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire for lecturers as 'Cronbach Alpha: ,94'. The researcher of this study, on the other hand, has found the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire for students and of the questionnaire for lecturers as 'Cronbach Alfa: ,928' and 'Cronbach Alfa: ,924' respectively after conducting the questionnaires without making any change to check if statistics of two applications match. The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire for students and of the questionnaire for lecturers can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Reliability Statistics of the Questionnaires for Students and Lecturers

Group	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items**	**N of Items**
Students	,927	,928	25
Lecturers	,923	,924	18

Cronbach's alpha is a function of the average inter-correlation between items in a questionnaire (Green et al., 1977). Cronbach quantified this reliability by proposing a

coefficient which theoretically ranges from 0 to 1. If Cronbach's alpha is near 0 then the quantified answers are no reliable at all, and if it is close to 1 the answers are very reliable. As a general rule, if Cronbach's alpha is higher than 0,8 then the answers are considered reliable (Leontitsis & Pagge, 2007).

As for the qualitative analysis, the students' written responses to each open-ended question were analyzed, coded, and categorized. The coding was done by taking into consideration the research questions and the relevant literature. The codes that emerged during the data analysis process were listed, and their similarities and differences were examined. Accordingly, in the responses of the participants to the questions, similarly coded parts were combined under certain categories. Afterwards, the data were arranged according to the obtained codes and categories and presented in tables as *frequency* and *percentages*. Subsequently, the qualitative data were analyzed a few times for reliability concerns and compared to the related data in quantitative analysis to improve validity before deriving generalizable results.

Before semi-structured interviews with lecturers are analyzed, the responses of the lecturers to the interview questions were transcribed. When the interviews are transcribed, a separate interview transcription form was used for each lecturer, and the forms were given an interview number. Three of the interview transcription forms received from the computer were selected randomly. To ensure reliability of transcriptions, these interview forms were compared with the voice records by an expert from the field. Corrections were made in the interview transcription forms when necessary after they were compared with voice recordings. For internal reliability, more than one researcher should independently measure a situation in the same process in the same way. The aim here is to minimize the subjectivity that may occur. (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013, p.294). In order to ensure external reliability in the research, it is important to provide detailed information about the research process and to preserve the data so that others can examine it (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013, p.295). In the current research, the process is described in detail and all the raw data obtained are kept in a way that others can review. Ultimately, all transcription forms were analyzed by content analysis approach as prescribed by Strauss and Corbin (1998). As Patton (2002) advocates "…content analysis is used to refer to any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings." (p.453). Then, students' and lecturers' views were explored by identifying key themes recurring in their responses. Afterwards, codes were created

and were constructed considering the words, phrases, or sentences that the participants have repeatedly stated. Finally, the data were digitized, and then the research findings were interpreted. The purpose of quantifying qualitative data with numbers is to increase reliability, to reduce bias, to make comparisons among themes and categories, and to allow a small-scale study to be re-tested with larger quantitative studies. Therefore, in making the frequency calculations in qualitative research, there is no aim to make statistical generalizations and to establish relationship between variables as seen in quantitative research (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2004, pp.188–189).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents findings obtained through data collection instruments mentioned in the previous chapter. Firstly, findings of quantitative data collected by questionnaire for students and questionnaire for lecturers are demonstrated. Statistics of all participants regarding their demographic information and views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements are introduced. Following this, findings of qualitative data obtained through open-ended questions in written form, focus group interview, and semi-structured interviews are presented.

4.2. Findings of Quantitative Data

All quantitative data has been collected through distinct questionnaires for students and lecturers. In this section, students' demographic information, their views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements, and comparison of their views by personal variables are given. Then, demographic information of the lecturers participated in the study and their views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements are demonstrated. To the end of the section, cross-comparison of students' and lecturer' views gained through the questionnaires is presented in detail.

4.2.1. Demographic Information of Students

Students' demographic information such as their gender, departments they are enrolled in, high school they graduated from, their language level at the beginning of the EPP, their views on the significance level of language skills, and language skills levels they have is given in detail in Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7, respectively.

Table 3

Crosstab of Students by Gender and Departments They Are Enrolled in

	Gender		
Department	**Male (N)**	**Female (N)**	**Total (N)**
Software Engineering	8	3	11
Mechanical Engineering	53	6	59
English Language and Literature	3	27	30
Total (N)	64	36	100

In Table 3, it can be seen that 64 male and 36 female students, which makes 100 in total, participated in the study. Male students (61 out of 64) are mostly enrolled in engineering departments while female students (27 out of 36) are in ELL Department. It is clearly seen that nearly two thirds of the participants (64 out 100) are male. On the other hand, 11 students in SE Department, 59 students in ME Department, and 30 students in ELL Department have participated in the study. It is apparently shown that more than half of the participants (59 out of 100) are from ME Department.

Table 4

Distribution of Students by High School They Graduated from

High School	**f**	**%**
Anatolian High School	67	67,0
Religious Vocational High School	10	10,0
Technical and Vocational High School	6	6,0
Private High School	11	11,0
Others	6	6,0
Total	100	100,0

As can be seen in Table 4, 67% of students graduated from Anatolian High Schools, which means that almost two thirds of the students participated in the study have similar educational background. Other than that, ten students graduated from Religious Vocational High Schools, six students graduated from Technical and Vocational High Schools, 11 students graduated from Private High Schools, and six students graduated from other high schools. Since the number of students participated in the study is exactly 100, the frequency and percentage of participants show the same value every time, which makes it easier and uncomplicated for understanding the data.

There was not any testing for students to identify their language level before they began the EPP. The data regarding their language level before they began the EPP was gathered through their statements in the questionnaire conducted to them. Since the students were not familiar with the language levels in the CEFR such as A1, A2, B1, etc., they were asked in the questionnaire to define their language level as Elementary, Pre-intermediate, and Intermediate, which they had already familiar with.

Table 5

Distribution of Students by Their Language Level at the Beginning of the EPP

Language Level	**f**	**%**
Elementary	61	61,0
Pre-intermediate	29	29,0
Intermediate	10	10,0
Total	100	100,0

Table 5 shows the language levels that the students had had before they began studying in the EPP. 61% of the students were at *'Elementary Level'*, which was actually considered by the students as *'Beginner Level'* as they had just been given three options to choose one from. 29 students thought that they had had a *'Pre-intermediate Level'* of English, and ten students expressed that they had been at *'Intermediate Level'*. It can obviously be stated that more than half of the participants (61 out of 100) had not known English before they took classes in the EPP. That should be noted here that all students, no matter how much English they had known beforehand, started learning English from scratch in the EPP.

Table 6

Students' Views on the Significance Level of Language Skills

	Reading		**Writing**		**Speaking**		**Listening**	
Significance Level	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Very important	45	45,0	50	50,0	93	93,0	74	74,0
Important	47	47,0	43	43,0	7	7,0	25	25,0
Somewhat Important	8	8,0	7	7,0	0	0	1	1,0
Unimportant	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Total	100	100,0	100	100,0	100	100,0	100	100,0

As can be seen in Table 6, nearly half of the students hold the view that reading skill is very important (45%), and similarly the other half of them think that reading skill is important (47%). Only eight students (8%) define reading skill as somewhat important, that's reading skill is given much significance by the students.

Fifty participants (50%) present the opinion that writing skill is very important, and likewise, 43 of all the students (43%) think that it is important whereas seven of the participants (7%) note that writing skill is somewhat important. No participant considers that writing skill is unimportant.

Almost all the students (93%) have the view that speaking skill is very important. Seven students consider speaking skill as important while there is no student who thinks that speaking skill is somewhat important or unimportant. The results show that speaking skill is favored by nearly all the students, and it can be said that speaking skill is one of the most important language skills one should have.

The number of the students who hold the view that listening skill is very important is 74 (74%). 25 of the students (25%) have an opinion that listening skill is important. Listening skill is regarded as somewhat important and unimportant by only one student and none, respectively. According to the results, listening skill is seen essential to be able to communicate in English.

Table 7

Students' Views on Language Skills Levels They Have

	Reading		**Writing**		**Speaking**		**Listening**	
Language Skills Levels	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Very good	21	21,0	8	8,0	6	6,0	8	8,0
Good	52	52,0	57	57,0	39	39,0	33	33,0
Middle	26	26,0	31	31,0	46	46,0	40	40,0
Low	1	1,0	4	4,0	9	9,0	19	19,0
Total	100	100,0	100	100,0	100	100,0	100	100,0

In Table 7, results show that 21 students (21%) have a very good level of reading skills. The number of the participants who have a good level of reading skills is 52 (52%). More than a quarter of the students (26%) have a mid-level of that skill, and only one student has a low level.

Just eight participants (8%) state that they have a very good level of writing skills. More than half of them (57%) share that they have a good level of writing skills. The numbers of the students who have a mid-level and a low level of writing skills are 31 (31%) and four (4%), respectively.

With regard to speaking skills, 46% of the students think that they have a mid-level of speaking skills, and 39% of them have a good level. On the other hand, 9% of the students have a low level of speaking skills whilst 6% of them have a very good level. Less than half of the participants (45 out of 100) express that they have a very good and good level of speaking skills.

The number of the students who have a very good level of listening skills is just eight (8%). On the other hand, one third of the students (33%) state that they have a good level. 40 students (40%) have a mid-level of listening skills while 19 students (19%) have a low level.

The results, if analyzed in detail, show that most of the students fall under medium-level (good level and middle level) rather than the extreme ends (very good level and low level) concerning all language skills.

4.2.2. Students' Views about the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements

Table 8 shows the frequencies, percentage distributions, arithmetic means, and standard deviations of students' views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements.

Table 8

Students' Views on the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total			
Items	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD***
1. I can ask lecturers about the course in English.	45	45,0	47	47,0	8	8,0	0	0,0	100	100	**3,37**	,63014
2. I can answer a lecturer's question related to the course in English.	25	25,0	68	68,0	7	7,0	0	0,0	100	100	**3,18**	,53899
3. Thanks to my knowledge of English, I can use technology effectively.	20	20,0	47	47,0	31	31,0	2	2,0	100	100	**2,85**	,75712
4. I can easily use English in the classroom environment.	19	19,0	54	54,0	26	26,0	1	1,0	100	100	**2,91**	,69769
5. I can find English sources and get information.	28	28,0	50	50,0	20	20,0	2	2,0	100	100	**3,04**	,75103
6. I can answer questions about an English text.	25	25,0	61	61,0	13	13,0	1	1,0	100	100	**3,10**	,64354
7. My knowledge of English is sufficient to make an academic career.	4	4,0	27	27,0	51	51,0	18	18,0	100	100	**2,17**	,76614
8. I can read an English text and express it in my own words.	16	16,0	66	66,0	18	18,0	0	0,0	100	100	**2,98**	,58569
9. I can read and understand an English text.	35	35,0	58	58,0	7	7,0	0	0,0	100	100	**3,28**	,58741
10. I can understand English discussions in the classroom.	34	34,0	53	53,0	11	11,0	2	2,0	100	100	**3,19**	,70632
11. I can understand written instructions in English from lecturers.	30	30,0	50	50,0	19	19,0	1	1,0	100	100	**3,09**	,72607
12. I can write an English paragraph or composition on any topic,	16	16,0	64	64,0	16	16,0	4	4,0	100	100	**2,92**	,69165
13. I can convert an oral presentation in English into a written report in English.	7	7,0	42	42,0	43	43,0	8	8,0	100	100	**2,48**	,74508
14. I can summarize a text read in English by writing in English.	17	17,0	50	50,0	30	30,0	3	3,0	100	100	**2,81**	,74799
15. I can write an English letter, e-mail, etc. (formal or informal)	24	24,0	69	69,0	7	7,0	0	0,0	100	100	**3,17**	,53286
16. I can fill in an English form.	34	34,0	58	58,0	8	8,0	0	0,0	100	100	**3,26**	,59662
17. I can make a phone call in English.	15	15,0	55	55,0	27	27,0	3	3,0	100	100	**2,82**	,71605
18. I can make a presentation in English.	16	16,0	44	44,0	35	35,0	5	5,0	100	100	**2,71**	,79512
19. I can quickly understand the main idea of an English text.	16	16,0	52	52,0	21	21,0	11	11,0	100	100	**2,73**	,86287
20. I can read a magazine in English about my field.	19	19,0	55	55,0	21	21,0	5	5,0	100	100	**2,88**	,76910
21. I can guess the meaning of an English word that I don't know without using a dictionary.	4	4,0	53	53,0	36	36,0	7	7,0	100	100	**2,54**	,68785
22. I can write a CV in English.	19	19,0	60	60,0	18	18,0	3	3,0	100	100	**2,95**	,70173
23. I can make a report of information compiled in English given as a homework.	12	12,0	51	51,0	34	34,0	3	3,0	100	100	**2,72**	,71181
24. I can read scientific English articles about my field.	16	16,0	49	49,0	30	30,0	5	5,0	100	100	**2,76**	,78005
25. My knowledge of English is enough for me to achieve a good career when I go into business life.	4	4,0	40	40,0	41	41,0	15	15,0	100	100	**2,33**	,77921
									Overall Average		**2,85**	**,55732**

*SD: Standard Deviation

As shown in Table 8, the arithmetic means of items defining students' views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements vary between 3,37 and 2,17. The overall average of the scale is 2,85. Since this average is above the average value (M=2,50; see Table 1 *Limits and Levels Regarding the Options of the Questionnaires*) of the scale, it can be said that the objectives of the EPP have been achieved. Not all the objectives have been realized, though.

According to the arithmetic means in Table 8, since the arithmetic means of 22 items are higher than the average value of the scale (M=2,50), the objectives of the EPP defined in those items can be said to be achieved at *'sufficient level'*. On the other hand, the arithmetic means of three items are lower than the average value of the scale (M=2,50). Thus, the objectives of the EPP included in those three items can be said to be realized at *'insufficient level'*.

The items of which arithmetic means are higher than the average value of the scale can be listed from the highest to the lowest as: "I can ask lecturers about the course in English." (3,37), "I can read and understand an English text." (3,28), "I can fill in an English form." (3,26), "I can understand English discussions in the classroom." (3,19), "I can answer a lecturer's question related to the course in English." (3,18), "I can write an English letter, e-mail, etc. (formal or informal)" (3,17), "I can answer questions about an English text." (3,10), "I can understand written instructions in English from lecturers." (3,09), "I can find English sources and get information." (3,04), "I can read an English text and express it in my own words." (2,98), "I can write a CV in English." (2,95), "I can write an English paragraph or composition on any topic." (2,92), "I can easily use English in the classroom environment." (2,91), "I can read a magazine in English about my field." (2,88), "Thanks to my knowledge of English, I can use technology effectively." (2,85), "I can make a phone call in English." (2,82), "I can summarize a text read in English by writing in English." (2,81), "I can read scientific English articles about my field." (2,76), "I can quickly understand the main idea of an English text." (2,73), "I can make a report of information compiled in English given as a homework." (2,72), "I can make a presentation in English." (2,71), and "I can guess the meaning of an English word that I don't know without using a dictionary." (2,54).

The items of which arithmetic means are lower than the average value of the scale can be listed as: "I can convert an oral presentation in English into a written report in English." (2,48), "My knowledge of English is enough for me to achieve a good career

when I go into business life." (2,33), and "My knowledge of English is sufficient to make an academic career." (2,17).

4.2.3. Comparison of Students' Views by Personal Variables

In this section, the views of the students in different faculties are examined according to the variables of gender, department they study in, and high school they graduated from. The results of t-test on whether students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP differ according to the gender variable are given in Table 9.

Table 9

Students' Views on the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements by Gender

Gender	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**t**	**df**	**p**
Male	64	2,89	,58736	,972	98	,334
Female	36	2,78	,49921			

It can be seen in Table 9 that the arithmetic mean of male students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP is 2,89, and of female students' is 2,78. Although there is a slight difference between the arithmetic means of male and female students' views, that is a nonsignificant difference (t= ,972; p> ,05). It can be said that both group of the students *'agree'* (of which evaluation interval of arithmetic mean is between 2,51 and 3,25) with the statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP, and they possess the skills given in the statements in the questionnaire at *'sufficient level'*.

The results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on whether students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP differ according to the department variable are given in Table 10.

Table 10

Students' Views on the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements by Their Departments

Department	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F**	**p**
Software Engineering	11	3,14	,50452		
Mechanical Engineering	59	2,75	,56761	3,092	,050
English Language and Literature	30	2,95	,51445		
Total	100	2,85	,55732		

When Table 10 is examined, it can be seen that the arithmetic mean of the views of students in SE Department on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP is 3,14; of students in ME Department is 2,75; and of students in ELL Department is 2,95. There is some difference among the arithmetic means of students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP by the departments they are enrolled in. However, that is not a significant difference statistically (F= 3,092; p= .05). Besides, the students in three different departments *'agree'* (of which evaluation interval of arithmetic mean is between 2,51 and 3,25) with the statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP, and they possess the skills given in the statements in the questionnaire at *'sufficient level'*.

The results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on whether students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP differ according to the variable of high school they graduated from are given in Table 11.

Table 11

Students' Views on the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements by High School They Graduated from

High School	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F**	**p**
Anatolian High School	67	2,85	,57085		
Religious Vocational High School	10	2,90	,65828		
Technical and Vocational High School	6	3,00	,44721	,223	,925
Private High School	11	2,77	,60678		
Others	6	2,75	,27386		
Total	100	2,85	,55732		

Table 11 shows that the arithmetic mean of the views of students graduated from Anatolian High Schools on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP is 2,85; of students graduated from Religious Vocational High Schools is 2,90; of students graduated from Technical and Vocational High Schools is 3,00; of students graduated from Private High Schools is 2,77; and of students graduated from other high schools is 2,75. It is obvious that students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP by high school they graduated from do not differ significantly (F= ,223; p> ,05). No matter which high school the students graduated from, they all *'agree'* (of which evaluation interval of arithmetic mean is between 2,51 and 3,25) with the statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP, and they have gained the skills defined in the statements in the questionnaire at *'sufficient level'*.

4.2.4. Demographic Information of Lecturers

Lecturers' demographic information such as gender, work experience at Fırat University, and department they work in is presented in detail in Table 12.

Table 12

Distribution of Lecturers by Gender, Work Experience, and Department

Variable	**Category**	**N**	**%**
Gender	Male	5	55,6
	Female	4	44,4
Work Experience	0–5 year(s)	0	00,0
	6–10 years	6	66,7
	11–15 years	1	11,1
	21 and more	2	22,2
Department	Software Engineering	2	22,2
	Mechanical Engineering	2	22,2
	English Language and Literature	5	55,6
Total		9	100,0

Table 12 demonstrates that of the lecturers who participated in the study, five are male and four are female. Two thirds of the participants (66,7%) have a work experience of 6–10 years, two of them have more than 21 years of work experience, and only one lecturer has 11–15 years of work experience. None of the lecturers participated in the

study states having 0–5 year(s) of work experience. Four lecturers teaching in engineering departments (two in SE Department and two in ME Department) are included in the study while five lecturers working in ELL Department contribute to the study. The overall number of the lecturers participating in the study is nine.

Lecturers' views on the significance level of language skills for their students are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Lecturers' Views on the Significance Level of Language Skills

	Reading		**Writing**		**Speaking**		**Listening**	
Significance Level	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Very important	8	88,9	8	88,9	9	100,0	9	100,0
Important	1	11,1	1	11,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
Somewhat Important	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Unimportant	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Total	9	100,0	9	100,0	9	100,0	9	100,0

It is obvious in Table 13 that almost all participants (8 out of 9) state that reading and writing skills are very important for students, and the other results similarly show that all participants hold the view that speaking and listening skills are very important. It appears that four basic language skills are seen of great importance for students by lecturers teaching in various departments.

4.2.5. Lecturers' Views about the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements

Table 14 shows the frequencies, percentage distributions, arithmetic means, and standard deviations of lecturers' views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements.

Table 14

Lecturers' Views on the EPP's Meeting Pre-set Requirements

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total			
Items	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**
1. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program contributes to the academic development of the students.	3	33,3	3	33,3	3	33,3	0	0,0	9	100	**3,00**	,86603
2. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program have sufficient knowledge of English.*	1	11,1	0	0,0	6	66,7	2	22,2	9	100	**2,00**	,86603
3. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program is useful when students go to the departments.	2	22,2	4	44,4	3	33,3	0	0,0	9	100	**2,89**	,78174
4. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program are more successful in student exchange programs.	4	44,4	0	0,0	5	55,6	0	0,0	9	100	**2,89**	1,05409
5. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program have a better knowledge of English in general than the students who were exempt from the preparatory program.	3	33,3	2	22,2	3	33,3	1	11,1	9	100	**2,78**	1,09291
6. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can actively take part in overseas projects.	3	33,3	1	11,1	4	44,4	1	11,1	9	100	**2,67**	1,11803
7. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively.	0	0,0	2	22,2	6	66,7	1	11,1	9	100	**2,11**	,60093
8. I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts.	1	11,1	0	0,0	6	66,7	2	22,2	9	100	**2,00**	,86603
9. I think that the students will benefit from the English course taught in the preparatory program when they are employed.	5	55,6	1	11,1	1	11,1	2	22,2	9	100	**3,00**	1,32288
10. I think it is necessary for students to take English preparatory education.*	7	77,8	1	11,1	1	11,1	0	0,0	9	100	**3,67**	,70711
11. I think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is effective.	1	11,1	3	33,3	4	44,4	1	11,1	9	100	**2,44**	,88192
12. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program enables students to use technology more effectively.	2	22,2	1	11,1	4	44,4	2	22,2	9	100	**2,33**	1,11803
13. I think that students do not have any problems in preparing and responding to English correspondence (e-mail, application form, petition, etc.).	0	0,0	1	11,1	6	66,7	2	22,2	9	100	**1,89**	,60093
14. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can give clear and detailed information about various subjects of their interest.	0	0,0	3	33,3	6	66,7	0	0,0	9	100	**2,33**	,50000
15. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can write a composition or a report that provides information and argues by supporting or opposing a particular point of view.	0	0,0	2	22,2	7	77,8	0	0,0	9	100	**2,22**	,44096
16. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand English instructions.	1	11,1	4	44,4	4	44,4	0	0,0	9	100	**2,67**	,70711
17. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can write abstracts and criticisms of the professional or literary works.	0	0,0	1	11,1	5	55,6	3	33,3	9	100	**1,78**	,66667
18. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand most of the television news and programs regarding current events.	0	0,0	3	33,3	4	44,4	2	22,2	9	100	**2,11**	,78174
								Overall Average			**2,49**	**,56845**

*Reversed items, negative expressions are converted into positive.

As shown in Table 14, the arithmetic means of lecturers' views on the EPP's meeting pre-set requirements vary between 3,67 and 1,78. The overall average of the scale is 2,49. Since this average is slightly under the average value (M=2,50; see Table 1 *Limits and Levels Regarding the Options of the Questionnaires*) of the scale, it can be said that the objectives of the EPP are seen by lecturers not to be achieved.

According to the arithmetic means in Table 14, since the arithmetic means of eight items are higher than the average value of the scale (M=2,50), the objectives of the EPP included in those items can be said to be achieved at *'sufficient level'*. On the other hand, the arithmetic mean values of ten items are lower than the average value of the scale. Thus, the objectives of the EPP defined in those ten items can be said to be realized at *'insufficient level'*.

The items of which arithmetic means are higher than the average value of the scale can be listed as: "I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program contributes to the academic development of the students." (3,00), "I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program is useful when students go to the departments." (2,89), "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program are more successful in student exchange programs." (2,89), "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program have a better knowledge of English in general than the students who were exempt from the preparatory class." (2,78), "I think that students who studied the preparatory program can actively take part in overseas projects." (2,67), "I think that the students will benefit from the English course taught in the preparatory program when they are employed." (3,00), "I think it is necessary for students to take English preparatory education." (3,67), and "I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand English instructions." (2,67).

The items of which arithmetic means are lower than the average value of the scale can be listed as: "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program have sufficient knowledge of English." (2,00), "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively." (2,11), "I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts." (2,00), "I think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is effective." (2,44), "I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program enables students to use technology more effectively." (2,33), "I think that students do not have any problems in preparing and responding in English correspondence (e-mail, application form, petition, etc.)." (1,89), "I think that the students

who studied the preparatory program can give clear and detailed information about various subjects of interest." (2,33), "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program will be able to write a composition or a report that provides information and argues by supporting or opposing a particular point of view." (2,22), "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can write abstracts and criticisms of the profession or literary works." (1,78), and "I think that students who studied the preparatory program are able to understand most of the television news and programs regarding current events." (2,11).

4.2.6. Cross-comparison of Students' and Lecturer' Views

First-year undergraduates in different departments at Fırat University and the lecturers teaching in those departments are given two separate questionnaires including several overlapping items. The arithmetic mean values of overlapping items in both questionnaires are presented in Table 15. The arithmetic mean values higher than 2,50—which is the average value of the scale—are interpreted as students or lecturers *'agree'* with the statement indicated in related item and the achievement of the objectives of the EPP defined in those items can be likewise accepted as realized at *'sufficient level'*. On the contrary, the arithmetic mean values lower than 2,50 are evaluated as students or lecturers *'disagree'* with the statement indicated in related item, and similarly the achievement of the objectives of the EPP defined in that item is accepted as realized at *'insufficient level'*. The students' and lecturers' views concerning the achievement of the objectives of the EPP in overlapping items are compared by arithmetic mean values; in other words, the comparison is made based on arithmetic mean values of the overlapping items in two questionnaires. It is acknowledged that there is a significant difference between the students' and lecturers' views where one group agrees with an item and the other disagrees.

Table 15

Cross-comparison of Means of Overlapping Items in Both Questionnaires

Group	Item	N	Mean	SD*
Students	3. Thanks to my knowledge of English, I can use technology effectively.	100	**2,85**	,75712
Lecturers	12. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program enables students to use technology more effectively.	9	**2,33**	1,11803
Students	5. I can find English sources and get information.	100	**3,04**	,75103
Lecturers	7. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively.	9	**2,11**	,60093
Students	6. I can answer questions about an English text.	100	**3,10**	,64354
Lecturers	8. I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts.	9	**2,00**	,86603
Students	8. I can read an English text and express it in my own words.	100	**2,98**	,58569
Lecturers	8. I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts.	9	**2,00**	,86603
Students	9. I can read and understand an English text.	100	**3,28**	,58741
Lecturers	8. I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts.	9	**2,00**	,86603
Students	7. My knowledge of English is sufficient to make an academic career.	100	**2,17**	,76614
Lecturers	1. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program contributes to the academic development of the students.	9	**3,00**	,86603
Students	12. I can write an English paragraph or composition on any topic,	100	**2,92**	,69165
Lecturers	15. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can write a composition or a report that provides information and argues by supporting or opposing a particular point of view.	9	**2,22**	,44096
Students	15. I can write an English letter, e-mail, etc. (formal or informal)	100	**3,17**	,53286
Lecturers	13. I think that students do not have any problems in preparing and responding to English correspondence (e-mail, application form, petition, etc.).	9	**1,89**	,60093
Students	20. I can read a magazine in English about my field.	100	**2,88**	,76910
Lecturers	7. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively.	9	**2,11**	,60093
Students	23. I can make a report of information compiled in English given as a homework.	100	**2,72**	,71181
Lecturers	7. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively.	9	**2,11**	,60093
Students	25. My knowledge of English is enough for me to achieve a good career when I go into business life.	100	**2,33**	,77921
Lecturers	9. I think that the students will benefit from the English course taught in the preparatory program when they are employed.	9	**3,00**	1,32288
Students	11. I can understand written instructions in English from lecturers.	100	**3,09**	,72607
Lecturers	16. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand English instructions.	9	**2,67**	,70711

*SD: Standard Deviation

Table 15 shows that some items in the questionnaire for students overlap with just one item in the questionnaire for lecturers; therefore, the number of the items extracted from both questionnaires and presented varies (12 items in the questionnaire for students

and nine items in the questionnaire for lecturers). The 6th, 8th, and 9th items in the questionnaire for students overlap with the 8th item in the questionnaire for lecturers. The 20th and 23rd items in the questionnaire for students overlap with the 7th item in the questionnaire for lecturers.

