K. BARUT

METU 2012

AN EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC WRITING MATERIALS AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL: A CASE STUDY OF THREE UNIVERSITIES

KENAN BARUT

NOVEMBER 2012

AN EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC WRITING MATERIALS AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL: A CASE STUDY OF THREE UNIVERSITIES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

KENAN BARUT

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

NOVEMBER 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Gölge SEFEROĞLU

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Hüsnü ENGİNARLAR

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ayşegül DALOĞLU	(METU, FLE)	_____
Prof. Dr. Hüsnü ENGİNARLAR	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE	(Gazi U., FLE)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Betil EROZ-TUĞA	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nehir SERT	(Baskent U., EDS)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Kenan Barut

Signature :

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF
ACADEMIC WRITING MATERIALS
AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL: A CASE STUDY
OF THREE UNIVERSITIES

Barut, Kenan
PhD, English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Husnu Enginarlar

November 2012, 347 pages

This post-use evaluation research aims to investigate the appropriacy of academic writing materials to contextual needs, and to investigate the essential considerations concerning these materials. This case study was conducted with the participation of program designers, teachers, and students at three universities in Hungary, Turkey, and Oman.

A unique checklist was developed to evaluate the materials. The data collection process consisted of questionnaires and interviews.

The results concur with findings in the literature regarding the benefits of using computer-mediated communication in the writing class, the need to combine process and product pedagogies, the necessity of having discipline-specific themes, and the need to provide students with more guidelines and input. Interestingly, contrary to the literature, the students do not seem to benefit from peer feedback; they value teacher feedback more. Furthermore, despite their increasing role in writing, there are few collaborative writing activities in these materials. The quantitative and the qualitative data also demonstrate that the program designers and the teachers consider in-house writing materials more appropriate than global materials, since they were developed in view of the learning context and the specific requirements. However, neither global nor in-house materials are regarded as motivating and attracting for the students.

There are relatively new areas for further research as a result of these findings: the role of free writing in EAP and the ways to manage mixed language levels of the students. All these findings are expected to provide insights to researchers and practitioners in the fields of writing and materials evaluation.

Key words: EAP, Academic Writing Materials, Materials Evaluation, Checklist

ÖZ

YÜKSEK ÖĞRETİMDE KULLANILAN
AKADEMİK YAZMA ARAÇ-GEREÇLERİNİN DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ:
ÜÇ ÜNİVERSİTEDE YAPILAN DURUM ÇALIŞMASI

Barut, Kenan
Doktora, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Hüsnü Enginarlar

Kasım 2012, 347 sayfa

Bu kullanım sonrası değerlendirme araştırması, akademik yazma araç-gereçlerinin bağlamsal ihtiyaçlara uygunluğunu ve bu araç-gereçler ile ilgili temel sorunları ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Çoklu durum incelemesi yöntemini kullanan çalışma, Macaristan, Türkiye ve Umman'daki üç önemli üniversitedeki program geliştirme uzmanları, öğretmenler ve öğrencilerin katılımıyla gerçekleşmiştir.

Akademik yazma araç-gereçlerini değerlendirmek için özel bir kontrol listesi geliştirilmiştir. Veri toplama süreci ise, program geliştirme uzmanları,

öğretmenler ve öğrenciler için uyarlanan anketlerden ve bu katılımcıları içeren yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlardan oluşmuştur.