When the results are analyzed, it is apparent that each item in two questionnaires are responded by all participants (100 students and nine lecturers). The students *'agree'* with most of the items (9 out of 12) presented in Table 15, and *'strongly agree'* with just one item (9th item in the questionnaire for students, and the arithmetic mean of the item is 3,28). There are two items (7th and 25th items in the questionnaire for students, and the arithmetic mean of the items are 2,17 and 2,33 respectively) that the students *'disagree'* with. On the other hand, when the lecturers' views are analyzed, it can be obviously seen that the situation is just the opposite. The lecturers *'agree'* with only three of the items (1st, 9th, and 16th items in the questionnaire for lecturers, and their arithmetic means are 3,00; 3,00; and 2,67 respectively) whereas they *'disagree'* with the other items (6 out of 9) shown in Table 15.

The students agree with the 3rd item "Thanks to my knowledge of English, I can use technology effectively." (2,85), but the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program enables students to use technology more effectively." (2,33). The students agree with the 5th item "I can find English sources and get information." (3,04) while the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they have found effectively." (2,11). The students agree with the 6th item "I can answer questions about an English text." (3,10) and the 8th item "I can read an English text and express it in my own words." (2,98), and also strongly agree with the 9th item "I can read and understand an English text." (3,28) whereas the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts." (2,00). The students disagree with the 7th item "My knowledge of English is sufficient to make an academic career." (2,17), and conversely, the lecturers agree with the overlapping item "I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program contributes to the academic development of the students." (3,00). The students agree with the 12th item "I can write an English paragraph or composition on any topic." (2,92), on the contrary, the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program will be able to write a composition or a report that provides information and argues by supporting

or opposing a particular point of view." (2,22). The students agree with the 15th item "I can write an English letter, e-mail, etc. (formal or informal)" (3,17) whilst the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I think that students do not have any problems in preparing and responding in English correspondence (e-mail, application form, petition, etc.)." (1,89). The students agree with the 20th item "I can read a magazine in English about my field." (2,88) and the 23rd item "I can make a report of information compiled in English given as a homework." (2,72) whereas the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively." (2,11). The students disagree with the 25th item "My knowledge of English is enough for me to achieve a good career when I go into business life." (2,33), and contrariwise, the lecturers agree with the overlapping item "I think that the students will benefit from the English course taught in the preparatory program when they are employed." (3,00). The students agree with the 11th item "I can understand written instructions in English from lecturers." (3,09) while the lecturers disagree with the overlapping item "I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand English instructions." (2,67).

As Table 15 shows, the students' responses to the items in the questionnaire reveal that they mostly agree with the statements indicating their possession of language skills at sufficient level. On the contrary, the lecturers' responses to the items in the questionnaire show that they mostly disagree with the statements indicating their students' possession of language skills at sufficient level. It can be concluded that the students have more positive views on gaining the desired qualifications in the EPP whereas the lecturers in the departments have more negative views on the level of ownership of their students to the language skills indicated in the items.

4.3. Findings of Qualitative Data

Students' written responses to the open-ended questions in the questionnaire, students' views collected via focus group interview, and lecturers' views obtained by semi-structured interviews constitute qualitative data of the study. In order to analyze the qualitative data, content analysis method is utilized. All findings of the study are categorized, and the frequency of similar responses are counted. In addition to transfer of all participants' verbal or written views regarding the EPP to the tables, their responses to the questions addressed to them are directly quoted. Quotations have been used to

support both the tables and the participants' views. When quotations are shared, each participant whose response(s) is/are directly quoted is given a code such as *st.19, st.20,* and so on in the section "Students' Written Responses to Open-ended Survey Questions"; *st.A, st.B,* and so forth in the section "Focus Group Interview with Students", and *Lec.1, Lec.2,* etc. in the section "Semi-structured Interviews with Lecturers".

4.3.1. Students' Written Responses to Open-ended Survey Questions

In order to collect qualitative data regarding students' views, they are directed five open-ended questions designed by the researcher. The open-ended questions are included in the questionnaire applied to the students, and the students have responded these questions in written form. All written data was transferred from questionnaires to computer to make analysis. Before performing an analysis, all transferred data had been checked by an expert in the field to prevent any data loss and to confirm that everything is correct. Afterwards, their answers to each question were categorized, and the frequency of each category was obtained for each question.

4.3.1.1. Students' Views on the Different Aspects of the EPP

The 1st open-ended question is "What do you think about the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages? (Content of educational activities, language skills training, materials used, assessment/evaluation processes, etc.)", and students' responses are divided into two groups as positive and negative views. Students' positive responses to the 1st open-ended question is categorized into 7 different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement to express their views. Table 16 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of students' positive responses to the 1st open-ended question.

Table 16

Distribution of Students' Positive Views on the Different Aspects of the EPP

	Department			Total	
	SE	ME	ELL		
Positive opinions	**f**	**f**	**f**	**f**	**%**
Language skills training was adequately presented		3	19	22	22,0
The books were adequate, useful, and successful	2	9	8	19	19,0
The instructors were good and well equipped	4	6	12	22	22,0
The instructors were friendly, caring, and sympathetic		4		4	4,0
Pop quizzes were necessary and useful		3	2	5	5,0
Modular system was good	1	1	5	7	7,0
Physical and technological infrastructure was good enough		3	3	6	6,0

Table 16 presents that 22 students, mostly enrolled in ELL Department (19), stated that language skills training was adequately presented in the EPP. Comparing the number of students in engineering departments (3) to the ones in ELL Department (19) in terms of expressing the adequacy of language skills training in the EPP, it can be said that those students in ELL Department are more content with improving their language skills at the end of the program. Three students expressed their views which are quite similar as *"I can write more easily in my department with writing techniques I have learned in the program."* (st.22, st.32, st.39), two students stated that *"Thanks to the listening activities in the program, I can understand better and actively participate in classes in the department without difficulty."* (st.23, st.29), and another student delivered his/her opinion as *"My language skills level has increased a bit more because English was spoken in the lessons, and also speaking activities were done. In addition, the written and listening-oriented activities have improved our skills."* (st.24). Students also shared their views on speaking skill as *"At the moment, I can speak and hear English sentences, though at a mid-level."* (st.26), *"I can express myself in the classes thanks to the speaking course I took in the program. The most important skill that I have improved through the program is speaking in English."* (st.31), and *"Writing and speaking activities were very good. However, on the listening side, the pronunciation pace was above our level."* (st.35).

Nineteen percent of the students thought that the books used in the EPP were adequate, useful, and successful. St.22 stated that *"There were shortcomings in my*

grammar knowledge previously, but I reinforced my knowledge with the books we'd studied.". Two students responded as *"The materials we used were successful and correct."* (st.31, st.32) and another did as *"The materials used in the courses were also useful and detailed, except in the last module."* (st.59).

According to 22 students, 12 of whom are enrolled in ELL Department, the instructors teaching in the EPP are good and well equipped. Furthermore, four students studying in ME Department expressed that the instructors are friendly, caring and sympathetic. Some students worded their views as *"Some of our instructors were good, it was beneficial for us take lessons from different instructors in each module."* (st.13), *"Taking classes from different instructors also improved our listening skills because the pronunciation of each instructor was different."* (st15), *"The instructors were very good and knowledgeable. …They were trying their best to improve our speaking ability."* (st.21), and *"The instructors in the program were doing their best to make students attend the classes. They were constantly making students talk and showing effort to develop them. The instructors were able to teach the lessons in a very good way."* (st.28).

Three students in ME Department and two students in ELL Department stressed that pop quizzes they had frequently taken were necessary and useful. Two students presented their views as *"Quizzes and speaking exams led students to further work. It was an advantage to have quizzes in this aspect. Since we didn't know the time, we needed to be ready at all times…"* (st.39, st.64), and one did as *"The exams were a way to help with learning."* (st.59).

Modular system was also appreciated by seven students most of whom study in ELL Department (5). Two of the students expressed their views as *"The modular system was disciplined, fun and suitable for the program."* (st.15) and *"The modular system was also good in my opinion, because it was better to take many exams from a single exam, and it was hard to be away from learning because there were always exams and courses."* (st.31).

Six percent of the students liked the physical and technological infrastructure of the SFL by stating that *"The instructors have contributed greatly to students' learning English by using both technology and various presentations."* (st.22), *"The use of smart board during the course was a very effective method."* (st.38, st.94), and *"The number of students in the class was also good."* (st.101).

Students' negative responses to the 1st open-ended question is categorized into six different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement to

describe their views. Table 17 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of students' negative responses to the 1st open-ended question.

Table 17

Distribution of Students' Negative Views on the Different Aspects of the EPP

	Department			Total	
	SE	ME	ELL		
Negative Opinions	**f**	**f**	**f**	**f**	**%**
Language skills training was inadequate and superficial		11	14	25	25,0
Some of the books were inadequate	2	4	4	10	10,0
The instructors had high expectations from students		4	2	6	6,0
Exams were difficult and exhausting		2	2	4	4,0
Modular system was bad		2	3	5	5,0
The English was for daily life, not for the department	3	21	1	25	25,0

Table 17 demonstrates that a quarter of the participants (25%), more than half of them enrolled in ELL Department (14), stated that language skills training in the EPP was inadequate and superficial. In ELL Department, the number of students (19) sharing positive views about language skills training (shown in Table 16) is more than the number of ones (14) having negative views on the adequacy of language skills training in the EPP. However, the number of students enrolled in ELL Department and participating in the study is 30, which means some of the students have both positive and negative views. Students who had negative views regarding the language skills training in the EPP stated that *"In particular, the training provided for writing skills was very basic and not sufficient for a student of ELL Department to write an academic text. In the first two modules, there was nothing about academic writing. They expected us to write at an academic level without teaching us how to write."* (st.25), "*I don't think many of us have improved in listening. We still have trouble in understanding. Maybe this is because we watched English videos and listened to English audio tracks less."* (st.39), *"I find myself very inadequate about speaking [English]. I hope that there will be more studies on speaking skills rather than grammar."* (st.62), and *"We are unable to clearly identify any question in any course in the department and to respond in English. The program did not help much."* (st.95). Some students underlined that nothing was taught other than grammar, and education was based on grammar teaching. St.43 worded that *"I have a lot*

of difficulty in the department because nothing is taught in the program except grammar.", St.84 expressed his/her opinion as *"We had been taught English grammar for 8 years before the program and hadn't understood anything. We were taught grammar [in the program] again, and it didn't work for us."*, and St.110 responded as *"We only learned grammatical rules perfectly. We are insufficient in terms of speaking and understanding [English]."*.

Ten percent of the students (10 out of 100) found the books used in the EPP inadequate in terms of teaching grammar and content related to the department. Two of them defined their thoughts as *"The book of intermediate level was insufficient in terms of grammar teaching."* (st.14) and *"…but in order to get a better-quality education, I think there should be some books related to the department besides the books used in the program."* (st.42).

Six of the students thought that the instructors had had high expectations from students and shared their opinions as *"It was very meaningless for our instructors not to do anything while they knew that we were inadequate."* (st.25) and *"Instructors' teaching practices were good, but they put students in unnecessary difficulties. The instructors saw students as perfect and behaved accordingly."* (st.35). Two students in ME Department and 2 students in ELL Department (4 in total) held the view that exams were difficult and exhausting, and two of them stated their views which are quite similar to each other as "*Exams were given too often, and it can be more enjoyable if the frequency of taking exam is reduced…."* (st.89, st.108).

Contrary to seven students finding modular system good (shown in Table 16), five students suggested that modular system was bad and argued that it brings some disadvantages. Students' own words are as follows: *"Modular system is a bad system for students, causing stress"*. (st.28, st.57) and *"There was a modular system. I did not succeed in all modules. Therefore, I did not get an academic writing course [in the last module]."* (st.45).

The last but not the least, 25% of the students, almost all of them (24 out of 25) enrolled in engineering departments, claimed that the English they had learned in the EPP was for daily life, but not for the department. What they exactly uttered are as follows: *"The English I got in the program was for everyday life. I think I'm incomplete in terms of Professional English."* (st.12, st.56), *"Basically, I only understand what lecturers speak, I'm having a little trouble with technical phrases and terms."* (st.17), *"We didn't get any English related to the field of engineering, we took courses of English on everyday*

life." (st.59), and *"I do not think that the program provides in depth English, it was very superficial rather than going deep."* (st.33). It can be inferred from the results that the students enrolled in engineering departments, particularly in ME, have high expectations about learning technical English in the EPP.

4.3.1.2. Students' Views on the English Level Gained in the EPP

The 2nd open-ended question is "To what extent is your English knowledge gained in the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages sufficient to follow the lessons you take in English in faculty?". Students' responses to the 2nd open-ended question is categorized into 4 different phrases and/or statements, and some of the students have used more than one phrase and/or statement to convey their opinions. Table 18 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of students' responses to the 2nd open-ended question.

Table 18

Distribution of Students' Views on the English Level Gained in the EPP

	Department			**Total**	
	SE	**ME**	**ELL**		
Adequacy of English taught in the EPP	**f**	**f**	**f**	**f**	**%**
Quite sufficient		14	9	23	23,0
Adequate but technical/Professional English is not included	8	17	7	32	32,0
Partially sufficient	3	12	10	25	25,0
Not sufficient		16	4	20	20,0

It is presented in Table 18 that approximately one fourth of the students (23%) agreed that the English knowledge they had gained in the EPP is quite sufficient to follow the classes they take in English in the departments. Nearly a quarter of the students (14 out of 59 in total) in ME Department found the adequacy of English taught in the EPP quite sufficient while roughly 33% of the students (9 out of 30) in ELL Department did. St.22 stated that *"I can write more easily in my department with academic writing techniques I have learned in the program. As my grammar knowledge progresses further, I make less mistakes when speaking or answering questions in written exams."* and st.29 defined his/her views about the adequacy of English knowledge taught in the program as *"I can clearly understand lecturers and courses in the department. Listening and*

speaking [skills] are very important for language education. It is very important to give lessons in English. Courses in the program should always be given in this way.".

Thirty-two percent of the students held the view that the English they had gained in the program was adequate, but technical English was not included. Most of the students participating in the study (8 out of 11) in SE Department responded in that way. Two students (st.12, st.56) signified similar views as *"The English I got in the program was for everyday life. I think I'm incomplete in terms of Professional English."* and three students (st.40, st.46, st.48) shared their views as *"It is enough, but the English in the department is slightly different form the English in the program. It could be more connected."*. One of the students (st.43) stressed that *"The program and the department have nothing in common because the program was almost exclusively on grammar. I have very hard lessons in the department and have difficulty understanding them."* similar as to what st.89 indicated as *"They're independent. Technical phrases are used in the courses in the department. Learning English in the program is useful, but it just helps us to understand simple sentences here."*.

A quarter of the students (25%) were partially satisfied with the adequacy of English knowledge they had gained in the program. Ten students in ELL Department, 12 students in ME Department, and three students in SE Department are those who shared that opinion. The students pointed out that *"The English I have is sufficient to follow the lecturers and attend the classes in the department to a small degree."* (st.50), *"I think the program has improved my English. As a result, I can understand lessons in English a little, but still that is not enough."* (st.55), and *"The program is incomplete for the department because the department includes vocational English. In the program, we have just learned sentence structures that we can use here in the department."* (st.108).

One fifth of all participants (20%), mostly enrolled in ME Department (16 out of 20) thought that the English taught in the program was insufficient. Some students made criticism about lack of activities and exercises for language skills whereas most of them did about lack of teaching Professional English in the program. St.30 underlined the lack of activities and exercises as *"I don't think that listening activities and exercises were done enough in the program. I'm having trouble taking notes as the lecturers speak very fast in English in the department. I wish more significance had been given to listening skills in the program."*. Some students shared their views about the lack of teaching Professional English in the program as *"…when I came to the department, I felt like a fish out of water. The department is also very difficult and I have seen no benefit from*

preparatory program." (st.34, st.35), *"I don't think it's enough because the English we got in the program doesn't match the content of the courses we take in the department. For example, I have difficulty translating the terms I have seen in physics class."* (st.54), *"I don't think that's enough. Professional English should be included in the program as a totally separate course so that we can understand the department courses in English."* (st.91), *"It is insufficient. Since we have not learned anything about Professional English in the program, joining the program has little effect in the department."* (st.93), *"Definitely not enough. In the program, there is a teaching of daily language."* (st.103), and *"Given that the English taught in the program is not Professional English, it is insufficient for departmental courses."* (st.111).

4.3.1.3. Students' Views on English Level the EPP Presents

The 3rd open-ended question is "To what extent do you think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages provides students and the departments with required English?". Students' responses to the 3rd open-ended question is categorized into five different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement to define their views. Table 19 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of students' responses to the 3rd open-ended question.

Table 19

Distribution of Students' Views on English Level the EPP Presents

	Department			**Total**	
	SE	**ME**	**ELL**		
The English provided by the program	**f**	**f**	**f**	**f**	**%**
The program presents English sufficiently	2	11	11	24	24,0
The program presents English for daily life, but not the department	2	10	2	14	14,0
The program is insufficient in word teaching	2			2	2,0
The program presents English partially	4	18	12	34	34,0
The program does not present English sufficiently	1	14	5	20	20,0

It is demonstrated in Table 19 that approximately one fourth of the participants (%24) expressed that the EPP had presented English sufficiently. 24 students in three departments agreed that the English they had learned in the program was adequate in

terms of skills training and teaching of grammar and vocabulary. The students who indicated that skills training had been sufficient shared their views as *"I think I have developed my listening skills. I also think that I have improved my speaking ability because we were given the chance to talk a lot."* (st.12) and *"Article writing and speaking activities were pretty good."* (st.34, st.35). The students who stated that teaching of grammar and vocabulary had been presented sufficiently and thought that the program had enhanced their English further worded their opinions as *"It was super in terms of grammar teaching. I can use words quite well and can write beautiful sentences with almost no spelling mistake."* (st.26) and *"A program that takes one from the most basic level to the level that one can use English effectively. It is a program that gives us everything about English."* (st.45).

Fourteen of the students, mostly enrolled in ME Department (10 out of 14), suggested that the English presented in the program had been for daily life, but not for the department. The students in ME Department emphasized the necessity of teaching technical English in the EPP more than the students in ELL Department did (2 out of 14). Some of the students highlighted the lack of teaching Professional English in the program stating as *"In the program, we have learned English for daily life. In the department, we have encountered vocational/technical English. It would have been more useful if we had taken additional lessons containing terms."* (st.11, st.17, st.51, st.55, st.61, st.63, st.74, st.77, st.78), *"It was enough in terms of speaking and listening skills. However, as we didn't study books or take lessons regarding the department, I have come to the department without being fully mastered in English. I've struggled a bit because I'm unfamiliar with the departmental courses."* (st.23), and *"I don't think it's enough for the department because I think we have learned very little about the department."* (st.111).

Only two students in SE Department did completely give point to the inadequacy of word teaching in the EPP stating as *"Moderately sufficient. Engineering terms were not taught. We did not progress much at academic level."* (st.11, st.17).

More than one third of the students (34%) held the view that the program had presented English partially. Some of the students found the program sufficient for departmental courses but inadequate for business life indicating as *"The program is adequate for studying in English in the department but insufficient for business life."* (st.14, st.19) whilst some thought that grammar teaching had been sufficient but skills training had been far from being satisfactory wording as *"[The improvement of] students' reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills should be a bit more important…"* (st.20),

"In terms of grammar, I believe that I have overcome all my deficiencies, however, as for teaching of some skills, the program had shortcomings. I feel that my listening skills was not developed fully while my writing ability was improved throughout the program." (st.44), *"It offers [English] enough, but more should be offered for speaking skills training."* (st.73, st.79), and *"We only learned grammatical rules perfectly. We are inadequate in terms of speaking and understanding [English]."* (st.110). The results presented in Table 19 show that 34 of the students were content with grammar teaching in the program; however, they emphasized that the program provided them with insufficient skills training.

Fifteen students in engineering departments and five students in ELL Department (20% totally) expressed that the EPP had not presented English sufficiently. Some of the students underlined the deficiency of skills training in the program and shared their views as *"No, it's completely inadequate. It is very simple and superficial, especially in terms of [progressing] writing, listening, and reading [skills of students]."* (st.25) and *"What is done in the program is definitely not enough. Speaking skills training should be given more importance. I didn't even learn to write an essay."* (st.43). For some of the students, it could be challenging to follow the classes and lecturers in the department as st.54 pointed out *"Not enough. This year I have difficulty understanding physics lesson in English, and I cannot translate some sentence patterns in the book."*. One student in ELL Department complained about the content and usefulness of the books used in the program stressing that *"A more useful book could have been chosen. I think the book named Navigate by Oxford University Press is simple for students of English Language and Literature Department."* (st.47).

Table 18, Table 19, and students' quotations related to the results presented in those tables show that the program provides a good level of General English, but the departments require students to have some technical or vocational English which students think the EPP lacks.

4.3.1.4. Students' Suggestions for Improving Language Teaching in the EPP

The 4th open-ended question is "What are your suggestions for a more effective language teaching by the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages?". Students' responses to the 4th open-ended question is categorized into 12 different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement

to explain their views. Table 20 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of students' responses to the 4th open-ended question.

Table 20

Distribution of Students' Suggestions for Improving Language Teaching in the EPP

	Department			**Total**	
	SE	**ME**	**ELL**		
Suggestions	**f**	**f**	**f**	**f**	**%**
Reading skills training should be included more	1	2	5	8	8,0
Writing skills training should be included more	1	3	8	12	12,0
Listening skills training should be included more	2	6	12	20	20,0
Speaking skills training should be included more	2	21	11	34	34,0
Content and vocabulary related to the departments should be given	7	20	10	37	37,0
Classroom applications and out-of-class activities should be done more	3	11	12	26	26,0
There should also be foreign instructors in the EPP	2	4		6	6,0
Skills training should start in earlier modules		1	7	8	8,0
Percentage effect of CPG should be increased	1	1		2	2,0
More homework should be given		1	2	3	3,0
Courses should be given in English			2	2	2,0
Class of CALL should be excluded or its percentage effect should be reduced		1	2	3	3,0

*Some students have made more than one suggestion.

Table 20 presents that 74% of the students stated that language skills training (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) should be included more in the EPP. Six students expressed their views which are quite similar as *"Every skill should be given importance. Each skill needs to be taught separately and at an academic level."* (st.25, st.26, st.28, st.46, st.50, st.69), two students stated that *"... emphasis should be given on speaking and listening skills rather than on grammar."* (st.36, st.54), and another student delivered his/her opinion as *"Writing skills should be given more importance."* (st.31). The students also shared their views on including speaking skills more in the program as *"Students should be given more opportunities to speak English."* (st.84, st.57, st.66, st.67, st.71, st.73) and *"There must even be more speaking exams."* (st.82).

Thirty-seven percent of the students think that the content and vocabulary related to the departments should be presented in the EPP. The students in SE Department stated that *"Professional English related to the department must be taught."* (st.10, st.11, st.12, st.17) and *"Teaching of technical phrases and terms can be given more attention. Listening tracks and writing activities for the department can be included."* (st.18). Three students in ELL Department responded as *"We have been trained for only four skills in the program. I wish we had taken more literature-based courses."* (st.31), *"Throughout the program, the department-related training must be given for sure."* (st.34), and *"... but it would be great if there was a course of introduction to literature."* (st.48). Similarly, the students in ME Department expressed that *"In my opinion, an education linked to the departments can be given, considering the books of the departmental courses in English."* (st.62, st.63), *"Students' English should be developed by doing department-oriented activities or by teaching terms in the field."* (st.90), and *"Students should be provided with at least two hours of classes a week including departmental terminology."* (st.94). It is obvious that more than one third of the students (37 out of 100) suggested that the EPP should aim to prepare students for faculties, presenting content and terms related to their departments.

More than a quarter of the participants (26%) recommended that various classroom applications and out-of-class activities should be done more often. Some of the students suggested that making presentations or text translation activities are more likely to help them improve their English, and they expressed their views as *"... but more teaching activities should be done, such as English presentations."* (st.10, st.13), *"The number of English presentations and peer-check activities should be increased."* (st.24), and *"...more text translation or summary extraction activities should be done."* (st.33, st.44). Some students in ELL Department advised that some out-of-class activities can be organized to enhance their speaking skills stating as *"There should be an effort to provide opportunities for chatting outside the classroom and to teach more effective English inside the classroom. There is a need for activities that will involve students more actively."* (st.39), *"However, in order to make communication activities more productive and useful, there may be speaking activities that all ELL students will do together in a suitable class once or twice a week. Our friends who are afraid to talk in the course may develop themselves in this kind of group activity."* (st.42), and *"I think preparatory class communities should be created. Speaking activities should be done in these communities during weekdays or at weekends. This provides students with the opportunity to learn*

English and to gain the ability to speak English in the community." (st.49). On the other hand, the students in ME Department indicated that there is a need for classes in the program to be more fun and enjoyable through allocating time for different in-class activities such as playing games, watching movies, etc. Two students shared their views as *"English games can be played, and movies can be watched. Thus, students can be more interested in the lesson."* (st.67, st.68) and another did as *"Lessons need to be more fun. After a period of time, learning from books might sometimes become boring, and we can leave aside the course. For this reason, occasional movie viewing, playing games, or short theater-like activities should be done."* (st.105). Some students, two of whom joined the program the previous year, proposed that foreign students should be given opportunity to take classes in the program or be invited as a guest to contribute them in terms of improving their listening and speaking skills. They worded their suggestions as *"In-class educational activities should be done more. As in the previous year, foreign students should attend the classes more frequently."* (st.86, st.68) and *"For example, the arrival of foreign students who are native speakers of English provides a great advantage for English education."* (st.96, st.98).

According to six students, all of whom are enrolled in engineering departments, foreign instructors should also teach English in the program. Four students studying in ME Department expressed that *"Foreign instructors can also teach."* (st.75, st.77) and two students in SE Department worded their views as *"Instructors' level of teaching English is very good; however, in terms of pronunciation, instructors who are native speakers of English should also teach."* (st.14).

Eight of the students, seven of whom are in ELL Department, thought that skills training, particularly writing skills, should begin in earlier modules and shared their opinions as *"More importance should be given to education of article writing. As we literally started writing articles in the 4th module, we are incomplete in terms of writing articles."* (st.23), *"We started to take academic writing course in Module 3, but I wish I could have taken that course from the first module."* (st.38, st.39, st.44, st.46, st.47). One of the students suggested that making presentations could enhance their speaking skills, so they should have been assigned in earlier modules highlighting as *"We started to make presentations in the last module. Thanks to those presentations, I started to believe in myself more in speaking English. If only the presentation assignments had been given in the first module."* (st.30).

Only two students (2%) found the percentage effect of CPG, which is just 5%, within the overall average of a module in the program low, so indicated the necessity to increase it for students' good in a positive way. One of them defined his/her thought as *"The grading system should be based on things more like a student's speaking ability and capability of answering questions rather than just written exams. How much English a student learns should be graded by considering what he/she can do from the first module to the end."* (st.55).

One student in ME Department and two students in ELL Department (three in total) held the view that more homework should be given in the program, and two of them stated their views which are quite similar to each other as *"In the program, students should be given more homework so that they can make students more active."* (st.27, st.37).

Two students in ELL Department suggested that courses in the program were given in English and argued that it brings some advantages. One of the students' own words are as follows: *"It is very important to take lessons in English. Courses should always be given in this way."* (st.29).

The last but not the least, one of the courses included in the program—CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning), was argued as it was thought that it did not serve its purpose. The students suggested that the class of CALL can be excluded or its percentage effect can be reduced. Three students stated their views as *"Frankly, I find the class of CALL absurd because two hours of time is wasted. Students get answers from elsewhere, so it needs to be excluded." (*st.32, st.43, st.92) and another one did as *"I don't think that the class of CALL contributes to us."* (st.51).