Sonuçlar, bilgisayar merkezli iletişimin yazma derslerindeki yararları, süreç ve sonuç odaklı yöntemleri birleştirme gereksinimi, öğrencilerin alanları ile ilgili konuları dikkate almanın gerekliliği ve planlama safhasında öğrencilere daha fazla destek ve fikir sağlama gibi alanlarda, son zamanlardaki araştırma sonuçları ile benzerdir. Fakat öğrenciler, akranlarından aldıkları geribildirimlerden faydalanmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir; sonuç olarak da öğretmenlerinden gelen dönütlere, kendi yaptıkları öz değerlendirmelerden ya da akran değerlendirmelerinden daha fazla değer vermektedirler. Ayrıca, yazma çalışmalarındaki artan rollerine rağmen, işbirlikçi yazma etkinlikleri bu araç-gereçlerde fazla yer almamaktadır. Bu nicel ve nitel veriler, aynı zamanda, program geliştirme uzmanlarının ve öğretmenlerin, kendi geliştirdikleri araç-gereçleri, öğrenme ortamına ve belirgin ihtiyaçlar ile gereksinimlere uygunluklarından dolayı, ticari kitaplara göre daha uygun bulduklarını göstermektedir. Bununla beraber, bu iki farklı tür akademik amaçlı araç-gereç de, öğrenciler için yeterince güdüleyici ya da ilgi çekici görülmemektedir.

Bu çalışmada ortaya çıkan sonuçlar neticesinde, ileriki araştırmalar için iki göreceli olarak yeni alan belirlenebilir: serbest yazma çalışmalarının akademik amaçlı İngilizce programlarındaki rolü ve bu programlardaki farklı dil yeterlik seviyelerindeki öğrencilerle yapılan çalışmalar. Tüm bu bulguların, akademik yazma ve araç-gereç değerlendirme alanlarındaki araştırmacı ve uygulayıcılara farklı boyutlar kazandıracağı beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Akademik Amaçlı İngilizce, Akademik Yazma Araç-Gereçleri, Araç-Gereç Değerlendirme, Kontrol Listesi

To My Father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Husnu Enginarlar for his support, encouragements and insight throughout the research. His guidance helped me at all stages of this dissertation, and his supervision enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Aysegul Daloglu and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nehir Sert for their invaluable suggestions and comments throughout the study. Furthermore, I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pasa Tevfik Cephe and Assist. Prof. Dr. Betil Eroz for their feedback.

In addition, I am grateful to the management and the teaching staff at the foreign languages programs of Eötvös Lorand University in Budapest, Middle East Technical University in Ankara, and the Colleges of Applied Sciences in Rustaq for their sincere help during the data collection process.

I am greatly indebted to my friends and colleagues for their inspiration, sincere support, and for helping me develop the content and the formats of the questionnaires, and analyze the data. I would not have made it without their support.

Last but not the least, I owe special thanks to my dad and mum, my brothers, my wife, and my son for their relentless support and understanding. If my father could see me somewhere, I am sure he would be proud to see me getting this degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iv
ÖZ vi
DEDICATION viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS x
LIST OF TABLES xv
LIST OF FIGURES xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xix
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.0 Introduction 1
1.1 The Background of the Study 2
1.2 The Statement of Purpose 6
1.3 The Research Questions 8
1.4 The Significance of the Study 8
1.5 The Definition of Terms 11
2. LITERATURE REVIEW 13
2.0 Introduction 13
2.1 The Writing Process in ELT 14
2.1.1 The Writing Skill in the ELT Curriculum 14
2.1.2 The Developmental Stages of Teaching / Learning Writing 16
2.1.2.1 Process versus Product 16
2.1.2.2 Writing as a Cognitive Process 21

2.1.2.3 Writing as a Socio-Cognitive Process 24
2.1.2.4 Writing as a Collaborative Process 27
2.1.2.5 Current Issues in Teaching / Learning Writing 30
2.1.3 The Teaching / Learning of Writing within the Academic Writing Context 37
2.1.3.1 Research within the Academic Writing Context 37
2.1.3.2 Materials within the Academic Writing Context 41
2.2 Materials Evaluation 50
2.2.1 Materials in the ELT Curriculum 50
2.2.2 The Main Issues in Materials Evaluation 59
2.2.3 Materials Evaluation Models / Types 60
2.2.4 Materials Evaluation Checklists 67
3. METHOD 79
3.0 Introduction 79
3.1 The Research Design 80
3.1.1 The Research Questions 80
3.1.2 The Research Methodology 81
3.1.3 The Participants 84
3.1.3.1 Eötvös Lorand University, Budapest – Hungary 86
3.1.3.2 Middle East Technical University, Ankara – Turkey. 87
3.1.3.3 Colleges of Applied Sciences, Rustaq – Oman 88
3.2 The Data Collection 89
3.2.1 The General Analysis of the Materials 90
3.2.2 The Questionnaires 91
3.2.3 The Interviews 100
3.3 The Data Analysis 104
4. FINDINGS 107
4.0 Introduction 107
4.1 The Analysis of the Background of the Participants 108
4.2 The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Contextual Needs 117