4.3.1.5. Students' Preferences to Rejoin the EPP

The 5th open-ended question is "Would you like to attend the program anyway if the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is not compulsory?". Students' responses to the 5th open-ended question is divided into two, *Yes* and *No,* and then subcategorized into ten different phrases and/or statements. Some of the students have used more than one phrase and/or statement to express their views. Table 21 demonstrates the frequencies and percentages of students' responses to the 5th open-ended question.

Table 21

Distribution of Students' Preferences to Rejoin the EPP

		Department			Total	
		SE	ME	ELL		
Willingness to join the program		**f**	**f**	**f**	**f**	**%**
Yes	Success of the program	2	13	13	28	28,0
	English is necessary in business life	2	13		15	15,0
	I did not have enough English before	1	3	7	11	11,0
	English is necessary for my department	2	3	2	7	7,0
	Curiosity and desire	1	2		3	3,0
No	Failure of the program	1	11	5	17	17,0
	Waste of time		12	3	15	15,0
	I didn't take the exemption exam	1			1	1,0
	I knew enough English	1			1	1,0
	Different reasons		2		2	2,0

As shown in Table 21, nearly two thirds of the participants (64%) responded the 5th open-ended question as "Yes, I would attend the program even if it was not compulsory" which is split into five subcategories. 28% of the participants would like to join the EPP due to the success of the program. Those students underlined that education system was good stating as *"Yes, it'd helped me to master English language before I started studying in the department. There was a good system."* (st.17), and they had improved their language skills in the program wording as *"Yeah, because the program developed my speaking skills. I have started writing better thanks to the writing lesson. I understand better what my teachers are talking about. My listening and reading skills have improved."* (st.24), *"Yes, it is not a perfect program, but it has improved our skills. I'm glad I have joined the program. I can speak [English], write [in English], read [in English], and understand [English]."* (st.26), and *"Yes, the program has improved my speaking skills because we had taken only grammar education in high school, but not any speaking training. I've learned to speak [English] in the program."* (st.30).

Fifteen percent of the participants suggested that English is essential in business life, so they would like to attend the program voluntarily. Those students who are all enrolled in engineering departments highlighted that they would need English to be a qualified engineer or to study abroad through some student exchange programs such as

Erasmus+. Some of them presented their ideas as *"Yes, I have to know English because I want to be an international mechanical engineer."* (st.63), *"Yes, English is a world language and much needed for engineering."* (st.67, st.88), *"Yes, because when you graduate from university, the program diploma will provide an advantage in business life."* (st.89), and *"Yes, because English has contributed to my life. In addition, English will contribute to my business life, and knowing English will allow me to do Erasmus+ Student Exchange Program."* (st.102).

Eleven percent of the students most of whom are in ELL Department (7 out of 11) pointed out that their English level would not have been sufficient to understand the departmental courses if they had not participated in the program. It is obvious that the students in ELL Department are more aware of the fact that they could not follow the departmental courses without an adequate level of English which is to be B1+ according to CEFR. Those students shared quite similar views as *"Yes, my level of English was not enough to begin the department. If I had started from scratch, I would be challenged more in the department."* (st.31, st.32), *"Yes, although I'd thought the program would be a loss of one-year time before joining the program, I had the opportunity to develop myself during the process, and I realized that I had not known anything before the program."* (st.42), and *"Yes, I would like to attend [the program] because my English level was not sufficient to understand the departmental courses. I believe that I have developed my English in the program."* (st.44, st.45).

Two students in SE Department, three students in ME Department, and two students in ELL Department (7% in total) indicated that they would attend the program since English is required in their departments. A couple of those students delivered their views as *"Yes, it was good to take English education and to learn it since the medium of instruction in the department is English."* (st.11), *"Yes, English is required in the department. Even if it was not necessary in the department, I think English must be known today."* (st.51, st.52), and *"Yeah, I'm studying engineering. English is a must for me."* (st.58).

Only three participants held the view that they have already had the curiosity and desire to learn a different culture and language, and learning a new language—particularly English due to being an international language—is a necessity in today's world. One of them uttered his/her view as *"Yes, learning a foreign language is already a necessity in this era. No one says I cannot speak English anymore. That's why I wanted to learn. I wanted to know about people from other countries, their culture, language,*

etc." (st.20), and the other two said exactly *"Yes, because I'm really interested in learning and speaking other languages. Speaking another language makes me feel good."* (st.96, st.97).

Results in Table 21 demonstrate that slightly more than one third of the participants (36%) responded to the 5th open-ended question as "No, I would not attend the program if it was not compulsory" which is split into five subcategories. 17% of the students most of whom are in ME Department (11 out of 17) pointed out that they would not like to attend the EPP because of its failure. Some of them criticized the program for not being much contributing stating as *"No, because I think the program did not add much to us. Giving basic information for academic writing was just one good thing."* (st.21); for not teaching Professional English defining their views as *"No, it was beneficial in terms of academic writing and speaking of course, but we didn't do anything for the department [in the program]. Consequently, we have had to start from scratch."* (st.35) and *"No, because we were not given any Professional English training for our department."* (st.108); and not teaching anything other than grammar wording as *"No, the only thing the program helped us with was speaking ability, and I could do that either in a language course center out of school or through friends. Other than that, there was no need for grammar teaching."* (st.23, st.34) and *"No, I don't think the program contributed to me. We have been learning English grammar since high school, and the program was aimed at teaching grammar."* (st.43).

Fifteen participants (15%) expressed that studying in the EPP was a waste of time and/or money. One of the students (st.29) in ELL Department shared his/her view as *"No, because society and those around me say that [spending] a year [in the program] is a waste of time. I'd like to go directly to the department. However, now I'm glad to have participated in the program, and if I hadn't, I would be incomplete."* whilst another one in the same department defined his/hers as *"No, I've had a lot of knowledge in the prep program, but it's not worth a year. I could develop myself out of school. I think it's a financial loss."* (st.38). Similarly, the students who are in ME Department held the same view (12 out of 15) and indicated that the EPP was a waste of time stating as *"No, because this system only caused a loss of one-year time."* (st.55), *"No, I think it's a waste of time because there isn't enough teaching of Professional English."* (st.82), and *"No, one-year time is a big loss for me since the department is also difficult."* (st.85).

Two of the students in SE Department gave a negative answer to the 5th open-ended question and what they exactly uttered were as follows: *"If I had not missed the*

exemption exam at the beginning of the academic year, I would not have had to study in the program." (st.16) and *"I had had an adequate level of English before joining the program."* (st.10). After all, there are two students in ME Department who responded the same question as *"No"* and delivered different reasons which they did not give much detail about due to privacy concern.

4.3.2. Focus Group Interview with Students

In order to obtain more qualitative data about students' views, nine students enrolled in engineering departments are included in a focus group interview. The participants are all male, and three of them study in SE Department while six of them study in ME Department. Two students studied in the EPP for two years, and thus could compare these two years to each other and provided more detailed data about the achievement level of objectives of the EPP in which a modular system has been conducted for just a year. In focus group interview, the same open-ended questions in the questionnaire for students are directed to the participants. The questions are asked to the students in an order that all could express their views, and they have responded to all questions for more than an hour in total. All data was transcribed into computer to make analysis. Afterwards, their answers to each question were categorized and the frequency of each category was obtained for each question.

4.3.2.1. Students' Views on the Different Aspects of the EPP

The 1st question addressed to the students during the focus group interview is "What do you think about the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages?" and students' responses are divided into two groups, positive and negative. Students' positive responses to the 1st question is categorized into ten different phrases and/or statements, and some of the students have used more than one phrase and/or statement to explain their opinions. Table 22 demonstrates the frequencies of students' positive responses to the 1st question.

Table 22

Distribution of Students' Positive Views on the Different Aspects of the EPP

	Department		Total
	SE	ME	
Positive opinions	**f**	**f**	**f**
The use of Turkish in class sometimes worked well		2	2
Language education was generally good	3	3	6
Materials were adequate and effective	1	2	3
Instructors were good and qualified		2	2
Taking exams frequently was beneficial	3	1	4
Modular system was very good	2	3	5
Grammar teaching was good		2	2
Improved my writing skills	2	1	3
Improved my speaking skills	1	1	2
Improved four basic language skills	2		2

As can be seen in Table 22, two students enrolled in ME Department expressed that the use of their mother tongue, Turkish, had sometimes helped them understand the classes in the EPP better and follow the instructors more easily. They stated their views as *"The language used in the courses (Turkish or English) changed according to the instructors and class environment. In the first module, Turkish was used more. In general, the instructors were teaching in English. When not understood, we would ask for the instructors to speak in Turkish. Then, they were explaining half in Turkish and half in English again."* (st.A) and *"Some hard grammar subjects cannot be understood in English, so there is no problem in teaching of such subjects in Turkish."* (st.I).

Two thirds of the participants (6 out of 9) were content with the language education in the EPP and found it quite beneficial. St.I who studied in the program for two years and could compare modular system being conducted currently to the standart one-year-program conducted the year before pointed out that *"It was a good year compared to the previous year."*. Two of the students (st.H, st.C) worded that the education was generally good. Another student in SE Department underlined how much progress he made through the program stating his views as *"When I compare my situation at the beginning and the end of the program, I can certainly say that there is a big difference. They were the instructors, the books, the education that made it. We've reached a good level from scratch."* (st.Y). Two students enrolled in SE Department had

similar positive views stating as *"I understand the importance of the program and its benefits now after finishing the program. My grammar knowledge was quite missing, the program was very useful."* (st.B, st.E).

Three students presented positive views regarding materials used in the program. They found the books they had studied in the program effective responding as *"The materials were adequate and effective."* (st.M, st.E) and *"I was satisfied with the materials in general."* (st.C).

Two of the participants enrolled in ME Department highlighted that they appreciated the instructors teaching in the EPP. One of them shared his view about the instructors as *"The quality of instructors was good. We could ask as many questions as we wanted about the subjects that were not understood."* (st.A) and the other one did as *"Generally, I was happy with the instructors."* (st.C).

Three students in SE Department and one in ME Department held the view that taking exams in the program frequently, particularly pop quizzes, was beneficial for them. What they exactly uttered are as follows: *"Pop quizzes made us ready as if we were going to take an exam at any time. It kept us studying all the time. It was good."* (st.Y, st.A) and *"I think the number of exams was enough."* (st.B, st.E).

Five students signified that modular system was very good and allowed students to set short time goals and to learn from their peers at the same or similar level of English. Three of the participants in ME Department expressed their opinions related to the modular system as follows: *"The modular system was very good, keeping students ready for exams. It kept us in a good condition."* (st.A, st.C) and *"The modular system was great. There was a race in the classroom. Joining students who are at the same or similar level in a classroom contributed in a positive sense."* (st.F). Likewise, two participants in SE Department shared their views as *"The modular system was very good. The division of education into levels and modules was good in terms of knowing what we would learn in that module."* (st.E, st.B).

Two participants enrolled in ME Department indicated that grammar teaching in the EPP was good and sufficient. One of them worded his view on grammar teaching as *"We received a good education on grammar and learned a lot."* (st.A).

Three of the participants agreed that they have improved their writing skills through the program stating their views as *"I can write English in any subject. The program developed me in this sense."* (st.I) and *"Writing activities were adequate."* (st.B). Similarly, two students defined that they have advanced their speaking skills

presenting their views as *"The program has contributed to speaking skills and grammar knowledge, which are essential for us."* (st.H, st.B). Moreover, two participants enrolled in SE Department stressed that they have improved four basic language skills. One of them stated that *"…different activities related to listening and writing [skills] were done [in the program]. I think we could develop ourselves in four basic skills."* (st.Y) and the other one shared his view on language skills training in the program as *"For instance, while I couldn't watch anything subtitled in English before, now I can watch an English subtitled video such as series, or movies."* (st.E).

Students' negative responses to the 1st question is categorized into nine different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement to convey their views. Table 23 demonstrates the frequencies of students' negative responses to the 1st question.

Table 23

Distribution of Students' Negative Views on the Different Aspects of the EPP

	Department		**Total**
	SE	**ME**	
Negative Opinions	**f**	**f**	**f**
Class of CALL did not serve its purpose		2	2
In the following modules, listening tracks were quite difficult.		4	4
Some teachers were unfortunately inadequate		1	1
There was no standard in writing assessment	2		2
Speaking skills were not given much importance	1	2	3
Listening activities were very low in number		1	1
Students do not speak in the department for various reasons	2		2
English education was for daily life, but not for the department	3	5	8
The use of mobile in writing activities shouldn't be allowed		1	1

Table 23 illustrates participants' negative views regarding the EPP. Two students in ME Department criticized the class of CALL for not being beneficial and sometimes being a waste of time. St.M justified his criticism by stating that *"The class of CALL was not useful. It would have been nice if we'd watched English films or videos and then done speaking practice."* while st.H described his opinion as *"In the class of CALL, students were getting a lot of help or answers from others. Students were happy to receive extra points."*.

Four of the participants studying ME signified that in the following modules of the program, listening tracks and some videos had been quite difficult to understand. Two of them expressed their thoughts about listening tracks and videos presented to them in the program as *"In the first two modules, the listening tracks were not difficult, but in the third module, things started getting harder. And it demotivated us."* (st.F, st.H) while the other two delivered theirs as *"Listening tracks and videos were not understandable due to their speed, and because foreigners could speak quickly, it could be difficult for us to understand."* (st.C, st.A).

Only one participant stressed that a few instructors were unfortunately inadequate in terms of teaching style or methods. He worded his view about instructors as *"Instructors have a great impact on learning and can affect success positively or negatively. I think some of the instructors have significant deficiencies compared to other instructors. The problem is not their knowledge, but the way they teach."* (st.H).

Two of the respondents studying SE underlined that there was no standard in writing assessment, and it might be a lack of objectivity and/or standardization of writing assessment. They defined their views which are quite similar as *"Assessment of writing tasks could change from an instructor to another. In writing activities, we were writing according to the instructor and getting different points."* (st.Y) and *"We were writing according to the instructors. For the same or similar writing assignments, we were receiving different grades from different instructors."* (st.E).

Three students pointed out that speaking skills were not given much significance in the program, and thus they had problems with speaking English in general. They introduced the view that students could not find adequate chance to speak stating as *"I think all students are lacking speaking ability. We couldn't find enough opportunity to speak in class of Listening & Speaking."* (st.F), they did not practice speaking sufficiently indicating as *"There could have been more speaking activities."* (st.H), and speaking skills were not given much importance sharing as *"Speaking skills seemed not to be given much importance except for the last module."* (st.B). Likewise, another student (st.H) in ME Department argued that listening activities were very low in number in the program, so he felt inadequate in terms of listening skills.

Two students enrolled in SE Department claimed that there might be some personal or environmental reasons why students cannot speak English in the department, presenting their views as *"It may be because they do not have knowledge about that subject, of the classroom environment, or of their personal characteristics."* (st.Y) and

"The reason for not speaking English in the department might be the sense of shame." (st.B).

As can be seen in Table 23, the most negatively criticized aspect of the EPP by almost all of the participants (8 out of 9) was its lack of teaching Professional English. They highlighted that English education in the program was for daily life, but not for the department. What they exactly stated are as follows: *"The English we studied in the program was more General English. Now we understand lecturers, but we do not know the terms. Especially in physics course, we have a hard time understanding."* (st.A), *"Engineering-related teaching should have been included in the program."* (st.M), *"We have a lack of Professional English."* (st.F), *"…We have tons of terms in our field, Software Engineering, and we have not seen them."* (st.Y), and *"However, mathematical or computer-related terms should be given in the program since [the program] is compulsory for our program and we will go abroad."* (st.E).

Only one student held the view that the use of mobile phones instead of hard-copy dictionaries while doing writing activities did not help students learn much. He presented his opinion as *"The use of mobile phones in writing activities didn't add anything to us. I wish that the use of hard-copy dictionaries was encouraged."* (st.I).

4.3.2.2. Students' Views on the English Level Gained in the EPP

The 2nd question asked to the students during the focus group interview is "To what extent is your English knowledge gained in the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages sufficient to follow the lessons you take in English in faculty? What are your views on this issue?". Students' responses to the 2nd question is categorized into three different phrases and/or statements, and some of the students have used more than one phrase and/or statement to describe their views. Table 24 demonstrates the frequencies of students' responses to the 2nd question.

Table 24

Distribution of Students' Views on the English Level Gained in the EPP

	Department		Total
	SE	ME	
Adequacy of English taught in the EPP	**f**	**f**	**f**
Quite sufficient	2		2
Adequate, but Professional English is not presented	1	4	5
Not sufficient		2	2

Table 24 shows that two students in SE Department found the English taught in the EPP quite sufficient. These students consider that the program has contributed to their English a lot; in the exact opposite situation, it would be challenging for them to understand and follow the classes in the department. The students shared similar responses to the 2nd question as *"Absolutely adequate. I would have had a hard time if I didn't get into the program and began studying directly in the department. Thanks to the education and experiences in the program, I can now understand the lessons."* (st.Y) and *"That was sufficient for me, too. It is completely due to the contribution of the program that we are now able to understand the lessons in the department. We eat the fruits of what we did in the program."* (st.E).

More than half of the participants (5 out of 9), mostly enrolled in ME Department (4 out of 5), responded to the 2nd question as "Adequate, but Professional English is not presented". They feel confident in General English; however, they lack technical English which they compulsorily need in the department. These students are satisfied with the level of English they have learned in the EPP while they think that the program should have taught technical expressions and terms related to their major. What they have uttered word by word regarding the 2nd question are as follows: *"We are inadequate in terms of specific phrases in mathematics, and we are having difficulty setting up equations. There are verbal expressions in physics exams, and we cannot answer the questions without understanding them."* (st.F, st.A), *"…In general, there is no problem in talking to the lecturers and understanding them, but technical expressions and terms can cause problems. We have no problem with the structure of sentences or grammar."* (st.C), and *"We're experiencing a lack of terms. It wouldn't make sense to learn them in the program. Apart from that, the program was very useful."* (st.B).

Similar to the students who find the program partially adequate, two students in ME Department pointed out that they find the English taught in the EPP insufficient since it, to their opinion, lacked teaching of terms related to the departmental courses. They indicated their views on the issue as *"The first few weeks I had difficulty in physics, I didn't understand [it]. We didn't understand [it] because we didn't know [the terms], for example, we'd known 'momentum' as speed."* (st.M) and *"The English taught in the program should have been sufficient to understand the departmental courses and to be successful in the department since [the program] is compulsory. There are some students who cannot use verbal expressions and/or cannot write in the exams."* (st.H).

4.3.2.3. Students' Views on English Level the EPP Presents

The 3rd question directed to the students during the focus group interview is "To what extent do you think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages provides students and the departments with required English?". Students' responses to the 3rd question is categorized into three different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement to define their views. Table 25 demonstrates the frequencies of students' responses to the 3rd question.

Table 25

Distribution of Students' Views on English Level the EPP Presents

	Department		**Total**
	SE	**ME**	
English knowledge provided by the program	**f**	**f**	**f**
The program presents English for daily life, but not for the department	1	1	2
The program is insufficient in word teaching	2	1	3
The program presents English partially	1	4	5

As demonstrated in Table 25, only two participants stated that the EPP had presented English for daily life, but not for the department. These students agreed that they had learned General English whilst they opposed that the program had not provided them with technical terms which they are definitely required to know in the department. The students expressed their views exactly as *"We learned General English, and the only thing [related to the department] we learned in the program last year was a screwdriver.*

We have seen everything for the first time in the department, the problem is that." (st.A, st.Y).

Another similar response to the 3rd question, which is given by three students, is that the program is insufficient in word teaching. The students held the view that the EPP had taught English in general presenting grammatical structures, vocabulary about daily life, and basic language skills training; on the other hand, they highlighted the need for learning technical expressions considering their education in the departments. These students worded their views as *"Likewise, there should be some basic level of informative content such as parts of the machine, introduction to mechanical engineering."* (st.H), *"There is no Turkish word in the world of computer, everything is in English, and we were not given much about it. I think terms are a big part of our department."* (st.Y), and *"We understand that the lecturer producing the sentence 'I have added a semicolon' has added something, but we do not know the [word] semicolon. It may be enough for mathematics and physics but it is insufficient for computer, software, and algorithm."* (st.E).

Five students, most of whom (4 out of 5) are enrolled in ME Department, presented their views on the 3rd question as "The program had presented English partially". What the students criticized most was that the EPP had not included teaching of Professional English. They strongly agreed that engineering-related information should have been included in the program. They justified their views on the need for Professional English as *"We have a lack of Professional English."* (st.F), *"Engineering-related information should have been included in the program. I can say that the program was half enough."* (st.M), *"The contribution of the program to us is around 60%, but talking for the department it can be up to 50%."* (st.H), *"I think the program was sufficient up to 80%. The courses in the department are understood and questions are asked and answered in the courses. The remaining 20% are terms and you need to handle it by yourself."* (st.B), and *"I think we were inadequate at the end of the program. When we first started the department, we were astonished because there was a lot we didn't know. It was like we had opened a new page."* (st.C).

4.3.2.4. Students' Suggestions for Improving Language Teaching in the EPP

The 4th interview question addressed to the students during the focus group interview is "What are your suggestions for a more effective language teaching by the

English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages?". Students' responses to the 4th question is categorized into 11 different statements, and some of the students have used more than one statement to express their views. Table 26 demonstrates the frequencies of students' responses to the 4th interview question.

Table 26

Distribution of Students' Suggestions for Improving Language Teaching in the EPP

	Department		**Total**
	SE	**ME**	
Suggestions	**f**	**f**	**f**
Speaking skills training should be included more	2	3	5
Courses should be given in English		1	1
Professional English should be taught		4	4
More listening activities can be included		1	1
There should be foreign instructors and/or guests	1	4	5
Writing activities should be revised		2	2
Various classroom activities should be done		4	4
The percentage effect and content of class of CALL should change		2	2
There must be a standard in writing assessment	2		2
Grammar teaching must be done	1		1
More practice should be done	1	1	2

It can be seen in Table 26 that more than half of the participants (5 out of 9) recommended that speaking skills training should be included more in the EPP. Three of these students underlined that oral exams can be held more often so that they can improve and test themselves stating as *"The number of oral exams can be higher because we generally have a lack of speaking [English]. There can be speaking quizzes like a pop quiz, it will improve students' [speaking ability]."* (st.A), *"...Similarly, the number of oral exams can be increased."* (st.M), and *"The number of speaking exams can be increased. In order to encourage everyone to speak, a separate class should be defined for speaking."* (st.F). Some of the students signified that there can be more in-class and various extracurricular activities in the program to let students have more opportunities to speak. They shared their suggestions wording as *"Speaking skills can be enhanced by extracurricular activities. The significance and percentage effect of speaking skills can be increased..."* (st.M), *"...In-class speaking activities should be conducted more so that*

everyone can speak [English] more." (st.F), and *"…students may be asked to play sketches in different subjects and areas. There should definitely be a revision for speaking."* (st.E). One of the participants remarked that a defined speaking class should be included in the program to indicate the significance of the need for speaking skills training, and stated his views as *"A separate speaking course should be defined to [let students] talk about topics from the agenda, listen to problems, etc."* (st.B).

One of the students in ME Department suggested that the courses in the EPP should be given in English all the time, presenting his view as *"I think learning in English is more useful."* (st.A).

Four of the participants who study in ME Department (4 out of 6) pointed out that Professional English should be taught in the program. These students stressed the necessity of teaching Professional English, and that it could be presented in the last module of the program. They described their suggestions as *"Engineering-related English is a must."* (st.A), *"…In the last module, Professional English can be given. The focus should be on teaching Professional English."* (st.F, st.H), and *"In the last module, it would be beneficial if terms could be given to prepare us for the department."* (st.I).

One of the participants in ME Department recommended that there could be more listening activities in the program, underlying the inadequacy of those activities as *"More listening activities can be included as well."* (st.F).

Four students in ME Department and a student in SE Department delivered the view that there should be some foreign instructors teaching English and/or guests joining the classes in the EPP. According to these students, that would help them improve their speaking skills and would create a situation in which they compulsorily could speak in English as they thought that they did not feel like talking in English when they communicated with a Turkish instructor, a Turkish student, or any Turk. What they exactly uttered are as follows: *"Participation of foreign guests [in the classes] should be ensured. We had Ghanaian guests in the second module, and that was very nice. Or we should have foreign instructors. That would contribute to our speaking skills in a positive sense. We'd have to speak English with them."* (st.I), *"From the very beginning, there must be foreign instructors. Lecturers from the department can also be included in the preparatory program for teaching English related to the department."* (st.H), *"In all modules, we may have foreign guests. This would improve our listening and speaking skills."* (st.M), *"In speaking [English], I believe in the necessity of the obligatory [situation]. Speaking with a Turk and speaking with a foreigner are different things.*

Compulsory [situation] requires speaking English." (st.C), and *"In the first module, two foreign ladies came to class. Such participations of foreign people or instructors should be increased. Talking to a foreigner and talking to a Turk are not the same thing."* (st.Y).

Two participants in ME Department suggested that writing activities done in the program should be revised in term of the frequency of activities and topics to be written on. One of the students thought that the number of the writing tasks in each module, which was one for each week, was a bit high and so fatiguing. Other than that, another student complained about the complexity of topics given to the students to write on, which they thought they could not write about even in their mother tongue, Turkish. They defined their suggestions as *"Having writing assignments can be instructive, unless the number [of them]is much exaggerated."* (st.I) and *"Simple and basic topics can be picked up for writing tasks so that students can express ideas on."* (st.F).

Four students in ME Department pointed out that various classroom activities such as making presentations, giving short speeches, watching some videos or films, and memorizing English songs or poems could be done in the program. They worded their suggestions as *"Presentations and prepared speeches can be made. Short videos about the lessons can be watched."* (st.A), *"Films can be watched in the [computer] laboratory. Speaking [activities] about those films can be done."* (st.M), *"As I am a person who is eager to listen to and speak English, [I can suggest that] students can memorize things like English songs, poems, etc. In this way, students' pronunciation can also be tested."* (st.C), and *"To learn a language, you need to learn culture. Some activities to teach foreign culture can also be done."* (st.H).

Two respondents in ME Department recommended that the percentage effect of the class of CALL on overall average and its content should change since it is not seen as instructive and beneficial enough. They thought that the percentage effect of the class of CALL on overall average, which is 10%, should be decreased, and the way of teaching in that class should be varied. They simply uttered their suggestions as *"The percentage [effect] of the class of CALL can be reduced."* (st.A) and *"The content of the class of CALL should change."* (st.H).

Two participants in SE Department held the view that there should have been a standard in writing assessment as it could sometimes differ from instructor to instructor, and students had to write accordingly. They believed that an instructor could give a high score to a paper while another could give lower to the same or similar paper, which aroused a deep sense of injustice among students. They expressed their criticisms as

"There should be no difference in the assessment of writing assignments from instructor to instructor." (st.Y) and *"Although the number of writing activities is adequate, there should be an evaluation which does not differ from teacher to teacher."* (st.E).

One of the students in SE Department underlined the need for grammar teaching in the program. He suggested that *"Grammar is a must. Although I thought it was not necessary in the past, I think that it is the basis of the language. In the simplest term, it is necessary to understand the time period in which the narrative occurs."* (st.Y).

Two participants enrolled in SE Department responded to the 4th interview question as more practice should be done in the program, indicating that practice comes before theory. They presented their suggestions as *"English should be improved through listening and speaking exercises. Grammar and writing should follow."* (st.H) and *"It would be better to practice rather than learning theory."* (st.Y).

4.3.2.5. Students' Preferences to Rejoin the EPP

The 5th question directed to the students during the focus group interview is "Would you like to attend the program anyway if the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is not compulsory?". All students have used positive phrases and/or statements when they are asked to talk about willingness to participate in the program. Their responses are categorized into four different phrases. Some of the students have used more than one phrase to convey their views. Table 27 demonstrates the frequencies of students' responses to the 5th question.

Table 27

Distribution of Students' Preferences to Rejoin the EPP

		Department		**Total**
		SE	**ME**	
Willingness to participate in the program		**f**	**f**	**f**
Yes	Success of the program	3	2	5
	Requirement in department and business life		3	3
	To make friends	2	2	4
	To get used to the school and the city	1	1	2

As indicated in Table 27, all participants responded to the 5th question as "Yes". They gave different reasons, though. Five students, three of whom are enrolled in SE

Department and two of them study in ME Department, would like to participate in the EPP again if it was not compulsory because of the success of the program. They advocated the program, stating as *"Yes, because I want to improve myself and learn this language. When I look at the education in the program, I can say that it is of good quality."* (st.A) and *"If this question was asked to me before starting the program, I would say no because I thought it would be a loss of one-year time. But now, after being included in the program, I'm glad I joined the program."* (st.B).

Three students in ME Department acknowledged that they would voluntarily join the program again since English is a requirement in the departments and business life. They emphasized their willingness to study in the program again by uttering as *"Yes, because I was advised that English is a sine qua non of the profession. The English we learned here was very different from our previous learning. However, I was prejudiced that it might be inefficient."* (st.F), *"Yes, English is required for a department such as Mechanical Engineering. You even need to know more than one language."* (st.I), and *"Yes, because our profession requires it. It would be closed-mindedness not to attend the program. Even [learning] a language is inadequate. This takes us a few steps ahead of others."* (St.C).

Four students stated that they would participate the program voluntarily again since it helped them to make friends whilst two students noted that they would do the same again in order to get used to the school and the city. The program creates a positive environment and has a warm atmosphere for students from different departments, so they have a chance to meet new students and make friends. Moreover, they get used to the city and become more familiar with the campus and the city after they spend some time of a year. The students expressed their willingness to join the EPP again by wording as *"Yes, we got closer with friends from the department and made new friends. The program helped me to get used to the school and the city."* (st.M), *"Yeah, we got a chance to make friends. The education was also good. We got used to the city and English. We had an English conversation environment. Everyone spoke English at school."* (st.E), *"Yeah, because of what I learned and the friendships I got. I would not [attend the EPP] due to some deficiencies caused by the system and some teachers. Overall, I would."* (st.H), and *"Yes, definitely. While I was thinking of this as a one-year loss before being included in the program, I understood the necessity of the program after joining [it]. Spending a year [in the program] didn't take anything from me, but it did much. At least I had friendships, and I had the opportunity to improve myself in English. If I am comfortable in the*

department, it is thanks to what I have gained and what I have done in this program." (st.Y).

4.3.3. Semi-structured Interviews with Lecturers

In order to gain qualitative data about lecturers' views, nine lecturers (five from ELL Department, two from ME Department, and two from SE Department) are interviewed personally. In semi-structured interviews, 5 open-ended questions are addressed to the interviewees. The questions are directed to the lecturers in the same order, and they have responded to all questions for 10–20 minutes. All data was transcribed into computer to make analysis. Before performing any analysis, all transcribed data had been checked by an expert in the field to prevent any data loss and to confirm that everything was correct. Afterwards, their answers to each question were categorized and the frequency of each category was obtained for each open-ended question.

4.3.3.1. Lecturers' Views on the Effectiveness of the EPP

The 1st interview question asked to the lecturers during the interviews is "What do you think about the effectiveness of the English Preparatory Program?", and lecturers' responses are divided into two groups as positive and negative. Lecturers' positive responses to the 1st interview question is categorized into four different statements, and some of the lecturers have used more than one statement to express their views. Table 28 demonstrates the frequencies of lecturers' positive responses to the 1st interview question.

Table 28

Distribution of Lecturers' Positive Views on the Effectiveness of the EPP

	Department		**Total**
	Engineering	**ELL**	
Positive Views	**f**	**f**	**f**
Education in the EPP is getting better	1	1	2
Students are more successful than before	1	1	2
Students joining the program are more successful		2	2
Students understand written and oral instructions	1	1	2

As demonstrated in Table 28, some of the lecturers in all departments responded to the 1st interview question positively to some extent; in other words, they acknowledged that there are some positive outputs of the EPP. These positive outputs are limited, though. Two lecturers stated that the education in the program is getting better and the program is successful. They thought that this favorable outcome is through the change of the education system, which is currently modular. They expressed their views on the effectiveness of the EPP as *"I think education [in the program] is getting better. The contribution of the modular system is undeniable because in the modular system students of the same level are in the same class, and this is beneficial in terms of efficiency."* (Lec.6) and *"Obviously, I think it's been useful to have switched to the modular system."* (Lec.5). These two lecturers also shared the view that students are more successful in general after the shift to the modular system in the program. They delivered their views related to students' success at the end of the program as *"You can already see the success of the students."* (Lec.6, Lec.5).

Two lecturers teaching in ELL Department stressed that the students who participated in the program are more successful than those who did not. They responded to the 1st interview question as *"I think that students who did not participate in the program have problems of adaptation to school and they fail in their courses. I think there is a difference between students participating in the program and those who did not."* (Lec.4) and *"However, compared to those who did not participate in the program, I can say that there is a definite difference. There is a 100% difference in terms of writing [skills of students]. The students [included in the program] know the rules at least. In terms of speaking [skills], the students who participated in the program have higher self-esteem and can express themselves better. Those who did not participate are more afraid of speaking [English]. They can't put a few words together."* (Lec.5). Since the number of the students who are enrolled in the first grade of engineering departments is really high and there are more foreign students in those departments, the lecturers teaching in engineering departments might not have known much about their students' background, and hence, may not have mentioned if there is any difference between the students participating in the EPP and those who did not in terms of their performance in departmental courses taught in English.

Two lecturers presented the view that students understand written and oral instructions in classes in the departments. They underlined the fact that the students had gained the ability to understand written and oral instructions thanks to the practices they

did frequently during oral/written examinations and listening activities in the program. These two lecturers defined their thoughts upon the specified subject as *"You conduct oral examinations [in the program] four times a year. You give them verbal instructions [in the classes]. You teach in English, especially [to the students] of ELL Department. In these lessons, the students get used to English instructions. So, there's an awareness. The instructions of all exams are written in English. It would be cruelty to say that all these do not contribute to the students."* (Lec.4) and *"The program is useful in terms of improving students' listening skills. Students do not have any difficulties understanding [instructions]."* (Lec.9).

Lecturers' negative responses to the 1st interview question is categorized into six different statements, and some of the lecturers have used more than one statement to describe their views. Table 29 demonstrates the frequencies of lecturers' negative responses to the 1st interview question.

Table 29

Distribution of Lecturers' Negative Views on the Effectiveness of the EPP

	Department		**Total**
	Engineering	**ELL**	
Negative Views	**f**	**f**	**f**
The program should be revised	3	2	5
Students are not successful	1	4	5
Students do not understand	2	2	4
Students not joining the program are more successful		2	2
Skills training is inadequate	2	2	4
Individual differences affect success	2	2	4

It can be seen in Table 29 that the lecturers in all departments held several negative views on the effectiveness of the EPP. Although four lecturers in engineering departments were interviewed, they shared ten negative views in total. More than half of the participants (5 out of 9) suggested that the program should be revised for it is not as effective as expected. They worded their views on ineffectiveness of the program as *"I think you should revise the preparation program."* (Lec.1, Lec.2, Lec.7, Lec.9) and "*It's not as effective as I want."* (Lec.8).

Five lecturers, most of whom teach in ELL Department (4 out of 5), found students unsuccessful at the end of the program. They thought that the program outcomes are far from being sufficient to meet the requirements of the departments. What the participants exactly uttered are as follows: *"I find students very unsuccessful when I look at the program outcomes."* (Lec.1, Lec.5), *"We're teaching all the depths of English literature [in the department], but students can't use the verb 'to be'. Such mistakes are not recurrences with exam excitement during the exam, but are made all the time [by students]. I think students have very very incomplete knowledge of English."* (Lec.2), *"We cannot see students who attended the program and come to the department the following year carry traces of that education."* (Lec.3), and *"They cannot get the necessary scores from the exams such as IELTS and TOEFL, which meet the expectations of the university with international agreement. All of our students have to study English again in America."* (Lec.7).

Two lecturers in engineering departments and two lecturers in ELL Department (4 in total) complained bitterly that students do not understand written and oral instructions or what they are taught. Two of them teaching in ELL Department indicated that the students cannot even answer the questions in exams due to their inability to understand what they read, and they worded this as *"Students certainly don't understand what they read and what they are told. They can't answer the questions in exams because they don't understand the instructions and questions."* (Lec.1, Lec.2). On the other hand, one lecturer teaching in both engineering departments (ME and SE) underlined the fact that the percentage of the students who can comprehend him/her or his/her instructions are limited to 10%, which is dramatically low, and described this as *"Some understand the lesson, understand the explanations, and ask questions, but only 10 out of 100 students in Mechanical Engineering Department. There are twenty students in Software Engineering Department. Those from Nigeria understand, those from Morocco understand, but Turkish students do not understand. They may even have difficulty understanding the question of 'What do you think about the weather today?'."* (Lec.8). Another lecturer teaching in SE Department pointed out that students can just understand half of the lectures or the things discussed in class, and defined this as *"I think they can understand 50% of what I teach, and this is a big problem. So, I have to repeat what I teach over and over again."* (Lec.7).

Two lecturers in ELL Department compared the students who had attended the program the year before to those who had not, and found surprisingly the students who

had not joined the program more successful. They described their views similarly as *"The students who did not participate in the program are more successful than the students who did."* (Lec.1) and *"The students who attended the preparatory program are worse. We have students who do not deserve to study in ELL Department."* (Lec.2).

Four lecturers expressed that students lack basic language skills in addition to terminology required in the departments, which means skills training in the program is inadequate. They shared their views regarding the inadequacy of students' basic language skills as *"…students do not come to the department well-equipped. Our first impression is that the students' grammar knowledge is incomplete, their pronunciation is not enough, and their speaking skills are incomplete. Their best skill is reading, but they have troubles with that as well."* (Lec.3), *"I expect them to have difficulty in terminology when they first come to the department, but I think even their very basic language skills are weak, for example, they have no reading comprehension skills."* (Lec.8), *"…when students come to ELL Department, it is uncertain whether they have gained the basic skills needed, I guess they haven't. I can observe that students cannot write. Perhaps their writing skills in the program might have been better, but I think they cannot show their skills adequately when asked to write about a book or a book review. They are very inadequate in terms of speaking skills as well."* (Lec.5), and *"…however, it is not enough in terms of speaking skills. There is a problem about asking questions and attending classes."* (Lec.9).

Approximately half of the participants (4 out of 9) held the view that student's individual differences also affect their success in a negative manner. They justified that view as *"A learner is also important as well as a teacher, so a student has to aspire to English."* (Lec.6), *"Of course, student's individual differences such as interest, attitude, and readiness are also significant. An intellectual readiness for a student of ELL Department is also essential. Students [of ELL Department] cannot develop four basic skills due to studying in a department they don't actually want. For example, students of Mechanical Engineering Department care about the Professional English course in the department because they think that they will need it and it will be useful. They aim to get a job at a foreign company and use it there while the students of ELL Department can't put it anywhere in their career."* (Lec.4), *"But I'm not sure if students' inability is caused by the education in the program or related to student's profile. As the main reason for failure, we can show both the program and the personal characteristics of the students. But the main reason is, I can say, the background of the student. Students' not expressing any opinion on any subject even in Turkish has nothing to do with the program. It would*

be wrong to expect a student who does not have the habit of reading Turkish books to read English books." (Lec.5), and *"As Fırat University is in the east of Turkey, the students' [university entrance] scores are low and they are weak."* (Lec.8).

4.3.3.2. Lecturers' Views on the Purpose of the EPP

The 2nd question directed to the lecturers during the interviews is "What do you think is the purpose of the English Preparatory Program?". Lecturers' responses to the 2nd question is categorized into seven different phrases and/or statements, and some of the lecturers have used more than one phrase and/or statement to describe their views. Table 30 demonstrates the frequencies of lecturers' responses to the 2nd question.

Table 30

Distribution of Lecturers' Views on the Purpose of the EPP

	Department		**Total**
	Engineering	**ELL**	
Purposes	**f**	**f**	**f**
To improve students' language level		2	2
To ensure that students reach the expected language level	1	1	2
To raise awareness of self-confidence	1	1	2
To develop four basic language skills	2	2	4
To provide students with basic skills	1		1
Preparing students for department shouldn't be the purpose	2	2	4
To prepare students for the departments		1	1

Two participants teaching in ELL Department advocated the view that the purpose of the EPP must be to improve students' language level. They thought that the program should contribute more to taking students further in terms of their language level, and stated this exactly as *"Students in the program have a certain profile, all at the same level. This level should be determined so that the program can take this level a little further."* (Lec.1) and *"The aim should be to provide a better education than the current situation."* (Lec.2). Similarly, two lecturers expected the program to ensure that students reach the demanded language level before they begin their education in the departments. These lecturers remarked as *"We expect students to come [to the department] with a*

language level of B1+ from the program." (Lec.2) and *"Students should be able to reach the language level expected from them."* (Lec.7).

Two lecturers responded to the 2nd question as the program should aim to raise students' awareness of self-confidence. The program can enhance students' certain skills such as speaking by increasing their self-confidence. What the interviewees exactly recommended are as follows: *"The aim should be to increase the self-confidence of the students and to provide them with adequate English."* (Lec.6) and *"I think that students can gain self-confidence about speaking [English], which I believe the program achieves."* (Lec.5).

Nearly half of the lecturers (4 out of 9) stressed that developing four basic language skills of students can be aimed by the EPP since students need these skills in the departments to understand who/what they listen to and what they read, to take notes in and out of class and write down in exams, to answer verbally any question directed to them by lecturers or their peers. The lecturers, who teach in different departments and held the same views on what the purpose of the program should be, answered the 2nd question exactly as *"I expect the program to develop four basic skills of students. [In ELL Department], reading is very important, and writing is the most important because we want students to produce it in the exam. Besides, listening is also very significant because we teach in English. Listening and speaking skills are more needed to communicate. I expect students to speak and make interpretations in class."* (Lec.4), *"The goal should be to improve students' understanding the texts written in the original language, gaining the necessary language skills they can use in a writing activity while and/or after doing a text review."* (Lec.5), *"The purpose is to develop students' listening, speaking, and writing skills together, especially to enable students to express themselves in general terms after the program."* (Lec.9), and *"Speaking and listening skills of students should especially be enhanced."* (Lec.7).

Only one of the participants who teaches in an engineering department signified that the EPP must aim to provide students with basic skills to meet their needs other than four language skills, and shared his/her suggestion as *"The aim of the program should be to enable students to read the literature in their field, to follow information sources, to express themselves in international meetings, to have basic skills and to meet their basic needs."* (Lec.8).

Roughly half of the interviewees (4 out of 9) indicated that preparing students for department should not be the purpose of the EPP. The lecturers in ELL Department

described their views about the specified subject as *"The aim of the program is NOT to teach literature to the students of ELL Department."* (Lec.4) and *"We provide students with literary content until they graduate [from the department]."* (Lec.2) while the lecturers in engineering departments did similarly as *"In the program, it is NOT possible to provide separate and detailed, field-oriented English for each department."* (Lec.9, Lec.8). On the contrary, one of the lecturers (1 out of 5) in ELL Department held the view that the program should aim to prepare students for the department, and worded this as *"The purpose should be preparation for the department. There must be an education appropriate to the concept of the department. The curriculum should be determined according to the department and education should be provided accordingly."* (Lec.3).

4.3.3.3. Lecturers' Views on the Courses and Content the EPP Presents

The 3rd interview question addressed to the lecturers during the interviews is "What are your views on whether the courses/contents in the English Preparatory Program are appropriate for ensuring the needs of students and faculties?". Lecturers' responses to the 3rd interview question is categorized into four different statements, and some of the lecturers have used more than one statement to define their views. Table 31 demonstrates the frequencies of lecturers' responses to the 3rd interview question.

Table 31

Distribution of Lecturers' Views on the Courses and Content the EPP Presents

	Department		**Total**
	Engineering	**ELL**	
Courses/Content in the EPP	**f**	**f**	**f**
Program meets the needs	2		2
General English is taught	1	3	4
Program is inadequate and lacks skills training	1	3	4
Grammar teaching is insufficient		3	3

As demonstrated in Table 31, two of the participants teaching in engineering departments expressed that the EPP meets the needs of the departments. The lecturer who indicated that it is impossible to teach Professional English in the program, but General English shared his/her view as *"There are different expectations according to the departments. For example, in Mechanical Engineering Department, there is more*

expectation of technical English. Teaching of Professional English is demanded, but this is not possible in practice. It is not included in foreign language education, but there are keys of how to deal with it. How to analyze a text is taught in the program. Therefore, we can say that the needs of departments are met by 80%." (Lec.6). The participant who stated that the program had enhanced students' level of General English worded his/her opinion as *"The course content is sufficient for students to improve their level of General English. However, I do not think that the lessons and content that enable students to reach the level they can express themselves without fear of making mistakes are included in the program."* (Lec.9).

Four of the lecturers, mostly teaching in ELL Department (3 out of 4), suggested that the English presented in the program had been for daily use, but not for the department, which was favored by 3 of them and opposed by one. Two of the lecturers (Lec.1, Lec.2) teaching in ELL Department emphasized that it is unnecessary to teach Professional English in the EPP, wording as *"What is done in the program is related to General English. We don't expect anything regarding literature, though."* whilst another lecturer in the same department advocated teaching of field-oriented English in the program, and highlighted the necessity of teaching Professional English exactly as *"There should be an appropriate education for the department. A curriculum for the department can be developed rather than teaching General English."* (Lec.3). One lecturer teaching in one of the engineering departments opposed the view of teaching field-oriented English in the program as it is not seen as a mission of the program but students' responsibility. That lecturer justified his/her thought as *"English is taught in the program, not a profession. The program includes instruction on the daily use of English. During that process, students are developing their skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Students must learn these professional terms before, during, or after that process. No one can teach them those terms in the program. If you study physics, you should take a look at the terms related to physics."* (Lec.6).

Approximately half of the participants (4 out of 9) held the view that the program is inadequate and lacks skills training. These lecturers mostly teaching in ELL Department (3 out of 4) thought that the program had been insufficient and skills training had been far from being satisfactory, wording their views as *"Students are insufficient in English. There are major shortcomings in students' skills."* (Lec.1), *"There are deficiencies in basic language skills. Students do not have reading, writing, and speaking skills. Students don't even answer as 'Yes' or 'No'. If we are to talk about listening skills,*

students do not understand us although we express the same thing several times in different ways." (Lec.2), *"Students lack speaking skills. The most important thing for me is that a student should understand what he/she reads because all the lessons are in English. Another one is listening skills. I expect students to write in the exam what I teach in the lesson and what I focus on. I expect the program to give these skills to the students."* (Lec.4), and *"I don't think the program provides enough English. I see that students cannot understand what I talk about during class and even the subjects and the questions presented to them through a slideshow. Additionally, their listening and reading skills are inadequate. In a good language education, students should understand what a text means in their own language."* (Lec.8).

More than half of the lecturers in ELL Department (3 out of 5) who were interviewed expressed that grammar teaching had been insufficient in the EPP although there might not have been any problem with content of the courses given in the program. They underlined the deficiency of grammar teaching and shared their views as *"I can say the program is sufficient by 60–70%. However, I consider that students' knowledge of grammar is incomplete, that's something I have noticed especially during writing activities and exams. Students lack too much of grammar unfortunately."* (Lec.5, Lec.1, Lec.2).

4.3.3.4. Lecturers' Views on the Shortcomings of the EPP

The 4th question asked to the lecturers during the interviews is "What do you think about the shortcomings of the English Preparatory Program?". Lecturers' responses to the 4th question is categorized into six different phrases, and some of the lecturers have used more than one phrase to convey their views. Table 32 demonstrates the frequencies of lecturers' responses to the 4th question.

Table 32

Distribution of Lecturers' Views on the Shortcomings of the EPP

	Department		Total
	Engineering	ELL	
Deficiencies	**f**	**f**	**f**
Graduation of inadequate students	1	2	3
Incomplete terms of exemption	1		1
Insufficient training of language skills	2	4	6
Subjectivity in evaluation		2	2
Non-demanding program		1	1
Lack of foreign instructors	1		1

Table 32 illustrates participants' views regarding the deficiencies of the EPP. One lecturer in ME Department and two lecturers in ELL Department criticized the program for graduating students who had not learned sufficiently. Two of them justified their criticism by stating that *"Inadequate students graduating from the program have to take the same course repeatedly."* (Lec.2) and *"It is a problem that some students graduate from the program and come to the department although they haven't achieved a good level of language."* (Lec.8) while one described his/her opinion as *"Due to process evaluation of students in the program, students come to the department insufficient."* (Lec.1).

Only one participant held the view that certificates of foreign language exams such as YDS (Foreign Language Exam) and YÖKDİL (Foreign Language Exam for Higher Education Institutions) should not be accepted as valid by the SFL for being able to begin studying directly in the department without participating the EPP as the assessment capacity of these foreign language exams held in Turkey is limited to assessing students' reading skills and the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. These exams lack evaluating applicants' certain language skills of listening, speaking, and writing. The lecturer worded his/her view as *"To be exempted from the program, exams such as YDS should not be simply accepted as sufficient and valid."* (Lec.8).

As can be seen in Table 32, the most negatively criticized aspect of the EPP by two thirds of the participants (6 out of 9) was its insufficient training of language skills. The lecturers signified that skills training in the program had been inadequate, and thus students have problems with performing specific language skills in general. Three

lecturers introduced the view that students need to be trained more on writing skills, and stated this as *"In the writing course, students need to be trained on page usage, text editing, etc."* (Lec.1), *"With regard to writing skills, students' information about page usage or the MLA format (Modern Language Association) is missing."* (Lec.2), and *"Students have difficulties in writing. For example, students are trying not to use verbal expressions in written exams as much as possible."* (Lec.9). On the other hand, one of the lecturers expressed that writing skills had been presented sufficiently in the program whereas reading skills had not, and indicated his/her view as *"Writing skills are sufficiently focused on; however, if reading skills are given more significance as well, students will become more prepared and equipped for the department."* (Lec.5). Two lecturers underlined that students have difficulty in communicating in English in departmental courses, sharing as *"In the previous preparatory program, there was an intense teaching of grammar. There is no meaning of grammar knowledge if speaking skills are neglected. What can a student who cannot understand write? When a student does not understand what he listens to, he/she cannot answer the questions addressed to him/her and cannot write about it."* (Lec.7) and *"Students do not have much difficulty understanding, but they have great problems when they ask questions in English. They are trying to use Turkish while communicating."* (Lec.9). Likewise, another lecturer (Lec.4) argued that enhancing four basic language skills of students had hardly been achieved in the program.

Two interviewees teaching in ELL Department highlighted that there might have been a lack of objectivity and/or standardization of assessment in the program. They defined their views which are quite similar as *"We're getting a number of rumors about how instructors can be far from objectivity in assessment."* (Lec.2, Lec.1).

One lecturer in ELL Department claimed that students had not been enforced to study hard and to show much effort in the program, presenting his/her view as *"Students should not be given so much comfort because we have an impression that students have had a comfortable period in the program. They are used to laziness. They have no study routine, and are very reluctant. They have no desire to improve themselves."* (Lec.3).

Only one participant held the view that foreign instructors, if included in the program, could help students improve their communication skills as well as encouraging them to overcome the anxiety of speaking to a foreigner. He presented his opinion as *"One shortcoming [of the EPP] is that no foreign instructor is included in the program for a couple of years. It's a major shortcoming. Communicating with a foreign instructor*

will contribute positively to the process of students' learning as well as encouraging them." (Lec.6)

4.3.3.5. Lecturers' Suggestions for Improving the Outcomes of the EPP

The 5th interview question addressed to the lecturers during the interviews is "What are your suggestions for improving the English Preparatory Program?". Lecturers' responses to the 5th interview question is categorized into 14 different statements, and some of the lecturers have used more than one statement to explain their views. Table 33 demonstrates the frequencies of lecturers' responses to the 5th interview question.

Table 33

Distribution of Lecturers' Suggestions for Improving the Outcomes of the EPP

	Department		**Total**
	Engineering	**ELL**	
Suggestions	**f**	**f**	**f**
Process evaluation should be abandoned		2	2
Proficiency exam should assess better and be more objective	1	2	3
Program repetition must be an option	1	3	4
Skills should be assessed rather than grammar knowledge	1	1	2
There should be more focus on language skills	4	3	7
More practice is needed	3	1	4
Content and activities related to the departments should be integrated	1	3	4
Education should differ sharply according to the departments		2	2
Video content should be presented more	2	1	3
Students should be given more homework	1	1	2
Foreign instructors should also teach in the EPP	1		1
Material selection is important	1		1
Mobile phones can help teaching process	1		1
Motivation is essential	1	1	2

Table 33 shows that suggestions to enhance the education in the EPP vary. Two lecturers in ELL Department stated that process evaluation should be abandoned, and product evaluation should be carried out instead. They also suggested a change of percentage effect of assessment tools on overall average at the end of the program for a

more objective assessment of students, wording their views as *"Minimizing process evaluation of students in the program, you should increase the effect rate of the proficiency exam on the overall average at the end of the program for a more objective evaluation. That exam should be more effective and significant."* (Lec.1) and *"The effect rates in the process should change."* (Lec.2). Similarly, these two lecturers in ELL Department and one more lecturer teaching in SE Department discussed that proficiency exam held at the end of the program should assess better and be more objective, and they put forward that the form of the exam and the way students were assessed might have been subjective. They defined their views on the form and quality of the proficiency exam as *"The proficiency exam must be in the form of a test. The evaluation of speaking and writing skills can be subjective, biased, and inadequate."* (Lec.1), *"We expect the exam at the end of the program to be more effective, more realistic, and more objective."* (Lec.2), and *"The quality of the proficiency exam should be better."* (Lec.8).

Four participants, three of whom teach in ELL Department, argued that program repetition must be an option for inadequate and incompetent students. They claimed that program repetition would avoid students coming to the department unqualified. They worded their argument as *"Students should repeat the program if needed."* (Lec.1, Lec.2, Lec.5, Lec.8).

Two interviewees underlined the need for assessing students' language skills rather than their knowledge of grammar. They put forward that students should not be seen as successful without detailed testing of their language skills separately during and at the end of the modules in the program. They conveyed their views as *"The exams are of very high quality and not easy. In the exams, you can only focus on certain skills. Students should not succeed in exams with just their knowledge of grammar. You can reduce focus on grammar in all exams (such as quiz, visa, and final). The number of questions for different skills can be increased."* (Lec.5) and *"Exams should be done in detail in a way that language skills are measured separately."* (Lec.8).

Most of the lecturers (7 out of 9) stressed that there should be more focus on improving students' language skills. One of the participants (Lec.7) suggested that four skills should be focused on more while two of them (Lec.3, Lec.9) recommended that speaking and listening exercises should be particularly done more. Other lecturers (4 out of 7) held the view that the concentration should be more on reading and writing skills by stating their suggestions as *"Reading and writing activities should be done more."* (Lec.4,

Lec.8), *"Students may be asked to read some stories and to discuss them."* (Lec.5), and *"[Students'] academic writing skills should be advanced."* (Lec.1).

Nearly half of the lecturers (4 out of 9), most of whom teach in engineering departments, signified that more practice of basic language skills is needed since students lack listening and speaking skills and self-confidence. One of them (Lec.7) remarked that a kind of partnership between qualified students and incomplete students could be applied because it is believed that students might sometimes learn better from each other. Lec.7 expressed his/her suggestion as *"For a couple of hours in a week, a partnership can be applied between students so that the students with a good linguistic skill can give something to other students.".* Two participants highlighted the significance of practice, expressing their views as *"Practice is important. In addition to the theory, students must learn through practice."* (Lec.6, Lec.5). Likewise, another participant (Lec.9) demanded that students should not be insistently demotivated through the requirement of the use of accurate grammar. Instead, they should be encouraged more to speak English. Lec.9 suggested that *"The use of 100% accurate grammar should not be a sine qua non because it blocks the desire of speaking [English]."*.