4.2.1 The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements 118
4.2.1.1 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements (Case 1) 118
4.2.1.2 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements (Case 2) 123
4.2.1.3 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements (Case 3) 130
4.2.2 The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations 136
4.2.2.1 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations (Case 1) 137
4.2.2.2 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations (Case 2) 143
4.2.2.3 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations (Case 3) 150
4.2.3 The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and Interests of the Students 156
4.2.3.1 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and Interests of the Students (Case 1) 157
4.2.3.2 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and Interests of the Students (Case 2) 163
4.2.3.3 The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and Interests of the Students (Case 3) 169
4.3 The Main Considerations concerning the Academic Writing Materials 176
4.3.1 The Main Considerations of the Program Designers 176

4.3.1.1 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Program Designers in Case 1 177
4.3.1.2 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Program Designers in Case 2 179
4.3.1.3 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Program Designers in Case 3 181
4.3.2 The Main Considerations of the Teachers 182
4.3.2.1 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Teachers in Case 1 183
4.3.2.2 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Teachers in Case 2 185
4.3.2.3 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Teachers in Case 3 187
4.3.3 The Main Considerations of the Students 190
4.3.3.1 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Students in Case 1 191
4.3.3.2 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Students in Case 2 193
4.3.3.3 The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Students in Case 3 195
5. CONCLUSION 198
5.0 Introduction 198
5.1 Overview of the Study 199
5.2 The Implications of the Findings on the Evaluation of the Academic Writing Materials 201
5.2.1 The Implications of the Findings in the External Evaluation 202
5.2.2 The Implications of the Findings in the Internal Evaluation 207
5.2.3 The Implications of the Findings in the Overall Evaluation 215
5.3 Recommendations for Further Research 217
5.4 Limitations of the Study 219

5.5 Conclusion 220
REFERENCES 222
APPENDICES
A. THE INFORMED CONSENT FORM 247
B. SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROGRAM DESIGNERS 248
C. SAMPLE TRANSLATED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS 266
D. SAMPLE SIMPLIFIED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS 277
E. THE INTERVIEW GUIDE 282
F. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES 284
G. CURRICULUM VITAE 320
H. TURKISH SUMMARY 322
I. TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU 347

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1 Comparison of Diaries and Blogs 31
Table 2 Differences between Portfolios and Standardized Testing..... 33
Table 3 Richards' Comparison of Past and Now in Writing..... 36
Table 4 Pro- and Anti-Textbook Views 44
Table 5 Summary of Main Features of Current Academic Writing Textbooks 46
Table 6 Disadvantages of Textbooks 52
Table 7 Advantages of Textbooks..... 55
Table 8 Textbook Evaluation Checklists (2000s) 74
Table 9 The Strengths and Weaknesses of Case Studies 86
Table 10 Examples from the Adaptation of the Checklist Items Used in McDonough and Shaw's Model..... 96
Table 11 Demographic Statistics of the Students, the Teachers, and the Program Designers (Case 1)..... 111
Table 12 Demographic Statistics of the Students, the Teachers, and the Program Designers (Case 2)..... 113
Table 13 Demographic Statistics of the Students, the Teachers, and the Program Designers (Case 3)..... 115

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES

Figure 1 McGrath's Cycle of Materials Evaluation Types 6
Figure 2 White and Arndt's Process Writing Scheme 19
Figure 3 Harmer's Process Writing Scheme 20
Figure 4 Hyland's Writing Scheme 26
Figure 5 Aspects in Writer Identity 34
Figure 6 The Interaction Scheme for Opportunities to Learn 58
Figure 7 Hutchinson and Waters' Materials Evaluation Model 61
Figure 8 McDonough and Shaw's Materials Evaluation Model 65
Figure 9 Classification of Textbook Evaluation Criteria 75
Figure 10 The Research Design 106
Figure 11 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 1) 117
Figure 12 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 1) 118
Figure 13 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the the PYP Program Designer (Case 1) 120
Figure 14 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the the FYP Program Designer (Case 1) 121
Figure 15 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 1) 122
Figure 16 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 1) 122
Figure 17 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Program Designers (Case 2) 123

Figure 18 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Program Designers (Case 2)..... 124
Figure 19 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Program Designers (Case 2)..... 126
Figure 20 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Program Designers (Case 2)..... 127
Figure 21 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Program Designers (Case 2)..... 128
Figure 22 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Program Designers (Case 2)..... 128
Figure 23 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 3)..... 129
Figure 24 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 3)..... 130
Figure 25 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 3)..... 132
Figure 26 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 3)..... 133
Figure 27 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 3)..... 134
Figure 28 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 3)..... 134
Figure 29 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 1) 136
Figure 30 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 1) 137
Figure 31 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 1) 139
Figure 32 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 1) 140
Figure 33 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 1)..... 141
Figure 34 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 1)..... 141
Figure 35 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 2) 142
Figure 36 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 2) 143
Figure 37 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 2) 145

Figure 38 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 2) 147
Figure 39 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 2)..... 148
Figure 40 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 2)..... 148
Figure 41 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 3) 149
Figure 42 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 3) 150
Figure 43 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 3) 152
Figure 44 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 3) 153
Figure 45 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 3)..... 154
Figure 46 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 3)..... 154
Figure 47 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 1)..... 156
Figure 48 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 1)..... 157
Figure 49 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 1)..... 159
Figure 50 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 1)..... 160
Figure 51 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 1) 161
Figure 52 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 1) 161
Figure 53 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 2)..... 162
Figure 54 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 2)..... 163
Figure 55 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 2)..... 165
Figure 56 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 2)..... 166
Figure 57 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 2) 167
Figure 58 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 2) 167
Figure 59 Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 3)..... 168
Figure 60 Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 3)..... 169
Figure 61 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 3)..... 171
Figure 62 Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 3)..... 172
Figure 63 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 3) 173
Figure 64 Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 3) 173

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ELT	English Language Teaching
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
CMC	Computer-Mediated Communication
GCC	Gulf Corporation Countries
PYP	Preparatory Year Program
FYP	Freshman Year Program
ELTE	Eötvös Lorand University
METU	Middle East Technical University
CAS	Colleges of Applied Sciences

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

The introduction aims to present the rationale for this study with relevant references to the previous literature as well as to the significance of the research considering the academic studies in the field of academic writing and materials evaluation. Included within this introductory chapter are the background of the study, the statement of purpose, the research questions, the significance of the study, and the definition of the terms used in the study.

The chapter starts with an overview of the relevant research in English language teaching (ELT) with references to the prominent academic works. Next the purpose of the study is presented along with the research questions. Afterwards, the aspects that make this present study significant in the field are mentioned. At the end of this introduction, common terminology that occurs frequently throughout this study is defined based on the descriptions established by well-known ELT figures.