Four participants, three of whom teach in ELL Department, believed that the content and activities regarding departments should be integrated more within the EPP. In this way, students' readiness for departments can be increased. The lecturers teaching in ELL Department exemplified the use of literary content in the program as *"Students can study literary texts, short stories, and poetry related to the department or perform drama."* (Lec.3), *"Reading club or short story activities can be done for a few hours a week. Students may be asked to understand them, to give information about the author, or to make presentations on some literary works."* (Lec.4), and *"For the last module or the last two modules, I can say that text readings in the original language can be provided more. Some activities such as reading short stories or reading some simple poems may be done."* (Lec.5). Lec.9, likewise, underlined the need for inclusion of academic content in the program, and worded his/her suggestion as *"The program should include more academic content. In this way, students can acquire more vocabulary at academic level."*.

Two participants in ELL Department suggested that language teaching should differ sharply according to the departments. They both thought that program details for the students in distinct departments should entirely differ in terms of curriculum, materials, weekly course hours, percentage of attendance, and success score. They defined their suggestions as *"Students of ELL Department may be subject to a different*

curriculum than the other students in the program in terms of content, course hours, and [percentage of] attendance which should be 90% rather than 80%" (Lec.3) and *"The students in the departments of ME and ELL have already been taught differently [in the program] in terms of the curriculum [they are subject to] and the materials [they use]. You need to take it further. You have to make planning for two separate departments. 60 points is a very low limit for students of ELL Department to succeed in the program. It should be higher for sure. It should be increased from 60 to 70."* (Lec.5).

Three of the participants (two in engineering departments and one in ELL Department) pointed out that video content should be presented more in the program. These participants stressed the necessity of organizing film sessions and/or separate video classes to be included in the program. They described their suggestions as *"Cinema hours or film sessions can be organized."* (Lec.7), *"For example, students may be asked to answer questions about a video they watch from YouTube."* (Lec.4), and *"Video and film content should be included more. Separate video watching classes should be included in the program."* (Lec.9).

Two of the lecturers (Lec.3, Lec.8) suggested that students should be given more homework to have them continue learning out of the classroom, which might result in autonomous learning. Another lecturer (Lec.6) recommended that there could be more foreign instructors included in the program, and underlined the fact that the students would benefit a lot from foreign instructors in terms of enhancing self-confidence and developing communication skills through face-to-face interactions.

One lecturer (Lec.8) teaching in one of the engineering departments indicated that material selection is also important, and suggested that *"I think the materials should be chosen correctly and the number of these materials should be increased quantitatively."*. The same participant (Lec.8) made another suggestion of integrating mobile phone use into normal classroom environment, expressing as *"You should also actively involve mobile phones in language teaching."*. The last but not the least, two lecturers held the view that motivation is essential, and thus students' motivation should be increased. They simply uttered their suggestions as *"Students' motivation can be increased as it is a significant factor of success."* (Lec.3, Lec.6).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the findings of the present study which aims to investigate and cross-compare faculty students' and their lecturers' views regarding the effectiveness of English language teaching curriculum of the EPP at FU SFL are discussed with their relevance to the research questions and with reference to the previous studies. Similar results of previous studies have been highlighted and differences have been identified.

5.2. Discussion of Findings with Relevance to the Research Questions

The aim of this study is to investigate the EPP at FU SFL according to the views of students who have successfully completed the program in 2018–2019 and are currently (2019–2020) in undergraduate programs where medium of instruction is wholly or partially English and to the views of lecturers teaching undergraduate courses in English in relevant departments, and then to cross-compare their views. 100 students studying first grade of three distinct undergraduate programs of three faculties in 2019–2020 academic year and nine lecturers teaching in the same programs are included in the study.

Students' views on the level of realizing the pre-set objectives of the EPP at FU SFL are obtained through a questionnaire including 25 standardized items, five open-ended written questions that are included in the same questionnaire, and a focus group interview during which the same five open-ended questions with further questions of "why" and "how" are directed to nine students from engineering departments. The results gathered from the questionnaire for students and open-ended questions addressed to the students in focus group interview are intended to be discussed under the 1st and 2nd research questions.

Research question 1: *To what extent do the freshmen from different faculties of Fırat University think that the EPP meets the pre-set requirements?*

Sixty-one students out of 100 defined that they had had an elementary level of English prior to the beginning of the program (see Table 5 in Chapter 4). In fact, they

were false beginners and had to choose the option “Elementary” to define the level of English they had since the options presented in the questionnaire were limited to three which were “Elementary”, “Pre-intermediate”, and “Intermediate”. *‘False beginner’* means a person with a basic knowledge of a language, but needs to study it again from the beginning (Collins English Dictionary, 2019; Macmillan Dictionary, 2019; Oxford Learner’s Dictionary, 2019). Other than that, the results of students’ views on the significance level of language skills revealed that listening and speaking skills are seen as more significant than reading and writing skills—as found by Karcı Aktaş (2018) as well—and essential to be able to communicate in English (see Table 6 in Chapter 4). The results of similar research by Sarı (2003), who studied with 230 students, 25 doctors, and 7 teachers and evaluated the English teaching program at Gülhane Military Medical Faculty, displayed that speaking and reading were seen as primary skills by students. It can be claimed based upon the results that language skills such as listening and speaking are what students need most to follow lectures in English in their departments, to communicate with foreigners, and to have a successful job interview in the future. However, the results of the students’ views on language skills levels they had at the end of the program showed that they mostly have a “good” level of reading and writing skills whereas they have a “middle” level of listening and speaking skills (see Table 7 in Chapter 4). Though they find listening and speaking skills fundamental and essential in communication, they could not achieve a “good” or “very good” level of these skills. There are also other studies (Alameddine, 2013; Balcı et al., 2018; Köse, 2012; Özkanal, 2009) displaying the same findings with the current research and emphasizing that there should be more focus on oral communication in foreign language teaching courses and programs.

Students’ views about the realization level of the objectives of the EPP were explored, and it was found that the overall average of the questionnaire is 2,85 which is above the average value (M=2,50) of the scale (see Table 8 in Chapter 4). Thus, it can be said that the objectives of the EPP have mostly been achieved at ‘*sufficient level’*. Nevertheless, this result does not indicate that students possess all the skills given in the statements in the scale at *‘sufficient level’* for there are three objectives of which arithmetic means were found to be lower than the average value of the questionnaire (items 7, 13, and 25). When previous research is examined, Köse (2012), who studied with 326 students in the EPP at Uludağ University SFL and explored their views about the realization level of the objectives of the program, found out the overall average of the

questionnaire applied to the students as 2,45 which was below the average value (M=2,50) of the questionnaire. Özkanal (2009) also studied with 129 first-graders who were enrolled in the faculties at Osmangazi University after graduating from Foreign Languages Department (FLD) successfully, and evaluated the EPP of FLD based on the elements of curriculum and explored whether the program achieved the desired qualities. Özkanal (2009) found out the overall average of the questionnaire, which was applied to the students and included 20 statements about students' success level of language skills, as 2,95 which was above the average value (M=2,50) of the questionnaire.

Apart from investigating students' views in general, their opinions on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP were examined according to the variables of gender, department they study in, and high school they graduated from. The results gained from students' responses to the items in the questionnaire revealed that there is not any meaningful difference between male and female students' views statistically. Similarly, the difference among students' views in terms of the high schools they graduated from is not found to be meaningful. Although there is some difference among the arithmetic means of students' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP by the departments they are enrolled in, that is not a significant difference statistically (F= 3,092; p= .05).

To be able to answer the 1st research question, all students were given a questionnaire, and additionally, nine of them were interviewed afterwards since more qualitative data was needed. The students in ELL Department were found to have progressed their language skills at the end of the program more than the students in engineering departments had. It was revealed that the language instruction in the EPP was generally good and contributing. Speaking is, specifically, uttered to be one of the most improved skills of students though some students shared negative views. Students might lack speaking ability due to finding little chance of speaking English sufficiently in and out of school. Because of this reason, it is supposed that speaking skills might not have been given much significance in the program, which contradicts with positive responses of some students. According to the results of students' responses to the items in the questionnaire, students can ask and answer questions related to the departmental courses in English. Relying on the results, it can be said that students have improved their speaking skills, and they can ask and answer questions about courses. Students' views about being able to ask and answer questions related to courses in English are in line with previous studies of Köse (2012) and Özkanal (2009). Exceptionally, in Özkanal's (2009)

research, students highlighted that the EPP provided all language skills sufficiently other than speaking skills.

The results of students' views regarding achieving reading skills and expanding their vocabulary knowledge through the EPP yielded that they can find English sources and get information, answer questions about an English text, read and understand an English text, understand written instructions, understand the main idea of an English text quickly, and read a magazine or any scientific articles in English related to their field. It can be considered that the EPP at FU SFL provided students with vocabulary they would need in daily life and partly in their departments and with comprehension skills which were defined by Colorín Colorado (2019) as "summarizing, sequencing, inferencing, comparing and contrasting, drawing conclusion, self-questioning, problem-solving, relating background knowledge, distinguishing between fact and opinion, finding the main idea, important facts, and supporting details". Moreover, it was found that they can read an English text and express it in their own words, which also indicates that they can summarize a piece of text. Other studies (Balcı et al., 2018; Köse, 2012; Özkanal, 2009) also found similar results about students' success level of comprehension skills at the end of other English preparatory programs.

The findings of this study also pointed out that students can write an English paragraph or composition on any topic, write a formal or an informal English letter, e-mail, resume, etc., fill in an English form, and make a report of information in English. Therefore, it can be assumed that the program at FU SFL taught students how to express their ideas and thoughts in writing and how to fill in forms containing personal information. The results of previous studies (Balcı et al., 2018; Köse, 2012; Özkanal, 2009) presented that students could similarly perform good writing skills as well. The students at FU SFL were, additionally, claimed by both some students and lecturers to have reached a level of being able to write in English to some extent. The training provided for writing skills was thought to be very basic and not sufficient for a student of ELL Department to write an academic text because no separate writing course had been included in the first two modules of the program.

The students reported that they can understand the discussions held in English in classroom and summarize a text read aloud in English by writing in English; however, they are not able to convert an oral presentation in English into a written report in English. In Özkanal's (2009) research, the students expressed positive views about all the language skills mentioned above. The students participated in Köse's (2012) study, on the other

hand, were reported not to be able to summarize a text read aloud in English and convert an oral presentation in English into a written report in English. It seems that the program at FU SFL is sufficient to foster students' basic listening skills whilst inadequate to upskill students and expand their abilities to express what they listen to in writing. The number of listening activities was mentioned to be very low in the program, so the students felt inadequate when it came to understanding a person or an audio track. Audio tracks and some videos included in the materials used in the program were considered to be quite difficult to understand, especially in the third and fourth modules. They were defined to be above students' level, and thus could be demotivating. Audio tracks and videos presented in the program might not be understandable due to high speech pace of natives or foreigners.

The results presented above support that though listening skills were shared to be challenging for students to achieve at a good level, students can understand lectures and participate in debates in the department with little difficulty as well as watching any English subtitled video such as series, or movies. In Özkanal's (2009) study, similarly, participants were shared that they could attend English activities, understand lecturers' speaking English, understand listening materials, English presentations, and in-class English discussions.

The present study also aimed to investigate students' views about achieving speaking skills, and the results indicated that students can make a phone call and a presentation in English, but that is not at a desired level. The arithmetic means of the related items were higher than the average value of the scale, though. Hence, the program can be thought to be inadequate to give students skills such as one to one conversation, basic communication, and oral expression on various subjects. When these results are compared with those obtained from Köse's (2012) study, an asymmetry is recognized.

The EPP was heavily criticized by the students in engineering departments for its teaching General English, (or English for daily life) but not Professional English (or field-oriented English). The program was argued not to provide in depth English, namely it was very superficial. It is worthy of remark that while students are be able to understand what lecturers speak in general, they do have trouble with technical phrases and terms. The instruction of "Engineering-related English" is highly expected to be included in the program by the students enrolled in engineering departments, particularly in ME Department. Likewise, the EPP at Osmangazi University FLD was found by most of the undergraduates (Özkanal, 2009) to be sufficient in teaching General English, but not in

teaching Professional English. It was highly criticized for providing English or grammar for daily use, but not for their majors. The English Preparatory Programs in Turkey focus mainly on teaching General English along with basic language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary (Çetinavcı & Topkaya, 2012), whereas university students' need for Academic English is generally neglected in these programs (Kırkgöz, 2009).

Another noticeable finding of the present study is that the majority of the students do not reckon that their knowledge of English is sufficient to make an academic career and to achieve a good career when they go into business life. This finding is not compatible with previous research of Yükselir (2018) who explored students' perceptions of the Optional English Preparatory Program in a state university in Turkey. In his study, students believed that the EPP would enable them to get promotion in their career in future. Several researches in the field of engineering (Alameddine, 2013; Al-Tamimi & Shuib, 2009; Bobkina & Fernandez de Caleya Dalmau, 2012; Yang & Lau, 2003) demonstrated that English is an essential instrument for any engineer who would like to carry out his/her professional practice in the international arena. Ellis (1994) pointed out that the paramount importance of English language makes language acquisition attractive for especially engineering students (cited in Bobkina & Fernandez de Caleya Dalmau, 2012). Thus, learners' motivation turns out to be a decisive factor that influences the success of foreign language learning. When previous researches are examined, it can be apparently seen that students mostly need English for instrumental reasons. Bobkina and Fernandez de Caleya Dalmau (2012), who studied with 72 Industrial and Technical Engineering students from the fifth grade in the Higher Technical School of Industrial Engineering Technical University of Madrid, aimed at exploring their motivation and attitudes towards learning English. On the contrary to the findings of this study, they found that engineering students mostly need English for instrumental reasons such as studies (97,4%), professional career (98,6%), and a well-paid job (90,3%). Similarly, Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) studied with 81 students of Petroleum Engineering at Hadhramout University of Sciences and Technology to investigate their motivation and attitudes towards learning the English language. In their study, participants showed greater support of instrumental reasons for learning English including pragmatic/professional (e.g. to get a job easily) and academic reasons (e.g. to carry some tasks more efficiently, to further education, and it is a university requirement). Alameddine (2013) found out that students are motivated to learn technical English

primarily for instrumental reasons [e.g. to maintain high Grade Point Average (GPA)], to pass exams, or since it is a university requirement) and secondly for personal reasons such as improving their professional development and advancing their education. Yang and Lau (2003) conducted a research with forty-two freshmen from Business Faculty, Humanities and Social Sciences Faculty, and Science and Engineering Faculty and discussed students' attitudes towards English before and after their tertiary studies. Through their study, they found that a more liberal choice of English courses at university helped students obtain the language needed for their future career and personal growth.

The graduates of the EPP at FU SFL can use technology more effectively thanks to their knowledge of English, which confirms that the program provided students with vocabulary they might need in the world of technology and to use computers, smart phones, and the Internet. Relying on the results, it can be concluded that the program contributes to students' keeping up with new developments in the field technology in digital age. This finding is also in line with the same finding of Köse (2012).

English language instruction in the EPP at FU SFL is applied through a modular system. Despite the fact that modular system could cause stress according to some students, the advantages of modular system were appreciated by most of them. The system allows students to set short time goals to reach and to learn from their peers at the same level of English. The division of language education into modules enables students to know what they will learn in each module of eight weeks. It was also defined as disciplined, fun, and suitable. Considering the fact that the students at FU SFL had positive views on the application of modular system, it is not surprising that the students participating in the study of Balcı et al. (2018)—who evaluated the compulsory EPP at Necmettin Erbakan University SFL—suggested an implementation of modular system in their program. It is thought by Balcı et al. (2018) that students' demand for a shift to the modular system in the program might be due to the fact that they have friends with different levels of English in their classrooms, and this situation creates problems in terms of benefiting from the lessons (p.887). In addition to the advantages of modular system mentioned above, learning process is never interrupted in the system because students frequently take exams, at least one in two weeks. Though some students recommended that the frequency of taking exams in each module was great, which could sometimes be challenging and fatiguing (Soruc, 2012); it was highly stressed by the participants that frequently given exams—particularly pop quizzes held at random times and speaking tests—had been beneficial to their learning. Taking exams frequently keeps students

studying all the time and leads them further studies as well. Another study (Özkanal, 2009) attempted to find the views about the functionality of exams in an EPP and presented that exams were claimed to be functional and especially quizzes prepared students for midterm exams. Likewise, in the study of Tunç (2010), the instructors worded that they did not find any negativity about the exams, and the exams were useful for monitoring the progress of the students and keeping students ready all the time. On the other hand, participating in Şen Ersoy and Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu's (2015) research, both students and instructors indicated that the number of exams in the program was high, and thus, the students highlighted that their desire to study decreased since they were tested frequently and the lecturers emphasized that their workload increased.

Offered to the students in the program two hours a week, the class of CALL was likely not to be serving its purpose. CALL is a general term for "the range of processes and activities that employ computers in the teaching and learning of a new language" and has two featured advantages which are "the ability to cater to individual differences" and its interactive nature (Stevie D., 2019). However, these features of CALL bring some disadvantages in practice when it comes to the reality of its application. Students are required to study and practice on their own in computer laboratories for a couple of hours in a week or out of school as much as they wish. Instead, they do it cooperatively or sometimes cheat while doing exercises. By doing so, students are given high marks for the class of CALL by online practice application of the publisher of the materials used in the EPP, which is regarded as non-acceptable and undesirable by both the instructors and managerial staff of the FU SFL. Similarly, the ineffectiveness of the use of the online system for assessing students' progress was also criticized by the instructors and students who participated in Coşkun's (2013) research. Both the instructors (N=8) and students (N=8) in that research believed that the students generally requested their friends or some other to do their assignments on the online platform.

The materials used in the EPP were strongly supported for being satisfactory, convenient, and effective to get a quality English education whereas there were a few voices of dissent. The books were regarded by dissident voices as inadequate in terms of teaching English grammar and the content related to the departmental courses. In general, the materials used in the program were revealed to be quite useful and detailed. These materials are not prepared to present field-oriented English for certain departments, though. Accordingly, the findings of the study of Yang and Lau (2003) also displayed that most of the students in different departments were happy with the materials although

the course contents were irrelevant to their studies. Öner and Mede (2015) found out that apart from speaking materials, the materials used in the A1 program were perceived by the respondents to be generally adequate and efficient. Nevertheless, some previous studies (Karataş, 2007; Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Nam, 2005; Sarı, 2003; Tunç, 2010; Yılmaz, 2011) showed that the materials used in language teaching courses and programs were negatively viewed by respondents as of poor quality, uninformative, insufficient, ineffective, grammar focused, or uninteresting.

The instructors teaching English in the EPP at FU SFL were found to be friendly, caring and sympathetic, besides being an expert in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) and well-equipped, which is quite similar to the findings of Özkanal (2009) in terms of the quality and success of the instructors. In the study conducted at Adnan Menderes University (Karcı Aktaş, 2018), the instructors in the SFL were mostly found to be sufficient by both the students in the program and the instructors themselves in terms of academic and personal characteristics such as the knowledge and teaching expertise, level of meeting the needs of students, and counseling. The students in the EPP at FU SFL take classes from various instructors in different modules so that they can improve their speaking and listening skills through being exposed to different accents of instructors. The instructors were viewed to endeavor constantly to develop students, teaching in several ways that might attract all students. Previous research (Yang & Lau, 2003) also showed that the effort an educator put into teaching affected students' interest in learning. Nonetheless, some of the instructors at FU SFL were criticized for having high expectations from students and putting them in unnecessary challenges. Moreover, some instructors were argued to be inadequate in terms of teaching style or methods as was also found through the study of Karcı Aktaş (2018). It is suggested that the instructors in foreign language teaching programs can make classes more active and enjoyable by using some authentic materials and technology-based activities (Yükselir, 2018, p.46).

The participants appreciated the physical and technological infrastructure of the SFL at FU because of the fact that it has a five-year-old modern building including classrooms of different sizes for various groups, computer laboratories for online studies, and a conference hall for different purposes such as arranging orientation sessions, holding large-size meetings, performing dramas, etc. The physical and technological infrastructure of the SFL and the number of administrative and academic staff enable students to be grouped into 12–18 in each class to make language instruction better and more effective. Yang and Lau (2003) reported that smaller class size (usually 20, as

opposed to 35–40 students) allowed students to get more individual attention from teachers, which was pleasing for them. The students at FU SFL are taught in the classrooms well-equipped with computers connected to the internet, projectors, speakers, and whiteboards and through digital teaching resources designed for interactive use. On the contrary to the results of this research, the respondents from Osmangazi University (Özkanal, 2009) indicated that physical conditions of the building of FLD were insufficient, and similarly, the participants from Adnan Menderes University (Karcı Aktaş, 2018) pointed out that the SFL did not have a library or study room with only English resources, a language laboratory, a canteen, and a photocopy room though the EPP was applied in a 4-year-old building of which construction was finished in 2015.

The students found the English they have gained in the EPP quite sufficient to follow departmental courses instructed in English. They held the view that it would be challenging for them to understand and follow their lecturers and classes in the department unless they had attended the program which was thought to be contributing to their English a lot. However, most of the students criticized the EPP for not teaching Professional English which they compulsorily need in their faculties. In compatible with the results of Balcı et al. (2018), the students at FU felt content with language skills and English grammar they had gained in the EPP, but not the content and vocabulary. They stressed that the English they need in the department is quite different from the English in the program which was claimed to be General English. The participants highly suggested the need for Professional English which combines a strong grammar syllabus with the essential vocabulary students need for their school and business lives. It can be understood that the EPP at FU SFL did not provide students and the departments with required English. The students opposed the view that they could fully mastered in English at the end of the program. Some of the students found the courses/program insufficient for departmental courses in terms of presenting words or terms related to the departments whereas some thought that skills training was far from being satisfactory. With reference to previous research, while the present findings are consistent with some studies (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Kırkgöz, 2009; Özkanal, 2009; Yang & Lau, 2003; Yükselir, 2018), they are incompatible with others (Balcı et al., 2018). It was noted that half of the students (60 out of 129) and instructors (15 out of 27) who joined Özkanal's (2009) study, in parallel with the results of this study, shared exactly the same views. In another study (Yükselir, 2018), it was found that students' expectations from optional EPP were not fully met due to some factors such as more focus on teaching grammar explicitly, less emphasis on

language skills, highly use of Turkish by instructors, and few group discussions and task-based activities in lessons. Contrariwise, when students' opinions about the effectiveness of the compulsory preparatory program at Necmettin Erbakan University were examined, it was found that most of the students (65%) stated that the program was highly effective, and they were very satisfied with the program (Balcı et al., 2018). Yang and Lau (2003), besides, presented that the participants of their study were satisfied with the English learning environment at university.

English is an international and significant language that everyone needs to learn (Tahaineh & Daana, 2013, p.175) due to professional needs (Karahan, 2007, p.84) and essential in business life and labor market (Yükselir, 2018, p.46). In addition to the incentives mentioned above, the requirement of B1 or B1+ level of language skills of English to follow undergraduate courses in the departments at FU was defined to lead most of the students to attend the EPP at FU SFL voluntarily even if it had not been compulsory. Out of 81 reflections collected by Yang and Lau (2003), 62 reflected that students would like to take the English course anyway if they were allowed to choose due to some possible needs in the future. The English they had had prior to the beginning of the program was mentioned to be insufficient to understand departmental courses and to be qualified in their field after undergraduate education. This is in harmony with the results of Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) reporting one of their participant's view about the need for being equipped with a good level of English before beginning higher education as "Because they finish primary and secondary school with poor level in both language and communication skills, they fail to cope with the academic requirements at the university.". It was also mentioned by Balci et al. (2018), who argued students' aim of participating in the preparatory program and their expectations from the program, that students take classes in the preparatory program to learn English at a good level and as it is a requirement in their departments. In the present context, students' willingness to take the same program if they were allowed to make the choice again was also emphasized because of a few reasons such as making friends and getting used to the school life and the city, Elazığ. Other than that, one of the main reasons for students' desire to join the program voluntarily is the success of the program which was believed by most of them. However, there are some arguments to be made by some of the students. The program was defined as *failed* for not being much contributing, not teaching Professional English, not teaching anything other than grammar, etc. Moreover, it is seen as a one-year loss of time and a waste of money. The number of participants who thought in this way was very

small, though. Contrary to this finding, it was ascertained by Yükselir (2018) that most of the students (91 out of 110) did not see one-year (two semesters) EPP as a waste of time.

Research question 2: *What, in freshmen's opinion, should be made to improve the outcomes of the programme?*

The students believed that English language instruction of the EPP at FU SFL could be improved through various modifications. They shared their recommendations in written form and verbally. Training of four basic language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) was advised to be included more in the program, and this suggestion corresponds with those of the previous studies (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Özkanal, 2009; Yükselir, 2018). Speaking skill, specifically, was suggested to be given more emphasis (Öner & Mede, 2015). It seems that grammar teaching outweighs other language skills in these programs. In the EPP at FU SFL, each skill was recommended to be taught separately and at an academic level. The findings from other researches (Balcı et al., 2018; Köse, 2012; Özkanal, 2009; Yükselir, 2018) revealed that EPPs did not contribute much to students' speaking skills, and hence speaking practices should have been focused more in particular. The respondents of this study, further, underlined that listening and speaking skills are needed more than reading and writing skills. In order to encourage every student in the program to communicate in English, a separate class should be defined for listening and speaking skills, from the first module if possible. Additionally, skill-based teaching of English from the very beginning of the program rather than integrated teaching of English was advocated by some students. The suggestion of including a skill-based teaching of English in the program was also defined in the study of Balcı et al., (2018). However, Celce-Murcia (2001) stated that there has been a shift towards integrated approaches that promote the teaching of four skills in the same framework since 1980s. Similarly, Oxford (2001) criticized segregated-skill instruction as being completely opposite to the integrated language structure that people use in normal communication and being part of a traditional language teaching program, that language teaching experts have abandoned in recent years.

The undergraduates expected to learn Professional English in the program through a specific course including introductory information of literature or engineering terminology to be able to readily follow departmental courses they take in English. These

undergraduates highlighted that it would be beneficial if the content and vocabulary related to their department could have been given, which was one of the most expressed suggestions. This recommendation is in parallel with the suggestion made by the freshmen attending in the studies of Kırkgöz (2009) and Özkanal (2009). Considering the previous studies showing the inadequacy of EPPs in terms of preparing students for undergraduate education, in Turkish higher education, a shift from pure General English structure of the EPPs to a more EAP framework can be fairly suggested (Coşkun, 2013, p.3). The first-year students' need for learning English for academic concern in addition to learning General English has also been emphasized by some Turkish researchers (Gerede, 2005; Karataş & Fer, 2009; Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Kırkgöz, 2009; Mirici & Saka, 2004; Örs, 2006; Özkanal & Hakan, 2010) as well as foreign researchers (Dudley-Evans & St John, 2001; Hutchinson & Waters, 2004; Hyland, 2006).

Foreign instructors (or natives) were also believed to be able to contribute to the students' progress of listening and speaking skills. Students might benefit from foreign instructors or guests who are allowed to join the classes for a finite time. In this way, students can copy the way how to communicate to a foreigner, and specifically, be familiar with the right pronunciation and intonation of English words and sentence structures. Additionally, they may cope with fear of speaking English when they are enforced to interact with natives or foreign speakers of English. Students' demand of including foreign instructors in the EPP might result from the idea that foreign instructors provide the opportunity to improve students' speaking skills of English. Associated with the recommendation of including foreign instructors in the program, the courses in the program were suggested to be entirely taught in English all the time. It was argued that this brings some advantages such as being exposed to English more, finding more chances of interacting in English, engaging more in English, and so on. In the same way, other researchers (Balcı et al., 2018; Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Özkanal, 2009; Yang & Lau, 2003; Yükselir, 2018) found the same results concerning the need for foreign instructors and the medium of instruction in classes to be totally English. In harmony with these results, Balabakgil (2016) discussed some disadvantages of using first language (mother tongue) of students in teaching procedure. She put forward that language learners have very little opportunity to practice foreign language (target language) outside the classroom; frequent use of mother tongue creates over-dependency, and thus can be an obstacle to learn the target language; and the negative effects of translation between two languages (mother tongue and target language) can cause underproduction, overproduction, production

errors, and misinterpretation. On the contrary, she concluded her study by signifying some advantages of using first language to teach the target language such as clarifying target language meaning, checking comprehension, focusing on learners' attention, and building rapport with learners, which were welcomed and favored both by native (N=15) and non-native (N=15) instructors who participated in her study.