1.1. The Background of the Study

It is obvious that the demand for quality ELT programs have been increasing dramatically all over the world particularly in the new millennium. The main rationale behind this high demand is the strong need for communication (both oral and written) in English due to the fact that English language operates now as the lingua franca of the modern world (see Jenkins, 2007; Crystal, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2011). That is to say, English language has today "become part and parcel of their [people's] everyday communicative practices" (Ehrenreich, 2012, p. 181). Ehrenreich, furthermore, explains these common practices through her interesting anecdote within a multi-cultural environment:

> … a middle-aged German businessman, became interested and asked me what it was that I was reading. I replied it was an article about English as an international language. "OK," he responded, somewhat hesitatingly and a bit surprised, continuing "but English *is* the international language." "I agree," I said, "but there are still a lot of people out there who think of it as the language of the British and Americans." "Well," he said, "I use English a lot, you know, but the English, they are the hardest to understand. With the Indians and Italians, I have no problem, and the French, they just have the most beautiful accent" (p. 181).

Similarly, Matsuda, Ortmeier-Hooper, and Matsuda (2009) add that the international spread of English language in "business, scientific, and academic interactions have resulted in the expansion of English language users into a broad spectrum of contexts and countries" (p. 466). Consequently, English does not only constitute the common ground in the business world, but also in the socio-cultural settings in which cross-cultural communication is essential, since effective communication in English "can provide us with opportunities for acting as responsible cosmopolitan citizens" (Guilherme, 2007, p. 72). This new role of English is now a global fact, because social networking is also considered to be one of the survival skills for any individual who is involved in cross-cultural interaction.

As a result of this rapidly increasing demand for English language programs focusing on communicative skills – primarily speaking and writing – mostly owing to the issues above, these two skills are regarded as the survival skills in the school life. Writing, in particular, is today considered to be more than a skill or course to be covered in the school environment; it is a necessary skill to be learned in order to be successful in real life situations. According to Canagarajah and Jerskey (2009), "written competence in English has taken on added significance for students and scholars in the context of globalization" (p. 473). It is also significant as effective writing skills are an essential element for the tertiary level students in their current (i.e. academic) and further (i.e. business) achievements. During their academic life, most of the students are now asked to present their ideas and points of views, and defend their opinions through specific skills and strategies in a written format. In addition to this, the improvement of these writing skills and strategies helps these students lead a successful work life after the completion of their academic studies in the higher education.

On the other hand, difficulties that the students frequently face in academic writing "are enormous, particularly for those who go on to a university and study in a language that is not their own" (Nunan, 1999, p. 271). Rose (2009) emphasizes that these tertiary level students have to deal not only with the challenges of the mastery of their second / foreign languages during the academic writing classes, but also with the rigorous application of that language in an academic setting / discipline, which must necessarily involve their own ideas interweaved with the ideas of others. Moreover, according to Myles (2002), "academic writing requires conscious effort and much practice in composing, developing, and analyzing ideas" (p. 1). She further notes that there are many social and cognitive challenges related to second language acquisition during this complex writing process which requires critical and analytical thinking skills.

The current issues in writing, mentioned briefly above, are also dealt with in the recent studies (e.g. Harwood, 2005; Alexander, Argent, and Spencer, 2008; McCarter and Jakes, 2009; Tribble, 2009; Hyland, 2009) in the field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Some of these common concerns include the role of collaborative activities, teacher and peer feedback, learning styles and strategies, guided and free writing, integration of the four language skills, higher-level cognitive skills such as planning and organization, and assessment and evaluation procedures in academic writing. The availability and the effective use of these critical factors in the current writing materials are also areas of study today concerning the field of materials evaluation.