Various classroom activities such as making presentations, giving short speeches, watching some videos or films, memorizing English songs or poems, role-plays, and games were advised to be added to the existing program, which was also found by other researchers (Erozan, 2005; Öner & Mede, 2015; Soruc, 2012). Furthermore, some out-of-class activities were suggested to be orginised to make students involve more actively in learning process of their own, to avoid monotony and probable boringness of teaching procedure, and specifically, to enhance their speaking skills. The students of Osmangazi Universtity (Özkanal, 2009) and Necmettin Erbakan University (Balcı et al., 2018), likewise, recommended that speaking clubs should be created and be more functional. In parallel with the findinds of this study, Karcı Aktaş (2018) also found that in-class activities were carried out in order to enhance each language skills of students enrolled in Adnan Menderes University, but there were no extra-class activities such as speaking clubs, reading discussion group, drama clubs, conferences, festivals, and so forth.

One of the serious criticisms that was provoked from the faculty students was the lack of standard in the assessment of writing skills as it could sometimes differ from instructor to instructor, which they believed that one of the instructors could give a high score to a paper while another could give lower to the same or similar paper. In terms of objectivity in assessment, Coşkun's (2013) and Soruc's (2012) findings—similar to the results of the present study—revealed that the scoring of productive skills (writing and speaking) in the program was not found very objective by both students and instructors. The same piece of writing was underlined to be scored differently by two instructors. As a solution to this problem, one of the instructors recommended that rather than holistic scoring criteria, an analytic rubric can be used (Coşkun, 2013). Wiseman (2012) also emphasized that analytic scoring rubrics which are based on the idea to evaluate nominated features of a written text give more information about test taker's performance than a single score of holistic rating (p.60). There certainly should be a standard not only in writing assessment by instructors in the EPP at FU SFL but also in all assessment procedures in the program to avoid injustice and above all to make accurate assessment of language learners.

The percentage effect of CPG on the overall average of each module was seen nominal, and hence this percentage, which is 5%, was strongly recommended to be considerably escalated since the communication skills students performed in class were claimed to have higher priority over their reading and writing skills they performed in written exams. In recent years, the concept of product evaluation in education has been replaced by process-oriented approaches, and it is evident that the optimal assessment of students' learning can only be achieved when process and product evaluations are carried out together (Karakuş, 2013, p.17). The instructors and students participating in the study of Özuslu (2018), who evaluated the use of Performance-based Assessment Tasks as the supplementary assessment component of the English language teaching program in a state university, indicated that the number, content, and difficulty of tasks used to assess students' performance should be taken into consideration meticulously. The undergradutes' demand for an increase in the percentage of CPG in the EPP at FU SFL is somehow connected to the suggestion of including more practice of using English language in the program rather than focusing more on teaching theory, English grammar. In order to increase the achievement level of students, it was suggested that students should do more practice of speaking skills, that is, the opportunity to practice language skills should be increased in the courses and programs (Erozan, 2005; Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Öner & Mede, 2015). The finding about the fact that there should be less focus on grammar teaching in the program, contrariwise, is not consistent with the results of Özkanal's (2009) study which revealed that English grammar should be focused on more and of Gürata's (2008) study which showed that learning the grammatical rules of a foreign language and accurate language production are seen significant by learners of English language in Turkey. Similar to the results of the present study, the need for more practice in a postgraduate program of English Translation was emphasized by respondents included in the research of Birjandi and Nosratinia (2009). As stated by Birjandi and Nosratinia (2009), the main reason for inefficiency of the program in terms of the existing gap between what students learn in the program and what they actually encounter in real work scenarios might be that the program contains lots of theoretical courses for familiarizing the graduates with different theories, and models of translation, and hence during their studies students have less opportunities to put their acquired knowledge into practice. Finally, it was suggested by the students that the class of CALL can be excluded from the curriculum or its percentage effect, which is 10, within overall average of each module should be reduced a little bit as it is thought not to be serving its purpose.

Lecturers' views about the level of achievement of the objectives of the EPP at FU SFL are obtained through a questionnaire including 18 standardized items and a series of semi-structured interviews. The results gathered from the questionnaire for lecturers and the open-ended questions directed to them in one-to-one interviews are intended to be discussed under the 3rd and 4th research questions.

Research question 3: *To what extent do the lecturers from different faculties of Fırat University think that the EPP meets the pre-set requirements?*

The findings related to the lecturers' views on the significance level of language skills for their students revealed that four basic language skills were seen of great importance (see Table 13 in Chapter 4). The lecturers underlined that the students are required to have all four language skills to study in English, to communicate effectively in English, and to have a successful academic and business career rather than to have just one or two of those skills. Considering the findings from previous researches, this finding is supported by other studies (Köse, 2012; Özkanal, 2009) as well.

The lecturers' views on the realization level of the objectives of the EPP at FU SFL were explored, and it was found that the overall average of the questionnaire is 2,49 which is slightly under the average value (M=2,50) of the scale. Therefore, it can be seen that some of the objectives (defined in items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 16) of the EPP have been achieved at *'sufficient level'* while some have not (see Table 14 in Chapter 4). On the contrary, Özkanal (2009) who studied with 27 instructors teaching in the EPP at Osmangazi University FLD noted that the program was seen as successful by 15 instructors out of 27. Similar to the results of Köse (2012) and Özkanal (2009), who studied with 65 instructors teaching in the EPP at Uludağ University SFL, also found the overall average of the questionnaire applied to the instructors as 2,52 which is slightly above the average value (M=2,50) of the questionnaire. Though what Köse (2012) found in her research is different from the present study, the difference is not so much.

According to the results of the lecturers' responses to the items in the questionnaire, the students' knowledge of English they gained through the program contributes to their academic development and professional career when they are to be employed. Relying on these results, it can be said that the students benefit from English knowledge during and after their academic life and throughout their business career. It was, likewise, revealed by Köse (2012) that English taught in the EPP at Uludağ

University SFL was argued by the instructors to be useful when students begin studying in their departments. Parallel results to the present study were found by Alameddine (2013) who investigated the attitude of engineering students towards learning technical English. The results revealed that engineering students had positive attitude towards technical English and believed it would further their status and employment chances in future. Doiz et al. (2011), who investigated the views of teaching staff involved in English-medium instruction from pedagogical ecology-of-language and personal standpoints, ascertained that multilingual programs "give students the opportunity to work in English, attract foreign students, increase students' job opportunities, and facilitate teachers'/students' participation in exchange programs" (p.351). In another study (Karcı Aktaş, 2018), the instructors stated that students had been willing to attend the program at the beginning of the academic year for such reasons as having a good career or job, the necessity in academia, and going abroad.

Even though the lecturers did not have any information about the statistics related to whether their students are more successful in student exchange programs and/or can actively take part in the projects carried out overseas, they shared positive views about the realization of these objectives of the program. Students of all majors at tertiary level highly demand to do their studies abroad for a while at least one semester so as to make contacts with foreign students, lecturers, businessmen, and people for personal or professional concerns and to enhance their foreign language skills. Since internationalization has become highly topical, the European Commission has launched different student mobility programs (e.g. Erasmus+, Erasmus Mundus, etc.) to encourage the internationalization of higher education with an aim at increasing communication among graduate and undergraduate European students, whereas at the same time making European higher education more attractive to students from other countries (Doiz et al., 2011). In order to make language learning process more motivating for university students, as suggested by Berwick et al. (1989), "any number of foreign exchange programs with other universities, overseas 'homestay' programs, or any other activities which may help to motivate students to improve their target language proficiency" (cited in Tahaineh & Daana, 2013, p.175). Contrary to the present research, Köse (2012) found that students' actively taking part in the projects carried out overseas was viewed negatively by the instructors participating in her study.

The lecturers' responses revealed that the English course presented in the program did not enable students to use technology more effectively. They supposed that the

program was not effective in teaching the vocabulary the students need when they use technology.

The results showed that the students who attended the program the year before (2018–2019) have a better knowledge of English in general than the students who was exempt from the program at the beginning of the current academic year (2019–2020). The students who attended the program were expressed to be apparently more informed about writing academically and more capable of speaking in English fluently. Thus, it can be assumed that there is a significant difference between the students participating in the program and the students exempted from the program. However, in this case, the exemption exam of the EPP can be thought to be insufficient to distinguish between competent and incompetent students, or the terms of exemption of the program might be incomplete. These findings gathered from the questionnaire for lecturers are consistent with the results of the interviews with lecturers. The students who attended the program were reported to be able to write better since they know more about the rules and grammar of English and speak better as they have higher self-confidence. On the other hand, the previous research conducted by Köse (2012) yielded opposite results.

The English instruction in the EPP at FU SFL was believed by the lecturers to be getting better thanks to the shift to the modular system contribution of which is undeniable. It was admitted that there are some positive outputs of the program though these outputs are limited. Therefore, the program was recommended to be revised for it is not as effective as expected. On the contrary to the positive views of the lecturers at FU on the effectiveness of the modular system, Coşkun (2013), who evaluated an English language teaching program applied through the modular system in another state university in Turkey, found that the modular system should be discontinued since it has certain drawbacks and should be replaced by a more manageable and feasible system, considering specific contextual constraints such as the number of instructors, classrooms, and course materials. Karcı Aktaş (2018), who evaluated the curriculum of the EPP at Adnan Menderes University SFL according to Bellon and Handler model, found that the need for program update was uttered by the instructors and students in the EPP. According to Erozan (2005), who evaluated the language improvement courses in the undergraduate curriculum of the Department of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University, the students and instructors suggested some changes in the existing language improvement courses to make them more effective and better adjusted to the students' needs and expectations.

The lecturers at FU strongly argued that it is requisite for students to get educated in the program and the knowledge of English students acquire through program is beneficial when they go to the departments, as also defined by the lecturers participating in Karcı Aktaş's (2018) research. They did not agree with that the EPP is effective and the students who were taught English in the program have sufficient knowledge of English. The results of this study, similar to the others (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Kırkgöz, 2009), revealed that the program outcomes were discussed to be far from being adequate to meet the requirements of the departments. The lecturers from engineering departments of FU observed nationality contrasts in English fluency between local students who graduated from the EPP at FU SFL and international students. Differing English ability levels among students were further reported to have teaching/learning consequences, similar to what Doiz et al. (2011) found out in their research with teaching staff in multilingual programs at University of the Basque Country in Spain. The lecturers at FU, for instance, noted that Turkish students in general have a lower command of English than Nigerian, Moroccan, and Jordanian students. These results indicate that the EPP did not provide the students with a certain language acquisition and could not meet the lecturers' expectations. These results yielded parallel findings with the results of previous studies (Kırkgöz, 2009; Köse, 2012).

It can be claimed, based on the results collected from the questionnaire for lecturers, that the students who studied in the program cannot give clear and detailed information about various subjects of their interest, and similarly, these students cannot write abstracts and reviews of professional or literary works. Furthermore, it is obvious that they have problems in preparing and responding to English correspondence (e-mail, application form, petition, etc.) and cannot write a composition or a report by supporting or opposing a particular point of view. It can be clearly seen that the students were claimed not to have acquired writing skills in the program and to be weak in expressing thoughts. Similar results were also seen in the study of Köse (2012) who studied with 65 instructors teaching in the EPP at Uludağ University SFL in terms of students' being unable to improve their writing skills in the program and weak in expressing their thoughts. Kırkgöz (2009), additionally, discussed that students need to learn not only academic conventions but also disciplinary writing requirements (p.90).

The freshmen in the departments were also claimed not to be able use the English sources they find effectively and to have problems in analyzing English texts, which displays that the program was insufficient to foster students' reading skills. Other than

that, it was found that the students can barely understand news on television and most of the programs regarding current events. Likewise, they were defined not to understand written and oral instructions in departmental courses though the students had been taught in English in the EPP and the instructions of written exams had been all in English, which aimed to enhance students' reading and listening skills to some extent. Besides, the undergraduates were seen incapable of completely understanding lectures and discussions in classes. Based on the previous research by Köse (2012), as for the level of students' listening skills, the students were further reported not to understand English instructions by instructors and most of the programs or news on television. Also, the lecturers getting involved in Kırkgöz's (2009) study noted that the students experienced difficulties understanding extended lectures, and thus performed low rate of participation.

As also emphasized by other researchers (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Tahaine & Daana, 2013), students' individual differences such as characteristics, background, readiness, interest, motivation, anxiety, and attitude might also affect their success of acquiring a foreign language in either positive or negative way. Some of the students in ELL Department were defined by their lecturers to be unwilling to study literature. They take undergraduate education of ELL to be a teacher of English, instead. As related to the individual differences of students, another study (Yang & Lau, 2003) displaying similar findings with the present research revealed that the students in business and engineering English courses generally held the same view that the elements they learnt might be similar to real life situations once they begin working in the field of their studies whereas literature students believed that the items they learnt would not be useful at all in the future. Enrolled in different faculties of Fırat University, the students' scores of university entrance exams were generally low, which might be an indication of their weakness in terms of understanding and expressing in both their mother tongue, Turkish, and the target language—English. In Özkanal's (2009) research of program evaluation of an EPP, the instructors (N=4) delivered the view that the students who did not know any English prior to the program could cause problems in the program, defining this as one of the deficiencies of the program. Including different groups of students taking classes either compulsorily or voluntarily in the same program was further discussed by a few instructors (N=3) to cause some troubles. In line with Özkanal's (2009) findings about what students' lack of required language skills prior to the program could cause, Birjandi and Nosratinia (2009) ascertained that most of the students had troubles in meeting course

requirements due to low language proficiency level and such weakness could bring them lots of problems.

It was expressed that the students lack basic language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking in addition to grammar knowledge and terminology required in the departments. It is obvious that the program provides students with General English, and teaching of Professional English in the field of English literature and engineering is understandably regarded as impossible in practice. The students were claimed not to have graduated from the program well-equipped in general. Previous research (Özkanal, 2009; Soruc, 2012) has shown that students were trained to enhance all four language skills in the EPP. In other words, they were presented with General English in an intensive program. However, in the study of Karcı Aktaş (2018), both faculty students and their lecturers indicated that the students' level of English was inadequate and the students had problems in four basic language skills which they needed and should be very good at. Studying with 220 first-year undergraduate students and 15 leacturers teaching subject courses, Kırkgöz (2009), who attempted to report students' and lecturers' perceptions on the effectiveness of the foreign language instruction in relation to students' academic needs in an English-medium university (Çukurova University, Adana), concluded that insufficient practice of speaking skills in the program and students' lack of confidence in their speaking abilities inhibited their class participation and interaction with lecturers.

Based on the results presented above, the lecturers suggested that the purpose of the EPP at FU SFL should be to improve four basic language skills of students or to ensure that students reach the demanded language level, which is supposed to be B1 or B1+, before they begin studying in the departments. As for language issues, the lecturers mostly criticize students' poor level of English and its harmful effects on the students' participation and academic performance in classes and departments where medium instruction is English (Doiz et al., 2011, p.354). There have been other studies (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Özkanal, 2009) demonstrating, likewise, that the aim of EPPs should be to develop four main language skills of students and to offer them basic knowledge of English to allow them to follow their studies in the departments. In addition, Öner and Mede (2015) defined that EPPs are designed "to meet the general language needs of students before they start their undergraduate program at various disciplines" (p.209). Other than that, the EPP at FU SFL is expected to boost students' self-confidence when they are required to communicate in any form of language, either written or oral. The last but not the least, it was put forward that providing separate and detailed, field-oriented

English for each department is impossible and non-practical, so the aim of the program cannot be to teach English literature and engineering to the students in ELL Department and certain engineering departments respectively. Karcı Aktaş (2018) showed similar results regarding what the aim of EPPs should be. It was discussed that General English should be taught in EPPs because SFLs or FLDs are not authorized to teach ESP and ESP is argued to be taught in undergraduate programs of other departments.

Research question 4: *What, in lecturers' opinion, should be made to improve the outcomes of the programme?*

Lecturers' suggestions to enhance language teaching practices in the EPP at FU SFL were gathered by means of their responses to the 4th and 5th questions addressed to them in one to one interviews. First and foremost, language skills training in the program was argued to be insufficient, so there should be more focus on that, either defining a separate class for each skill (e.g. reading, writing, listening, and speaking) or for a couple of skills (e.g. reading & writing, listening & speaking) or giving priority to the practice of these skills—if they are presented integratedly—rather than teaching theory to improve students' basic language skills. A distinguishing feature of the findings concerning the suggestions is that the lecturers in ELL Department expect students to be performing better reading and writing skills whereas those in engineering departments expect students to be qualified in listening and speaking skills. The results of a similar previous study (Karcı Aktaş, 2018), contrarily, showed that speaking skill of the students in Tourism Department was expected to be very good, reading and writing skills of the students in the field of engineering were expected to be good or very good, and all four language skills of the students in International Relations Department were expected to be good or very good. Kırkgöz (2009), unlike to the findings of this study, found out that reading was ranked as the most significant skill followed by listening/speaking and writing. Birjandi and Nosratinia (2009), incompatibly, demonstrated that the heads of departments, the instructors, and their students in a postgraduate program—English Translation—of nine universities in Iran defined reading as the most significant language skill followed by writing, speaking, and listening. The EPP at FU SFL was criticized heavily by those teaching in ELL Department for specifically not presenting students the detailed knowledge of academic writing such as page usage, text editing, the MLA format, etc. and for not training them in understanding written texts such as old literary

works, short stories, poems, and articles. However, the students were claimed by the lecturers in engineering departments to lack communication skills such as asking and responding to questions, understanding someone, expressing oneself, following lectures, and so on. Practice was stressed to be of first priority. It was suggested that the students should not be insistently demotivated through the requirement of the use of accurate grammar. They should be encouraged more to speak, instead.

The qualifications of the students who graduated from the program and of those who had had any certificate of foreign language exams such as YDS and YÖKDİL and immediately begun studying in the departments were questioned since they are regarded as inadequate and incompetent. Therefore, it was highly suggested that program repetition be an option for those students who do not learn sufficiently in the program in an academic year. Similarly, the students with a certificate of YDS or YÖKDİL should be necessarily included in the program as these foreign language exams lack the capacity of assessing applicants' certain language skills such as listening, speaking, and writing.

Some lecturers recommended that product evaluation can be carried out instead of process evaluation for a more objective assessment, either minimizing the percentage effect of assessment tools such as written and oral exams, writing tasks (portfolio), small-scale projects, and CPG on the overall average at the end of the program or completely quiting process evaluation because it was argued that the instructors in the program might be far from objectivity in assessment. With reference to previous research (Özuslu, 2018, p.141), it is noted that performance-based assessment tasks are perceived as a means of increasing learner autonomy, motivation, self-confidence and reinforcement though application of performance-based assessment is argued to be a method requiring time and effort from both practitioners' (instructors) and learners' (university students) perspectives. It is also claimed that if necessary guidance and training are provided; the planning, application, and scoring—the most worrying aspect for instructors—can be handled effectively (Özuslu, 2018, p.141). Despite negative criticisms by the lecturers at FU about the process evaluation of students in the EPP, the proficiency exam held at the end of the program was also claimed to be likely subjective, biased, and/or inadequate when some instructors assess students' productive skills of speaking and writing. Another parallel finding was found through the study conducted by Obaid (2016). In that study, the instructors in the Preparatory Year English Program in a Saudi tertiary level institution were claimed to adjust assessment practices to the benefit of some students so that those students could pass and progress to the following level in the modular system

implemented. In other researches (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Tiryaki, 2009), some instructors also delivered their views concerning the possibility of the emergence of subjectivity while assessing speaking skills of students, defining that they were disturbed by the format and content of the speaking exams. Hence, the proficiency exam was adviced by few lecturers at FU to be just in the form of a multiple-choice test excluding writing and speaking tests to enhance its effectiveness and objectivity. In this way, the proficiency exam is believed to measure students' language skills better. On the other hand, some lecturers highlighted that students' language skills should be evaluated rather than their knowledge of grammar. Some detailed tests for each language skill were recommended to be done during and at the end of the modules in the program. Because four basic language skills are discussed to be taken as the basis for assessment in foreign language teaching, using different tests or measurement tools for each skill is seen necessary (Karakuş, 2013, p.17). Concordantly, the number of questions for certain language skills were recommended to be increased while focus on measuring students' knowledge of grammar was suggested to be decreased in all exams including the proficiency exam. Another parallel finding was found in the study of Coşkun (2013), in which seven instructors criticized the content of the exams. These instructors recommended that the format of the tests including multiple choice questions should be replaced by more open-ended test types assessing students' language productivity.

Foreign instructors, if included in the EPP, are believed to enhance students' communication skills through face-to-face interactions as well as encouraging them to overcome the anxiety of speaking to a foreigner. The students are also expected to benefit a lot from foreign instructors in terms of increasing self-confidence. In other similar studies (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Tiryaki, 2009; Yıldız, 2004), it was emphasized by all stakeholders (students, instructors, and administrators) that there should be foreign instructors in the program to improve students' listening and speaking skills. It is also believed that the more students are exposed to the target language, the sooner it would be learned.

Rules and practices of the EPP were suggested to be sharply differentiated for the students in distinct departments in terms of syllabus, materials, weekly course hours, percentage of attendance, success score, and so on. In general, there is consensus in the lecturers' opinions, their responses vary in some aspects though. The students in ELL Department ought to be required to attend 90% of all classes rather than 80%, and the success score of the program for these students should be 70 out of 100 instead of 60

which was found to be low. Accordingly, the content and activities related to the departments were recommended to be integrated more within the EPP. The students of ELL Department can study literary texts, short stories, poetry, or perform drama whereas engineeing students should be provided more with technical words or phrases. Additionally, as revealed by Karcı Aktaş (2018) as well, the materials to be used in the program are supposed to be selected considering the needs of students and expectations of lecturers in different departments. An effective way to identify students' lexical requirements and design appropriate reading materials is to establish "a specialised corpus" comprising the written texts of different disciplines that first-year students are expected to read in their departments (Kırkgöz, 2009, pp.91–92).

The students need to be enforced to study hard and to show much effort in the program to avoid laziness, loss of motivation, unwilligness and to encourage them to have a study routine. The students should also be assigned to do some tasks, homework, or projects out of the classroom, which might help them make a habit of studying either alone or lead to *'autonomous learning'* process in which individuals take responsibility for their own learning (IGI Global, 2019).

When previous research is examined, it was strongly suggested by instructors (N=15) teaching in an EPP (Özkanal, 2009) that in-service training should also be given more importance and focused on in order to improve education quality of a language teaching program. In the research conducted by Karcı Aktaş (2018), the majority of instructors stated that the professional development of instructors was not sufficiently supported, some instructors expressed that the seminars were conducted appropriately, and some of them described that they were not offered any seminar, domestic and international education opportunities. Similarly, Erdem (1999), who explored the English language curriculum at a private school in Ankara based on an adapted version of the Bellon and Handler curriculum evaluation model, highlighted that mechanisms and procedures for in-service training service should be offered.

With the aim to investigate whether there is any conflict between students' and lecturers' views concerning the achievement level of objectives of the EPP, findinds gathered from two questionnaires and interviews are intented to be analyzed and discussed in detail under the 5th research question.

Research question 5: *Are there any differences and similarities between freshmen's and lecturers' perspectives?*

The results and overall averages of two questionnaires yielded sophisticated results. The students' responses to the items in the questionnaire revealed that they mostly *'agree'* with the statements indicating their possession of language skills at *'sufficient level'*. On the other hand, the lecturers' responses to the items in the questionnaire showed that they mostly *'disagree'* with the statements indicating their students' possession of language skills at *'sufficient level'*. Based on the cross-comparison of means of overlapping items in the questionnaires (see Table 15 in Chapter 4), it can be concluded that the students had more positive views on gaining the desired qualifications in the EPP whilst the lecturers in the departments held more negative views on the level of ownership of their students to the language skills.

The students shared that their knowledge of English was not adequate to make an academic career (item 7) while the lecturers were of the opinion that the EPP at FU SFL had contributed to the academic development of their students (item 1). Similarly, the students noted that the level of English they have is not satisfactory to achieve a good career when they go into business life (item 25) after graduating from university, whilst lecturers believed that the students would benefit from the English language instruction in the program when they are employed (item 9). Though the program was seen by the lecturers to be contributing to the students' improvement of their English to have a potential academic career at university or business career after they finish their studies at university, it was declined by the students that the program had been so effective.

The students supported the view that they could use technology effectively thanks to their knowledge of English (item 3), whereas the lecturers opposed that (item 12). The results gathered from the questionnaire for lecturers showed that the students are not good at using technology—which is probably due to their lack of vocabulary or required skills—though the students were confident of having basic technology skills such as "social media savviness, spreadsheeting, presentation skills, word processing, touch typing, keyboard shortcuts, e-mailing, staying with the times," (Ansari, 2019) and so on.

One notable finding of the present study is that the majority of the students found listening and speaking skills more substantial than reading and writing skills. Contrary to that, the lecturers highly rated all four language skills, not just one or two of them. This finding supports the following result of the study which indicates that the purpose of the

EPP, according to the lecturers, should be to improve four basic language skills of students or to ensure that students reach the demanded language level, which is supposed to be B1 or B1+, before they begin studying in the departments. However, according to the students, listening and speaking skills were signified to be more fundamental, and thus a separate class should be defined for listening and speaking skills from the first module. These arguments about which language skill(s) was/were seen significant by the students and lecturers at FU are not in harmony with those made by the participants included in Karcı Aktaş's (2018) study revealing that while speaking skill was seen as the most important skill by the students and instructors in the EPP, the least important skill was expressed as reading skill by the students and grammar by the instructors.

The students believed that they can read and understand an English text, answer questions about an English text, and express a text in their own words (items 6, 8, and 9) whereas lecturers assumed that the students have problems in analyzing English texts (item 8). Furthermore, the students indicated that they can find English sources and get information, and similarly are capable of reading an English magazine related to their field (items 5 and 20). However, the lecturers argued that the students cannot use the English sources they find effectively (item 7).

The lecturers were of the opinion that the students are unable to write a report or an essay that provides information and reasons by supporting or opposing a certain point of view (item 15). On the contrary, the students expressed that they can write English paragraphs or essays on any subject (item 12). Additionally, the students shared that they can write an English letter or e-mail (item 15) whilst the lecturers claimed that the students have problems in preparing and responding to English correspondence (item 13).

Another disaccord between the students and lecturers in the faculties of FU is whether the students can understand English instructions. The students held the view that they can understand written instructions in English (item 11) while the lecturers expressed that the students cannot understand English instructions (item 16), both written and verbal. The students were further reported by the lecturers as being incapable of completely understanding lectures and discussions in classes. Though some students stated that they have improved their listening and speaking skills to some extent to understand and participate in lectures actively, most of them and the lecturers stressed that the students have trouble in understanding lectures and lecturers, are unable to clearly identify some questions in the department, and are incapable of responding in English. The students highlighted that they had been mostly taught English grammar in the

program, but preferred the program to have focused more on fostering their language skills of listening and speaking instead of teaching theory. Likewise, as emphasized by Brown, “the main goal of foreign language teaching should be to engage learners in the functional use of language for meaningful purposes rather than merely focusing on aspects of grammar” (cited in Coşkun, 2013).

According to the lecturers, one of the main reasons for failure of students’ understanding and expressing themselves in departmental courses can be personal characteristics of students. The students were described not to express any opinion on any subject even in Turkish. Correspondingly, a few students underlined during focus group interview that the students sometimes do not speak English in the departmental courses because of some personal or environmental reasons such as poor knowledge of a specific subject, sense of shame, interpersonal relationships, etc. Thus, it can be inferred that student’s individual differences such as their attributes, background, readiness, interest, motivation, anxiety, and attitude might affect their success negatively or positively in departmental courses. Because anxiety is one of the strongest negative predictors of student achievement, it is suggested that setting realistic and achievable goals, creating a comfortable classroom environment, providing students with opportunities to use the foreign language more, and encouraging learners in this regard can reduce anxiety (Akpur, 2015, p.136).

Modular system was appreciated by most of the participants, both students and lecturers, because the system allowed students to set short time goals and to learn from their peers at the same level of English, which was believed to be really effective sometimes. Also, it was acknowledged by the lecturers that there are some positive outputs of modular system applied in the EPP at FU SFL. The students cannot move to the following module without learning exactly what they are supposed to in the module they study. They are required to repeat the same module they are enrolled in on condition that they fail, and hence in-depth and detailed learning of a certain level of English occurs. These positive findings concerning modular system are parallel to the results found by Karakuş (2013) who interviewed with 10 instructors in a state university to analyze different aspects of assessment procedures and evaluation of modular system in foreign language teaching. From the point of view of instructors, being systematic and planned are the positive aspects of the modular system. The fact that it is not uniform and the classes change after each module is thought to be motivating for the students. It was concluded that modular system obliges instructors and learners to be constantly active

(Karakuş 2013 p.21). However, the instructors participating in Coşkun's (2013) research confronted some major problems with especially the students failing in one of the modules in the program, which were reported to be "lack of instructors, limited number of classrooms, lack of new resources to use with repeating students, lack of student motivation, and hence discipline problems with repeating students". Other than these troubles, the school had to create a separate class of the same level even if there were a few failed students in the previous module. In the present study, modular system is further claimed to avoid boredom and frustration that might happen during and after a longer period of a semester or a full year since each module lasts for just eight weeks.

The materials used in the program were revealed to be quite useful and detailed. However, these materials were criticized by some students for not presenting field-oriented English for certain departments such as ELL, ME, or SE. On the other hand, there were few comments by the lecturers, which were quite neutral, on the effectiveness and benefit of materials as most of them did not exactly know what materials had been used in the program. They suggested that materials should be correctly chosen according to the needs of the students in distinct departments, if possible. They, additionally, reported that material diversity should be increased. In the same way, it was recommended by Coşkun (2013) that instructional materials with a more academic content focusing on language skills that students need in departments can be prepared.

Based on the results of open-ended questions addressed to the students and focus group interview with them, the instructors teaching English in the EPP were found to be friendly, caring, and sympathetic. The instructors were admitted by the lecturers to be expert in the field of English Language Teaching and well-equipped; however, they received some criticisms of being probably subjective while assessing students' writing and speaking skills. The findings on instructors' being far from objectivity as claimed by some students (Soruc, 2012) and lecturers can be caused by the differentiation in scoring similar written texts or speaking performance of students in exams, particularly proficiency exam that is determining whether students pass the program or not. Other than that, it was also highlighted by both the students and lecturers that there is a need for foreign instructors' being included in the program.

The students' views regarding the adequacy of their knowledge of English they had gained in the EPP were explored, and it was seen that they found it quite satisfactory to follow departmental courses which they are required to take in English. Although the students were contented with the level of English they had reached at the end of the

program, they argued that the program should have taught technical expressions and terms related to their field. The program was heavily criticized for not teaching Techical or Professional English which students compulsorily need in their faculties. The lecturers, on the other hand, objected to that the students who had succeeded in the program have sufficient knowledge of English. That was claimed to be mostly due to insufficient training of language skills in the program. The lecturers recommended that the aim of the program cannot be to teach literature to the students in ELL Department and engineering to the students in engineering departments, so the findings from the interviews with lecturers confirm that it is not applicable, realistic, and possible to provide separate and detailed, field-oriented English in the program for each department.

As discussed above, the students had high expectations of being presented with content and vocabulary related to their department, which seems non-practical and was also opposed by the lecturers. On the contrary, the lecturers suggested that there should be more focus on language skills training in the EPP. This demand actually corresponds with the aim of FU SFL and findings of previous research (Karcı Aktaş, 2018; Köse, 2012; Öner & Mede, 2015; Özkanal2009; Yükselir, 2018).

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter, overall conclusion of the study is presented. Implications drawn from the study are also discussed, and the recommendations for further studies are presented. This study is designed to explore and cross-compare faculty students' and lecturers' views regarding the effectiveness of English language teaching in the EPP at FU SFL, and it is significant to integrate the findings of the study into the field of foreign language education.

6.2. Conclusion

The present research aimed to investigate and cross-compare the views of first-year undergraduates and their lecturers in different faculties concerning the realization level of the objectives of the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages and to determine whether the foreign language instruction presented in the program meets the requirements of the faculties. The study took place in three different faculties of a state university in Elazığ, Turkey. The first-graders' opinions were explored through a questionnaire and a focus group interview while the lecturers' views were investigated by means of a questionnaire and one-to-one interviews. The main focus of the study was directed on primarily detecting the conflicts between students' and lecturers' views regarding the effectiveness of the EPP at FU SFL if there is any, secondly determining the existing drawbacks of the EPP, and ultimately identifying the suggestions to improve the quality of the foreign language education in the EPP.

Based on the students' responses to the questionnaire, listening and speaking skills were revealed to be found more significant than reading and writing skills. However, they mostly had a "good" level of reading and writing skills whereas they had a "middle" level of listening and speaking skills at the end of the program. The overall average of the questionnaire applied to the students was found as 2,85 which was above the average value (M=2,50) of the questionnaire, and it showed that the objectives of the EPP had mostly been achieved at *'sufficient level'*. There was, though, no difference

statistically according to the variables of gender, the department the students are enrolled in, and the high school they graduated from. The students in ELL Department were exceptionally found to have progressed their language skills at the end of the program more than the students in engineering departments had. In addition to enhancing the students' reading and comprehension skills, the program provided them with vocabulary they would need in daily life and partly in their departments. The students were educated on how to express their ideas and thoughts in writing and how to fill in forms containing personal information. They can understand lectures and participate in debates in the department with little difficulty as well as watching any English subtitled video such as series, or movies. Despite being sufficient to foster students' basic listening skills, it was found to be inadequate to upskill students and expand their abilities to express what they listen to in writing. Found to be giving less significance to the speaking skills, the program was heavily criticized for presenting General English (or English for daily life), but not Professional English (or field-oriented English). Another important point is that most of the students did not believe that the knowledge of English they had gained through the program is adequate to make an academic or business career and to use technology more effectively.

The qualitative data results showed that modular system was appreciated by most of the students though it could cause stress according to some. The materials used in the program were strongly supported for being satisfactory, convenient, and effective whereas there were a few voices of dissent. Also, the instructors were found to be friendly, caring and sympathetic, besides being an expert in the field of ELT and well-equipped. The participants, additionally, appreciated the physical and technological infrastructure of the SFL with a five-year-old modern building including classrooms of different sizes, computer laboratories, and a conference hall and the number of administrative and academic staff since these features of the SFL enabled them to be grouped into 12–18 in each class and made language instruction better and more effective. The students found the English they had gained in the program quite sufficient to follow departmental courses instructed in English though some of them considered that it was not at a desired level. Another remarkable finding of the study was that most of the students expressed willingness to attend the EPP at FU SFL again even if it had not compulsory since English was seen as an international language that they would need to learn for academic and professional concerns and the program was mentioned to be really successful in teaching English. Nevertheless, it was also defined as *failed* for not

presenting Professional English and not improving listening and speaking skills of students. Moreover, it was seen as a one-year loss of time and a waste of money.

With specific regard to the suggestions the students made to improve the quality of English language instruction in the program, teaching of four basic language skills was demanded to be included more in the program, and especially listening and speaking skills were uttered to be put greater emphasis on rather than reading and writing skills. It is worth mentioning that the undergraduates had understandably high expectations to be presented Professional English in the program to be able to follow departmental courses taught in English. In addition to the integration of more classroom activities such as making presentations, giving short speeches, watching some videos or films, memorizing English songs or poems, role-plays, and games into the existing program, some out-of-class activities were suggested to be necessarily organized to make students involve more actively in learning process of their own, to avoid monotony and probable boringness of teaching procedure, and specifically, to enhance their speaking skills. The percentage effect of CPG on the overall average of each module was also recommended to be significantly raised. This demand can be somehow connected to the suggestion of including more practice of using the English language in the program rather than focusing more on teaching English grammar. Foreign instructors were, additionally, believed to be able to contribute to the students' progress of listening and speaking skills. And associated with this recommendation, the courses in the program were suggested to be entirely instructed in English all the time. The class of CALL was expressed either to be excluded from the program or its percentage effect on the overall average of each module to be reduced a little bit as it was claimed not to be serving its purpose. To conclude the suggestions from the undergraduates, it was underlined that there certainly should be a standard not only in the writing assessment by the instructors but also in all assessment procedures in the EPP at FU SFL to avoid injustice and above all to make accurate assessment of the students.

The quantitative data results related to the lecturers' views on the significance level of language skills revealed that all four language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) were seen of great importance. The overall average of the questionnaire was found as 2,49 which was slightly under the average value of the scale, and it displayed that the objectives of the EPP had not been achieved at *'sufficient level'* according to the lecturers in the departments. The EPP at FU SFL was positively viewed in terms of its contribution to the students' academic development and professional career. Also, the

students were indicated to be more successful in student exchange programs, to be able to take part actively in the projects carried out overseas, but not to be able use technology more effectively. Additionally, the lecturers commented that the students who had attended the program previously had a better knowledge of English in general than those who had been exempt from the program, and could write better since they knew more about the rules and English grammar and speak better as they had higher self-confidence. Though the English language instruction in the program was believed to be improving thanks to the shift to the modular system, it was found not to be so effective as expected. First-year Turkish students were mentioned not to understand written and oral instructions in departmental courses and to have a lower command of English in general than foreign students from Nigeria, Morocco, and Jordan. They were even seen incapable of completely understanding lectures and discussions in classes. As a result, the findings indicated that the students lacked basic language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking in addition to English grammar and the terminology required in the departments. On the other hand, students' individual differences such as personality, background, readiness, interest, motivation, anxiety, and attitude were highlighted to be likely to affect negatively their success of acquiring a foreign language. Based on the interview results, the lecturers defined that the purpose of the EPP at FU SFL should be to improve four basic language skills of students to the demanded level, B1 or B1+. On the contrary to the students' arguments, teaching of Professional English was understandably regarded as impossible in practice. In other words, the results provided evidence that providing separate and detailed, field-oriented English for each department is seen impossible and non-practical, so the aim of the program cannot be to teach English literature and engineering to the students in ELL Department and certain engineering departments respectively.

Regarding the improvement of the quality of English language instruction in the program, the lecturers recommended that there should be more focus on language skills training allocating more time on the practice of these skills rather than teaching theory in the program. It was suggested that the students should not be insistently demotivated through the requirement of the use of accurate grammar. They should be encouraged more to speak, instead. One of the distinguishing findings concerning the suggestions was that the lecturers in ELL Department expect students to be performing better reading and writing skills whereas those in engineering departments expect students to be more qualified in listening and speaking skills. Also, it was highly suggested that program

repetition should be an option for the students who do not learn sufficiently in the program, and similarly, the students with a certificate of YDS or YÖKDİL should be necessarily included in the program as these foreign language exams lack the capacity of assessing applicants' certain language skills. Additionally, the proficiency exam held at the end of the program was also claimed to be subjective, biased, and inadequate, and thus, suggested to be just in the form of a multiple-choice test, excluding writing and speaking tests to enhance its effectiveness and objectivity. On the other hand, some lecturers highlighted that students' language skills should be evaluated rather than their knowledge of grammar. Similar to the students' views, if given a chance in the program, foreign instructors were credited to be able to enhance students' communication skills as well as encouraging them to overcome the anxiety of speaking to a foreigner. As presented above, the rules and practices in the program were suggested to be sharply differentiated according to the needs of the departments in terms of syllabus, materials, weekly course hours, percentage of attendance, success score, and so on. Moreover, the content and activities related to the departments were recommended to be integrated more. And finally, the students were suggested to be enforced to study hard and to show much effort in the program to avoid laziness, loss of motivation, unwillingness and to encourage them to have a study routine.

The results of the study provided a sufficient answer to the research questions addressed, and showed that the students had more positive views on gaining the desired qualifications in the EPP at FU SFL whilst the lecturers in the departments held more negative views on the level of ownership of their students to the language skills.

6.3. Implications of the Study

This study attempts to shed some light on the effects of English Preparatory Programs in Turkey where the presence of English in tertiary-level bilingual education has been increasing by handing the microphone to the students and lecturers who take part in English-medium education. The findings of this study provide some descriptive and practical implications for evaluation of language programs. The first implication which can be grasped from this study is the necessity and importance of program evaluation. The findings of the study can be used as a beginning point for providing some pedagogical implications that should be taken into consideration by all stakeholders, namely the administrators, English instructors, and syllabus designers at FU SFL. This

study has revealed that the objectives of the EPP at FU SFL should be clearly expressed. Another important point is the need for arranging the program in a way to advance students' four basic language skills. The courses and contents in the program should be reviewed to increase classroom interaction. There should be more practice of speaking and effective use of language incorporating the element of pleasure and balancing the pace in the existing program. Students should be motivated to use technology and the Internet through various projects. As students have greater desires to learn English for both pragmatic and academic reasons, English language instruction should be tailored to meet these prerequisites. Technical and/or Academic English must be somehow integrated to the program. This means that the current instruction of General English in the program is seen as inappropriate to equip students with the potential level and type of language skills. Other than these, it is undeniable now that process evaluation should be continued without ignoring the advantages of product evaluation to enable students to see their own development. Finally, students should be given motivation and support to continue their development of English after graduating from the EPP.

In the light of the implications, the administrators, curriculum designers, and instructors at FU and FU SFL should direct their attention to the students' and lecturers' voices to change the current English language instruction in the EPP at FU SFL to enable students to function successfully in university education. A strong collaboration of school management, instructors, faculty members, and curriculum development experts is first and foremost recommended by researcher, and then a formal curriculum in which the objectives are specified in detail should be developed in the light of scientific data. To conclude, it is hoped that this evaluative study, which aims to evaluate a modular English language teaching program at a state university in Turkey from the perspective of students and lecturers, can serve an example of program evaluation for other preparatory programs in Turkey and initiate more evaluation studies in similar contexts.

6.4. Suggestions for Further Research

Since the scope of this study is quite narrow, limited to the views of the first-year undergraduates and lecturers from three faculties at Fırat University, further research is suggested with larger participants to be able to generalize the findings to all similar contexts. Needs analysis can be done for the students enrolled in EPPs and the instructors teaching English in these EPPs. Similarly, needs analysis can also be done for the students

enrolled in faculties of which the language of instruction is English and their lecturers teaching major area courses. Validity and reliability studies for examinations such as placement (also held as an exemption exam), proficiency (also held as end-of-year exam), and others held in EPPs can be done to make assessment procedures sounder and to avoid bias and distortion. The effectiveness of a new program which will be remodeled with respect to the results of this study, the achievement level of its objectives, whether or not students will achieve the desired qualifications at the end of such a program can be periodically examined. It is also possible to compare the practices and outcomes of the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages with those of another English Preparatory Program.

REFERENCES

Akpur, U. (2015). *The relationship pattern between English prep school students' academic achievement and their academic motivation, anxiety and attitudes.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul.

Alameddine, M. (2013). Engineering students' attitudes towards learning technical English: The Case of technical writing engineering students. *In 9th International WFEO Conference* (pp. 350-368).

Alıcı, S. S. (2004). *The opinions of Yıldız Technical University, Foreign Languages Department English Preparatory School students on the quality of education they are provided with.* Unpublished master's thesis, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul.

Alison. (2018). *What is the difference among ESL, EFL, EAL, ESP, EAP, and ESOL?. Alison's ESL classroom.* Retrieved October 14, 2018, from https://alisonsesl.com/2018/05/03/what-is-the-difference-among-esl-efl-eal-esp-eap-esol/

Al-Nwaiem, A. (2012). *An evaluation of the language improvement component in the pre-service ELT programme at a college of education in Kuwait: A case study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Exeter, UK.

Al-Tamimi, A. & Shuib, M. (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: A study of petroleum engineering undergraduates at Hadhramout University of Sciences and Technology. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 9*(2).

Ansari, K. (2019). *8 basic tech skills every employee should have.* Retrieved on June 6, 2019, from https://theundercoverrecruiter.com/8-tech-skills/

Balabakgil, B. (2016). *The Use of L1 as a teaching strategy by native and non-native EFL instructors at a language preparatory program in Turkey.* Unpublished master's thesis, Bahçeşehir University, İstanbul.

Balcı, Ö., Durak-Üğüten, S., & Çolak, F. (2018). Zorunlu İngilizce hazırlık programının değerlendirilmesi: Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu örneği. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science/Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi, 11*(4), 860-893.

Balint, D. M. (2009). *Factors affecting learner satisfaction in EFL program evaluation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, USA.

Bayram, İ. (2011). *The Evaluation of the English Preparatory Curriculum at TOBB University of Economics and Technology Department of Foreign Languages from teachers' and students' point of view*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.

Beretta, A. (1986a). Program-fair language teaching evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(3), 431-444.

Beretta, A. (1986b). Toward a methodology of ESL program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 144-155.

Beretta, A. (1992). Evaluation of language education: An overview. In Alderson, J. C. & Beretta, A. (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp.5-24). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Birjandi, P. & Nosratinia, M. (2009). The qualitative program evaluation of the postgraduate English translation major in Iran. *The Journal of Modern Thoughts in Education, 4*(4), 37-58.

Board of Education. (2013). *2013 yılı kurul kararları.* Retrieved May 31, 2019, from http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/kurulkararlari/fihristler/fihrist_2013.pdf

Bobkina, J. & Fernandez de Caleya Dalmau, M. (2012). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: A study of engineering undergraduates at the Technical University of Madrid. *ICERI2012 Proceedings, 5*(1), 4492-4501.

Borçbakan, H. (1999). *Hazırlık sınıfı okuyarak ya da atlayarak birinci sınıfa devam eden öğrencilerin ders başarılarının karşılaştırılması*. Unpublished master's thesis, Uludag University, Bursa.

British Council & TEPAV. (2014). *Türkiye'deki devlet okullarında İngilizce dilinin öğretimine ilişkin ulusal ihtiyaç analizi.* Retrieved May 31, 2019, from http://www.tepav.org.tr/upload/files/1399388519-1.Turkiyedeki_Devlet_Okullarinda_Ingilizce_Dilinin_Ogrenimine_Iliskin_Ulusal_Ihtiyac_Analizi.pdf

Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (3rd Ed.).* Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Cengizhan, L. (2006). *Course syllabus comparison of the prep classes of universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.

Chang, J.Y., Kim, W., & Lee, H. (2015). A language support program for English-medium instruction courses: Its development and evaluation in an EFL setting. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(5), 510-528.

Collins English Dictionary. (2019). *Definition of 'false beginner'*. Retrieved May 21, 2019, from Collins English Dictionary website: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/false-beginner

Colorin Colorado. (2019). *Reading comprehension skills for English language learners.* Retrieved June 6, 2019, from http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/reading-comprehension-skills-english-language-learners

Coşkun, A. (2013). An investigation of the effectiveness of the modular general English language teaching preparatory program at a Turkish university. *South African Journal of Education, 33*(3), 1-18.

Council of Higher Education. (2016). *Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Yabancı Dil Öğretimi ve Yabancı Dille Öğretim Yapılmasında Uyulacak Esaslara İlişkin Yönetmelik.* Retrieved May 31, 2019, from Council of Higher Education website: https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=21475&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5

Cronbach, L. J. (2000). Course improvement through evaluation. In Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (Eds.), *Evaluation Models* (pp.235-247). *Evaluation in Education and Human Services, 49.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Education of mother tongue and teaching foreign language in Turkey. *Journal of Social Sciences Institution, 21*(2), 285-307.

Çetinavcı, U. R. & Topkaya, E. Z. (2012). A contrastive qualitative evaluation of two different sequential programs launched at the school of foreign languages of a Turkish university. *Online Submission, 3*(3), 82-101.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2011). Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction. *World Englishes, 30*(3), 345-359.

Dudley-Evans, T. & St John, M. J. (2001). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Erdem, H. E. (1999). *Evaluating the English language curriculum at a aprivate school in Ankara: A case study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Erozan, F. (2005). *Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergraduate ELT curriculum at Eastern Mediterranean University: A case study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Ertürk, S. (1979). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme.* Ankara: Meteksan A.Ş.

Eslek Onur, F. (2019). *An Evaluation of Compulsory English Preparatory Program through the Perspectives of Students and Instructors at the School of Foreign Languages at Firat University.* Unpublished master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.

Fırat University School of Foreign Languages. (n.d.). *About the distance learning unit*. Retrieved on May 31, 2019 from Fırat University School of Foreign Languages website: http://ydyo.firat.edu.tr/en/node/294

Fırat University School of Foreign Languages. (n.d.). *Compulsory English classes.* Retrieved May 31, 2019, from Fırat University School of Foreign Languages website: http://ydyo.firat.edu.tr/en/node/295

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education (8th Ed).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gerede, D. (2005). *A curriculum evaluation through needs analysis: Perceptions of intensive English program graduates at Anadolu University* Unpublished master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Green, S. B., Lissitz, R. W., & Mulaik, S. A. (1977). Limitations of coefficient alpha as an index of test unidimensionality. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37*(4), 827–838.

Gürata, A. (2008). *The Grammar learning strategies employed by Turkish university preparatory school EFL students.* Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.

Hancı-Yanar, B. (2008). *Investigation of the attitudes toward English lesson and perceptions of foreign language self-efficacy of Anatolian High School students who have taken preparatory class and those who have not.* Unpublished master's thesis, Ege University, İzmir.

Henning, G. (1982). Growth-referenced evaluation of foreign language instructional programs. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(4), 467-477.

Hogan, L. R. (2007). The historical development of program evaluation: Exploring the past and present. *Online Journal of Workforce Education and Development, 2*(4), 1-14.

Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book.* Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.

IGI Global. (2019). *What is autonomous learning*. Retrieved May 28, 2019, from https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/autonomous-learning/2014

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research, 1*(2), 112-133.

Karahan, F. (2007). Language attitudes of Turkish students towards the English language and its use in Turkish context. *Çankaya University Journal of Arts and Sciences, 1*(7), 73-87.

Karakuş, B. (2013). Üniversite yabancı dil hazırlık sınıflarında uygulanan modüler sistemdeki ölçme ve değerlendirme. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(4), 15-22.

Karataş, H. (2007). *Evaluation of the syllabus of English II instruction program in Modern Languages Department, Yıldız Technical University via the opinions of the teachers and students using context, input, process and product (CIPP) model.* Unpublished master's thesis, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul.

Karataş, H. & Fer, S. (2009). Evaluation of English curriculum at Yıldız Technical University using CIPP model. *Egitim ve Bilim, 34*(153), 47.

Karcı Aktaş, C. (2018). *Evaluation of Aydın Adnan Menderes University Foreign Languages School English preparatory curriculum according to Bellon and Handler Model: A case study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Aydın.

Kayapınar, U. (2006). A study on the quality of Mersin University School of Foreign Languages English preparatory classes' final exam. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2*(1).

Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Students' and lecturers' perceptions of the effectiveness of foreign language instruction in an English-medium university in Turkey. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(1), 81-93.

Kiely, R. (2003). What works for you? A group discussion approach to program evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 29*, 293-314.

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

Köse, C. (2012). *The evaluation of English Preparatory Program of Uludağ University, School of Foreign Languages.* Unpublished master's thesis, Uludag University, Bursa.

Leontitsis, A. & Pagge, J. (2007). A simulation approach on Cronbach's alpha statistical significance. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation, 73*(5), 336-340.

Long, M. H. (1984). Process and product in ESL program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(3), 409-425.

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

Macmillan Dictionary. (2019). *Definition of 'false beginner'.* Retrieved May 21, 2019, from Macmillan Dictionary website: https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/false-beginner

Mede, E. (2012). *Design and evaluation of a language preparatory program at an English-medium university in an EFL setting: A case study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

Mirici, I. H., & Saka, F. O. (2004). Dissemination of a proposed English preparatory class model for the Black Sea Region countries through Internet. *Online Submission, 5*(2), 33-39.

Muşlu, M. (2007). *Formative evaluation of a process-genre writing curriculum at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Nam, J. M. (2005). *Perceptions of Korean college students and teachers about communication-based English instruction: Evaluation of a college EFL curriculum in South Korea.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus-Ohio, The USA.

Obaid, R. (2016). Assessment practices of Preparatory Year English Program (PYEP): Investigating student advancement through third and fourth levels. *English Language Teaching, 9*(7), 48-58.

Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. (2019). *Definition of 'false beginner'.* Retrieved May 21, 2019, from Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary website: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/false-beginner

Oxford, R. (2001). Integrated skills in the ESL/EFL classroom. *ERIC Digest.* Retrieved June 19, 2019, from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED456670.pdf 19.06.2019

Öner, G. & Mede, E. (2015). Evaluation of A1 level program at an English preparatory school in a Turkish university: A case study. *ELT Research Journal, 4*(3).

Örs, M. (2006). *An analysis of the preparatory students' attitudes toward the appropriateness of the preparatory school program at the University of Gaziantep.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Gaziantep, Gaziantep.

Özdoruk, P. (2016). *Evaluation of the English language preparatory school curriculum at Yıldırım Beyazıt University*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Özkanal, Ü. (2009). *The evaluation of English Preparatory Program of Eskişehir Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department and a model proposal*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Özkanal, Ü. & Hakan, A. G. (2010). Effectiveness of university English preparatory programs: Eskisehir Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department English Preparatory Program. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 295-305.

Özuslu, N. (2018). *An Evaluation of the performance assessment component of an EFL preparatory school program.* Unpublished master's thesis), Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

Özüdoğru, F. (2017). Evaluation of the voluntary English preparatory program at a Turkish state university. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 10*(48), 501-509.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

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

Rennie, J. (1993). *ESL and bilingual program models. ERIC Digest.* Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Resmî Gazete. (2015). *Fırat Üniversitesi Yabanci Dil Eğitim ve Öğretim Yönetmeliği.* Retrieved May 31, 2019, from http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2015/09/20150930-1.htm

Richards, J. C. (1984). The secret life of methods. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(1), 7-23.

Sarı, R. (2003). *A suggested English language teaching program for Gülhane Military Medical Academy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Sawin, E. I. (2000). Toward clarification of program evaluation: A proposal with implications for the possible certification of evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation, 21*(2), 231-237.

Sharp, A. (1990). Staff/student participation in course evaluation: A procedure for improving course design. *ELT Journal, 44*(2), 132-137.

Soruc, A. (2012). The role of needs analysis in language program renewal process. *Mevlana International Journal of Education, 2*(1), 36-47.

Stevie D. (2019). *Teachers on CALL: What educators must know about computer assisted language learning*. Retrieved May 31, 2019, from https://www.fluentu.com/blog/educator/what-is-computer-assisted-language-learning/

Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* (Second Edition). California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971, February). *The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J.

Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Şahin, V. (2006). *Evaluation of the in-service teacher training program "The Certificate For Teachers of English" at The Middle East Technical University School of Foreign Languages.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Şen Ersoy, N. & Kürüm Yapıcıoğlu, D. (2015). İsteğe bağlı İngilizce hazırlık programının öğrenci ve okutman görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi, 3*(3), 7-43.

Tahaineh, Y. & Daana, H. (2013). Jordanian undergraduates' motivations and attitudes towards learning English in EFL context. *International review of social sciences and humanities, 4*(2), 159-180.

Tellis, W. M. (1997). Application of a case study methodology. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(3), 1-19.

Tiryaki, S. A. (2009). *The perceptions of the program coordinators, instructors and the students on the present curriculum of Ankara University School of Foreign*

Languages English Language Prepatory Program. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Tosun, C. (2006). Yabancı dille eğitim sorunu. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 2*(1).

Tsou, W. & Chen, F. (2014). ESP program evaluation framework: Description and application to a Taiwanese university ESP program. *English for Specific Purposes, 33,* 39-53.

Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of English Language Teaching Program at a public university using CIPP Model.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Tecnical University, Ankara.

Tümen Akyıldız, S. & Tayşı, E. (2017). Ghanaian Teacher Candidates' Perspectives on English Language Instruction in Preparatory Classes (The Case of Fırat University School of Foreign Languages). *Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, 6*(3), 967-983.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspect of language teaching.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Wilkes, M. & Bligh, J. (1999). Evaluating educational interventions. *Bmj, 318*(7193), 1269-1272.

Wiseman, C. S. (2012). A comparison of the performance of analytic vs. holistic scoring rubrics to assess L2 writing. *Iranian Journal of Language Testing, 2*(1), 59-92.

Yang, A. & Lau, L. (2003). Student attitudes to the learning of English at secondary and tertiary levels. *System, 31*(1), 107-123.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2004). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Sosyal Bilimler.

Yıldız, Ü. (2004). *Evaluation of the Turkish Language Teaching Program for foreigners at Minsk State Linguistic University in Belarus: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Yılmaz, F. (2011). Evaluating the Turkish language curriculum at Jagiellonian University in Poland: A case study. *Život i škola, 25*(1), 76-90.

Young, S. (2015). *What's the Difference Between ESL, EFL, ESOL, ELL, and ESP?* Retrieved October 14, 2018, from Reading Horizons website:

https://www.readinghorizons.com/blog-roll/what-s-the-difference-between-esl-efl esol-ell-and-esp

Yükselir, C. (2018). Students' perceptions of optional English preparatory program: A Case study in a Turkish university. *The Literacy Trek, 4*(1), 37-48.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Questionnaire for Faculty Students *(Turkish)*

FAKÜLTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNE YÖNELİK ANKET FORMU

Değerli Öğrenci,

Bu anket, 2018–2019 akademik yılında öğrenim gördüğünüz Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu tarafından uygulanan İngilizce Hazırlık Programını incelemek amacı ile hazırlanmıştır. Ankette, İngilizce Hazırlık Programının istenilen nitelikleri kazandırıp kazandırmadığına ilişkin görüşlerinize yönelik sorular yer almaktadır. Anket sorularına vereceğiniz yanıtlar programın niteliğini belirlemek ve programı geliştirmek bakımından son derece önemlidir. Bu nedenle, ankette yer alan maddeleri eksiksiz ve titizlikle yanıtlamanız gerekmektedir.

Cevaplarınız sadece bu çalışma için değerlendirilecek ve kesinlikle gizli kalacaktır. Ayrıca elde edilen veriler kişisel bazda değil, toplu olarak değerlendirilecektir. **Bu nedenle formlara isim yazmayınız.**

Sizden istenen anketi dikkatli bir biçimde okuyarak doldurmanızdır. **Bu araştırmanın amacına ulaşması sizin vereceğiniz yanıtların doğru ve içten olmasına bağlıdır.**

Katkılarınızdan dolayı içtenlikle teşekkür eder, çalışmalarınızda başarılar dilerim.

Muhyettin ACAR
Öğretim Görevlisi

Fırat Üniversitesi
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu
Mühendislik Kampüsü, Elazığ
macar@firat.edu.tr

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

Bu bölümde kişisel bilgiler yer almaktadır. Lütfen uygun bulduğunuz seçeneğin yanındaki kutu içine **(X)** işareti koyarak yanıtlayınız.

1. Cinsiyetiniz:

☐ Erkek
☐ Kadın

2. Şu anda üniversitede kayıtlı olduğunuz fakülte ve bölüm:

☐ Teknoloji Fakültesi (Bölüm.....)
☐ Mühendislik Fakültesi (Bölüm.....)
☐ İnsani ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi (Bölüm.....)

3. Bitirdiğiniz Lisenin Tam Adı:

_____

4. Hazırlık programına girişteki dil düzeyiniz:

☐ Elementary (Az bilenler)
☐ Pre-Intermediate (Orta-Alt düzey)
☐ Intermediate (Orta düzey)

5. Aşağıdaki yabancı dil (İngilizce) becerilerini önemli bulma derecenizi ilgili becerinin yanına (X) işareti koyarak yanıtlayınız.

Beceriler	Çok Önemli	Önemli	Biraz Önemli	Önemsiz
Okuma				
Yazma				
Konuşma				
Dinleme				

6. Aşağıdaki yabancı dil (İngilizce) becerilerine hangi derecede sahip olduğunuzu düşünüyorsunuz? Uygun olan seçeneğe (X) işareti koyunuz.

Beceriler	Çok İyi	İyi	Orta	Az
Okuma				
Yazma				
Konuşma				
Dinleme				

YABANCI DİLLER YÜKSEKOKULU İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK PROGRAMININ AMAÇLARININ GERÇEKLEŞME DÜZEYİ

BECERİLER				
Bu bölümde İngilizce Hazırlık Programının amaçlarının gerçekleşme düzeyine ilişkin ifadeler yer almaktadır. Aşağıda verilen becerilere sahip olma düzeyinizi uygun olan seçeneğe **(X)** işareti koyarak belirtiniz.	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
1. Öğretim elemanına ders ile ilgili İngilizce soru sorabilirim.				
2. Öğretim elemanının ders ile ilgili İngilizce sorduğu soruyu yanıtlayabilirim.				
3. İngilizce bilgim sayesinde teknolojiyi etkin bir biçimde kullanabilirim.				
4. Ders ortamında İngilizceyi rahatlıkla kullanabilirim.				
5. İngilizce kaynaklar bulup bilgi edinebilirim.				
6. İngilizce bir metinle ilgili soruları yanıtlayabilirim.				
7. İngilizce bilgim akademik kariyer yapabilmem için yeterlidir.				
8. İngilizce bir metni okuyup kendi sözcüklerimle ifade edebilirim.				
9. İngilizce bir metni okuyup anlayabilirim.				
10. Sınıfta yapılan İngilizce tartışmaları anlayabilirim.				
11. Öğretim elemanının verdiği İngilizce yazılı yönergeleri anlayabilirim.				
12. Herhangi bir konuda İngilizce paragraf, kompozisyon yazabilirim.				
13. İngilizce yapılan sunuları İngilizce yazılı rapor haline getirebilirim.				
14. İngilizce okunan bir metni İngilizce yazarak özetleyebilirim.				
15. İngilizce mektup, e-posta vb. yazabilirim (formal ve informal)				
16. İngilizce bir formu doldurabilirim.				
17. İngilizce telefon görüşmesi yapabilirim.				
18. İngilizce sunu yapabilirim.				
19. İngilizce bir metne hızlıca göz atarak ana fikrini anlayabilirim.				
20. Alanımla ilgili İngilizce bir dergi okuyabilirim.				
21. Bilmediğim İngilizce bir sözcüğün anlamını sözlük kullanmadan tahmin edebilirim.				
22. İngilizce CV (özgeçmiş) yazabilirim.				
23. Verilen ödev kapsamında derlediğim İngilizce bilgiyi rapor haline getirebilirim.				
24. Alanımla ilgili bilimsel İngilizce makaleler okuyabilirim.				
25. İngilizce bilgim iş hayatına atıldığımda iyi bir kariyer elde etmemi sağlayacak düzeydedir.				

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ YABANCI DİLLER YÜKSEKOKULU İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK PROGRAMINA İLİŞKİN GÖRÜŞLER

Bu bölümde, sizin Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programına ilişkin görüşlerinizi belirlemeyi amaçlayan sorulara yer verilmiştir.

1. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programı hakkındaki görüşleriniz nelerdir? **(Eğitim faaliyetlerinin içeriği, dil becerileri eğitimi, kullanılan materyaller, ölçme-değerlendirme süreçleri vb.)**

2. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programında edindiğiniz İngilizce bilgisi fakültede **İngilizce olarak aldığınız dersleri** izlemeniz için ne ölçüde yeterlidir? Bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?

3. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programının, öğrencilerin ve bölümünüzün gereksinimi olan İngilizceyi ne ölçüde sunduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

4. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programının daha etkili bir şekilde dil öğretebilmesi için önerileriniz nelerdir?

5. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programı zorunlu olmasaydı programa yine de katılmak ister miydiniz?

a) ☐ Cevabınız **evet** ise programın size katkılarını nedenleri ile açıklayınız.

b) ☐ Cevabınız **hayır** ise size bunu düşündüren nedenleri açıklayınız.

Appendix 2. Questionnaire for Faculty Students *(English)*

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FACULTY STUDENTS

Dear Student,

This questionnaire was prepared to evaluate the English Preparatory Program provided by Fırat University School of Foreign Languages in 2018–2019 academic year. The questionnaire includes questions related to your views about whether or not the English Preparatory Program had you gain the desired qualifications. Your answers to the survey questions are extremely important to determine the nature of the program and to improve the program. For this reason, you have to answer the items in the questionnaire completely and carefully.

Your answers will only be evaluated for this study and will remain strictly confidential. In addition, the data obtained will be evaluated collectively, not on a personal basis. **Therefore, do not write names to the forms.**

You are asked to fill in the questionnaire carefully. **The success of this research depends on the correctness and sincerity of your answers.**

I sincerely thank you for your contributions and wish you success in your work.

Muhyettin ACAR
English Instructor

Fırat University
School of Foreign Languages
Engineering Campus, Elazığ
macar@firat.edu.tr

PERSONAL INFORMATION

This section contains personal information. Please reply by placing an **(X)** sign in the box next to the option you found appropriate.

1. Your gender:

☐ Male
☐ Female

2. Faculty and department you are currently enrolled in:

☐ Faculty of Technology (Department.....)
☐ Faculty of Engineering (Department.....)
☐ Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (Department.....)

3. High school you graduated from:

_____

4. Your language level at the beginning of the preparatory program:

☐ Elementary
☐ Pre-Intermediate
☐ Intermediate

5. Answer the degree to which you find the following foreign language skills important by placing an (X) sign next to the relevant skill.

Skills	Very important	Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
Reading				
Writing				
Speaking				
Listening				

6. To what extent do you think you have the following foreign language skills? Mark the appropriate option.

Skills	Very good level	Good level	Mid-level	Low level
Reading				
Writing				
Speaking				
Listening				

REALIZATION LEVEL OF OBJECTIVES OF THE ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

SKILLS				
This section includes statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the English Preparatory Program. Indicate your level of possessing the skills given below putting mark (X).	I strongly agree	I agree	I do not agree	I strongly disagree
1. I can ask lecturers about the course in English.				
2. I can answer a lecturer's question related to the course in English.				
3. Thanks to my knowledge of English, I can use technology effectively.				
4. I can easily use English in the classroom environment.				
5. I can find English sources and get information.				
6. I can answer questions about an English text.				
7. My knowledge of English is sufficient to make an academic career.				
8. I can read an English text and express it in my own words.				
9. I can read and understand an English text.				
10. I can understand English discussions in the classroom.				
11. I can understand written instructions in English from lecturers.				
12. I can write an English paragraph or composition on any topic,				
13. I can convert an oral presentation in English into a written report in English.				
14. I can summarize a text read in English by writing in English.				
15. I can write an English letter, e-mail, etc. (formal or informal)				
16. I can fill in an English form.				
17. I can make a phone call in English.				
18. I can make a presentation in English.				
19. I can quickly understand the main idea of an English text.				
20. I can read a magazine in English about my field.				
21. I can guess the meaning of an English word that I don't know without using a dictionary.				
22. I can write a CV in English.				
23. I can make a report of information compiled in English given as a homework.				
24. I can read scientific English articles about my field.				
25. My knowledge of English is enough for me to achieve a good career when I go into business life.				

VIEWS ON THE ENGLISH PREPARATION PROGRAM AT FIRAT UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

In this section, questions aiming to determine your views on the English Preparatory Program of the School of Foreign Languages are presented.

1. What do you think about the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages? **(Content of educational activities, language skills training, materials used, assessment-evaluation processes, etc.)**

2. To what extent is your English knowledge gained in the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages sufficient to follow the lessons **you take in English in faculty**? What are your views on this issue?

3. To what extent do you think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages provides students and the departments with required English?

4. What are your suggestions for a more effective language teaching by the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages?

5. Would you like to attend the program anyway if the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is not compulsory?

a) ☐ **If yes,** please explain the contributions of the program to you.

b) ☐ **If no,** explain the reasons for this.

Appendix 3. Turkish and English Versions of Focus Group Interview Questions Addressed to the Students

ÖĞRENCİLERE SORULAN ODAK GRUP GÖRÜŞMESİ SORULARI

1. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programı hakkındaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?
2. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programında edindiğiniz İngilizce bilgisi fakültede İngilizce olarak aldığınız dersleri izlemeniz için ne ölçüde yeterlidir? Bu konudaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?
3. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programının, öğrencilerin ve bölümünüzün gereksinimi olan İngilizceyi ne ölçüde sunduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
4. Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programının daha etkili bir şekilde dil öğretebilmesi için önerileriniz nelerdir?
5. FÜ Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu İngilizce Hazırlık Programı zorunlu olmasaydı, yine de programa katılmak ister miydiniz? Neden?

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO THE STUDENTS

1. What do you think about the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages?
2. To what extent is your English knowledge gained in the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages sufficient to follow the lessons you take in English in faculty? What are your views on this issue?
3. To what extent do you think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages provides students and the departments with required English?
4. What are your suggestions for a more effective language teaching by the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages?
5. Would you like to attend the program anyway if the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is not compulsory?

a) ☐ **If yes,** please explain the contributions of the program to you.

b) ☐ **If no,** explain the reasons for this.

Appendix 4. Questionnaire for Lecturers *(Turkish)*

ÖĞRETİM ELEMANLARINA YÖNELİK ANKET FORMU

Değerli Öğretim Elemanı,

Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu tarafından 2018–2019 akademik yılında uygulanan İngilizce Hazırlık Programını değerlendirmek amacı ile bir araştırma yürütülmektedir. Bu araştırmada, İngilizce Hazırlık Programının amaçlarının gerçekleşme düzeyine ve öğrencilerin programı bitirdikten sonraki durumlarına ilişkin görüşleriniz son derece önemlidir. Bu nedenle ekteki anket formunda yer alan soruları titizlikle yanıtlamanız programı değerlendirebilmek açısından oldukça yararlı olacaktır.

Cevaplarınız gizli kalacaktır. Ayrıca cevaplarınız sadece bu çalışma için kullanılacak ve kişisel olarak değerlendirilmeyecektir.

Katkılarınızdan dolayı içtenlikle teşekkür eder, çalışmalarınızda başarılar dilerim.

Muhyettin ACAR
Öğretim Görevlisi

Fırat Üniversitesi
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu
Mühendislik Kampüsü, Elazığ
macar@firat.edu.tr

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

Bu bölümde kişisel bilgiler yer almaktadır. Lütfen uygun bulduğunuz seçeneğin yanındaki kutu içine **(X)** işareti koyarak yanıtlayınız.

1. Cinsiyetiniz:

☐ Erkek
☐ Kadın

2. Bitirdiğiniz yükseköğretim kurumu:

_____

3. Fırat Üniversitesi'nde çalışma süreniz:

☐ 0–5 yıl
☐ 6–10 yıl
☐ 11–15 yıl
☐ 16–20 yıl
☐ 21 yıldan fazla

4. Fırat Üniversitesi'nde görev yapmakta olduğunuz fakülte ve bölüm:

_____

5. Aşağıdaki yabancı dil (İngilizce) becerilerini bölümünüzde öğrenim gören öğrenciler açısından önemli bulma derecenizi, ilgili becerinin yanına **(X)** işareti koyarak yanıtlayınız.

Beceriler	Çok Önemli	Önemli	Biraz Önemli	En Az Önemli
Okuma				
Yazma				
Konuşma				
Dinleme				

YABANCI DİLLER YÜKSEKOKULU İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK PROGRAMININ AMAÇLARININ GERÇEKLEŞME DÜZEYİ

Bu bölümde İngilizce Hazırlık Programının amaçlarının gerçekleşme düzeyine ilişkin ifadeler yer almaktadır. Aşağıda verilen becerilere öğrencilerinizin sahip olma düzeyini uygun olan seçeneğe **(X)** işareti koyarak belirtiniz.	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
1. Hazırlık programında okutulan İngilizce dersinin, öğrencilerin akademik gelişimine katkı sağladığını düşünüyorum.				
2. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin İngilizce bilgisinin yetersiz olduğunu düşünüyorum.				
3. Hazırlık programında okutulan İngilizce dersinin, öğrenciler bölümlerine geçtiklerinde yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.				
4. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin, öğrenci değişim programlarında daha başarılı olduklarını düşünüyorum.				
5. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin, genel olarak hazırlık sınıfından muaf olan öğrencilerden daha iyi bir İngilizce bilgisine sahip olduklarını düşünüyorum.				
6. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin yurtdışı ile ilgili projelerde etkin olarak yer alabildiklerini düşünüyorum				
7. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin buldukları İngilizce kaynakları etkin bir şekilde kullanabildiklerini düşünüyorum.				
8. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin İngilizce metinleri çözümlemede sorun yaşamadıklarını gözlemliyorum.				
9. Hazırlık bölümünde okutulan İngilizce dersinin, öğrencilere iş hayatına atıldıklarında yarar sağlayacağını düşünüyorum.				
10. Öğrencilerin İngilizce hazırlık eğitimi almalarının gereksiz olduğunu düşünüyorum.				
11. F. Ü. Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nun İngilizce Hazırlık Programı'nın etkili olduğunu düşünüyorum.				
12. Hazırlık bölümünde okutulan İngilizce dersinin, öğrencilerin teknolojiyi daha etkin kullanmalarını sağladığını düşünüyorum.				
13. Öğrencilerin İngilizce yazışmalar hazırlamada ve cevaplamada sorun yaşamadıklarını düşünüyorum (e-mail, başvuru formu, dilekçe, vs.).				
14. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin ilgi alanına giren çeşitli konularda açık ve ayrıntılı bilgi verebileceğini düşünüyorum.				
15. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin, belirli bir bakış açısına destek vererek ya da karşı çıkarak bilgi sunan ve nedenler ileri süren bir kompozisyon ya da rapor yazabileceğini düşünüyorum.				
16. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin, İngilizce yönergeleri anlayabileceğini düşünüyorum.				
17. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin meslekî ya da edebî yapıt özetleri ve eleştirileri yazabileceğini düşünüyorum.				
18. Hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin televizyon haberlerini ve güncel olaylara ilişkin programların çoğunu anlayabildiklerini düşünüyorum.				

Appendix 5. Questionnaire for Lecturers *(English)*

SURVEY FORM FOR LECTURERS

Dear Lecturer,

A research is carried out to evaluate the English Preparatory Program provided by Fırat University School of Foreign Languages in 2018–2019 academic year. In this study, your views on the realization of the objectives of the English Preparatory Program and the situation of the students after the program is extremely significant. For this reason, responding to the questions in the attached questionnaire form will be very useful for evaluating the program.

Your answers will remain confidential. Your answers will only be used for this study and will not be considered personally.

I sincerely thank you for your contributions and wish you success in your work.

Muhyettin ACAR
English Instructor

Fırat University
School of Foreign Languages
Engineering Campus, Elazığ
macar@firat.edu.tr

PERSONAL INFORMATION

This section contains personal information. Please reply by placing an **(X)** sign in the box next to the option you find appropriate.

1. Your gender:

☐ Male
☐ Female

2. Higher education institution you graduated from:

_____

3. Years of experience at Fırat University:

☐ 0–5 year(s)
☐ 6–10 years
☐ 11–15 years
☐ 16–20 years
☐ 21 and more

4. The faculty and department you work in at Fırat University:

_____

5. Answer the degree to which you find the following foreign language skills important for the students studying in your department by placing an **(X)** sign next to the relevant skill.

Skills	Very important	Important	Somewhat Important	Least Important
Reading				
Writing				
Speaking				
Listening				

REALIZATION LEVEL OF OBJECTIVES OF THE ENGLISH PREPARATORY PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

This section includes statements about the level of achievement of the objectives of the English Preparatory Program. Please indicate the level of ownership of your students to the skills given below putting mark (X).	I strongly agree	I agree	I do not agree	I strongly disagree
1. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program contributes to the academic development of the students.				
2. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program have insufficient knowledge of English.				
3. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program is useful when students go to the departments.				
4. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program are more successful in student exchange programs.				
5. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program have a better knowledge of English in general than the students who were exempt from the preparatory program.				
6. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can actively take part in overseas projects.				
7. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can use the English sources they find effectively.				
8. I observe that students who studied the preparatory program have no problem in analyzing English texts.				
9. I think that the students will benefit from the English course taught in the preparatory program when they are employed.				
10. I think it is unnecessary for students to take English preparatory education.				
11. I think the English Preparatory Program at Fırat University School of Foreign Languages is effective.				
12. I think that the English course taught in the preparatory program enables students to use technology more effectively.				
13. I think that students do not have any problems in preparing and responding to English correspondence (e-mail, application form, petition, etc.).				
14. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can give clear and detailed information about various subjects of their interest.				
15. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can write a composition or a report that provides information and argues by supporting or opposing a particular point of view.				
16. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand English instructions.				
17. I think that the students who studied the preparatory program can write abstracts and criticisms of the professional or literary works.				
18. I think that students who studied the preparatory program can understand most of the television news and programs regarding current events.				

Appendix 6. Turkish and English Versions of Interview Questions Addressed to the Lecturers

ÖĞRETİM ELEMANLARINA SORULAN GÖRÜŞME SORULARI

1. FÜ YDYO İngilizce Hazırlık Programı'nın etkililiği konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
2. FÜ YDYO İngilizce Hazırlık Programı'nın amacı sizce nedir?
3. FÜ YDYO İngilizce Hazırlık Programı'nda yer alan derslerin/içeriklerin öğrencilerin ve fakültelerin gereksinimini sağlaması açısından uygun olup olmadığı konusundaki görüşleriniz nelerdir?
4. FÜ YDYO İngilizce Hazırlık Programının eksiklikleri konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
5. FÜ YDYO İngilizce Hazırlık Programı'nın geliştirilmesine yönelik önerileriniz nelerdir?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO THE LECTURERS

1. What do you think about the effectiveness of the English Preparatory Program?
2. What do you think is the purpose of the English Preparatory Program?
3. What are your views on whether the courses/contents in the English Preparatory Program are appropriate for ensuring the needs of students and faculties?
4. What do you think about the shortcomings of the English Preparatory Program?
5. What are your suggestions on the improvement of the English Preparatory Program?

Appendix 7. Approval from the Rectorate of Fırat University for Conducting Questionnaires in the Faculties

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 29/11/2018-296813

T.C.

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Genel Sekreterlik

Sayı :11611387/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni

Sayın: Öğr.Gör. Muhyettin ACAR

İlgi :21/11/2018 tarihli dilekçeniz.

Üniversitemiz İnsani ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dekanlığı'nın, 29/11/2018 tarih ve 89974897/044/296660 sayılı yazısı ekte gönderilmiştir.

Bilgileriniz ile gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Sadettin TANYILDIZI
Rektör V.

EK :
Yazı (2 Sayfa)

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Faks: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : CANSEL GÜNEŞLİ

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 29/11/2018-296660

T.C.

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

İnsani ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dekanlığı

Sayı :89974897/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)

GENEL SEKRETERLİĞE

İlgi :23/11/2018 tarihli, 295787 sayılı ve "Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)" konulu yazı

İlgi yazınız ile Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Öğretim Elemanı Öğr. Gör. Muhyettin ACAR'ın, yüksek lisans eğitimi kapsamında hazırladığı anketi Fakültemizde uygulama isteği, Dekanlığımızca uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Saadettin TONBUL
Dekan

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : Hatice KAYA
Faks: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr

T.C.
FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
İnsani ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dekanlığı
Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü

Sayı :94275700/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)

İNSANİ VE SOSYAL BİLİMLER FAKÜLTESİNE

İlgi :26.11.2018-295884 tarih ve 89974897/044/ sayılı yazınız.

Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Öğretim Elamanı Öğr. Gör. Muhyettin ACAR'ın anket uygulama isteğinde herhangi bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Mehmet AYGÜN
Bölüm Başkanı

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Faks: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : Mehmet ERDEM

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 07/12/2018-298362

T.C.

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Genel Sekreterlik

Sayı :11611387/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Öğr. Gör. Muhyettin ACAR)

Sayın: Öğr.Gör. Muhyettin ACAR

İlgi :21/11/2018 tarihli dilekçeniz.

Üniversitemiz Teknoloji Fakültesi Dekanlığı'nın, "Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)" konulu, 06/12/2018 tarih ve 49353074/044/298031 sayılı yazısı ekte gönderilmiştir.

Bilgileriniz ile gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Kutbeddin DEMİRDAĞ
Rektör

EK :
Yazı (2 Sayfa)

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : CANSEL GÜNEŞLİ
Faks: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 06/12/2018-298031

T.C.

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Teknoloji Fakültesi Dekanlığı

Sayı :49353074/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)

GENEL SEKRETERLİĞE

İlgi :23/11/2018 tarihli, 295787 sayılı ve "Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)" konulu yazı

Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Öğretim Elemanı Öğr. Gör. Muhyettin ACAR'ın, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda yaptığı yüksek lisans eğitimi kapsamında yürüttüğü; *"Fırat Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Programına İlişkin Öğrenci ve Öğretim Elemanı Görüşlerinin Karşılaştırılması"* adlı tez çalışması kapsamında hazırladığı anketi; Fakültemiz Yazılım Mühendisliği Uluslararası Ortak Lisans Programı Bölümü'nün ilgili öğrencilerine ve öğretim elemanlarına uygulanmasında herhangi bir sakınca bulunmadığına ilişkin Bölüm Başkanlığı'nın 05.12.2018 tarih ve 297837 sayılı yazısı ekte gönderilmiştir.

Bilgi ve gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Bahar DEMİREL
Dekan

EK :
1-Bölüm Başkanlığı'nın yazısı

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : Zülfiye ÖZEN (Figen BULUT Vekaletiyle)
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00 Faks: 0 424 2122717
E-Posta: : Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr

T.C.
FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Teknoloji Fakültesi Yazılım Mühendisliği Uluslararası
Ortak Lisans Programı Bölümü

Sayı :49353074/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)

TEKNOLOJİ FAKÜLTESİNE

İlgi :23/11/2018 tarihli, 295787 sayılı ve "Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)" konulu yazı

Sözkonusu anketin ilgili öğrencilerimize ve öğretim elemanlarına uygulanmasında herhangi bir sakınca görülmemektedir. Saygılarımla.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Asaf VAROL
Program Başkanı

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Fax: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : Asaf Varol

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 11/12/2018-299108

T.C.

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Genel Sekreterlik

Sayı :11611387/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Öğr. Gör. Muhyettin ACAR)

Sayın: Öğr.Gör. Muhyettin ACAR

Üniversitemiz Mühendislik Fakültesi Dekanlığı'nın "Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)" konulu 10/12/2018 tarih ve 98893209/044/298767 sayılı yazısı ekte gönderilmiştir.

Bilgileriniz ile gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Kutbeddin DEMİRDAĞ
Rektör

EK :
Yazı (1 Sayfa)

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : CANSEL GÜNEŞLİ
Faks: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 10/12/2018-298767

T.C.

FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Mühendislik Fakültesi Dekanlığı

Sayı :98893209/044/
Konu :Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)

GENEL SEKRETERLİĞE

İlgi :23/11/2018 tarihli, 295787 sayılı ve "Anket Uygulama İzni (Muhyettin ACAR)" konulu yazı

İlgi yazınızda belirtmiş olduğunuz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Öğretim Elemanı Öğr.Gör.Muhyettin ACAR'ın Fakültemiz Makine Mühendisliği Bölümü'nde anket yapması uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgileriniz ile gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır.
Prof. Dr. Ahmet ÖZER
Dekan

Fırat Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü 23119 ELAZIĞ/TÜRKİYE
Tel: 0 (424) 237 00 00
E-Posta: :
Ayrıntılı bilgi için irtibat : Işılay YILDIRIM
Faks: 0 424 2122717
Elektronik ağ:http://www.firat.edu.tr