In this respect, Harwood (2005) and Tribble's (2009) opinions are so strong that they argue very clearly for the impossibility of an academic writing textbook meeting the needs of the program designers, the teachers, and the students. Harwood states that "the current state of commercial materials is highly unsatisfactory, and that publishers and material writers must make greater efforts to ensure that research findings are operationalized in textbooks" (p. 149). Additionally, he points out that this failure is partly a result of the lack of a review of applied linguistic literature by the developers of these materials. Similarly, Tribble concludes that he has been stuck mostly by the fact of just "how little is currently published that will meet the needs of those who are preparing to write the long and complex texts which are required of students in higher education" (pp. 415-416). In this materials evaluation study on current EAP writing textbooks, he also adds that:

> One concern, therefore, is that the majority of the writing course books which have been offered for review focus on developing essayist literacy and will be suitable for students on courses which require such verbal performances. For students who face the challenge of writing extended, factual, evidence-based, and disciplinarily specific texts, there is still relatively little on the market. What also concerns me is that the differences between the varieties of EAP which we have identified in this review are not sufficiently signaled in the titles, back covers, and promotional materials associated with these books (p. 416).

It is not wrong to claim that the dissatisfaction with global textbooks to some extent can be noticed more while evaluating the materials in academic writing due to the specific program requirements and objectives, the teachers' teaching techniques and expectations, and the variety of the needs and the interests of the students at the tertiary level. As a result of these considerations, there is a tendency to use in-house materials in the academic writing classes. Nevertheless, it is extremely important to highlight that the majority of the research in the relevant literature (e.g. Murdoch, 2000; Atkins, 2001; Litz, 2005; Cakit, 2006; Al-Yousef, 2007; Jahangard, 2007; Alamri, 2008; Atai and Gheitanchian, 2009; Tribble, 2009; Huang, 2011; Nahrkhalaji, 2012; Rahman, 2012) focuses on the evaluation of textbooks (global / commercial) rather than in-house writing materials which are now becoming more common in tertiary level academic writing classes.

In order to evaluate any material, global textbooks or in-house materials, one of the most critical necessities is the checklist. There have been a variety of checklists used in the materials evaluation studies worldwide mainly since the 1970s. Some of these well-known checklists have been developed by the following academics whose studies are listed here in the chronological order: Tucker, 1975; Williams, 1983; Sheldon, 1988; Skierso, 1991; Cunningsworth, 1995; Ur, 1996; McGrath, 2002; McDonough and Shaw, 2003; and Miekley, 2005. These checklists have been implemented within three types of evaluation procedures: pre-use evaluation, in-use evaluation or post-use evaluation designs which are considered to be among a cyclical process by McGrath (2006), who states that the most reliable of these materials evaluation research designs is post-use evaluation as long as it draws on the experiences of teachers and learners:

Figure 1: McGrath's Cycle of Materials Evaluation Types

Some of these prominent materials evaluation studies, and the content and the features of several of these checklists are presented in a detailed way in the next chapter – Literature Review.

1.2. The Statement of Purpose

Regardless of the new mediums used in real life like the computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools, or continuously changing methodologies and pedagogies, different aspects of academic writing have recently been an area of interest in ELT. In addition, owing to the increasing role of writing in the business world as well as in the socio-cultural contexts today, it is now more important to develop effective academic writing courses in higher education settings so as to help the tertiary level students with their current and future studies.

Considering the primary critical success factors of these academic writing courses, materials are the core elements of them since they provide learners, teachers, and program designers with a clear path to follow in their educational environment. The academic writing materials, in contrast to other sorts of general English resources, should also be comprehensive enough to address the possible issues in the EAP class; for instance, the wide range of students with different backgrounds and disciplines. Therefore, it is vital to select the most appropriate materials to serve the needs and the requirements of these EAP writing programs to avoid any difficulties that might be faced throughout the academic year.

Nonetheless, Tomlinson (2008), while describing his last day as a teacher, stresses that he will not miss teaching an EAP class with an EAP textbook, implying his dissatisfaction with the EAP materials. Furthermore, while referring to the research on the EAP writing materials, Harwood (2005) concludes that "all of these studies find a lack of fit between how academic writers write and what the textbooks teach about writing" (p. 150). Thus, in spite of the increasing role of writing in the EAP programs and the developments in the theoretical sides of these programs, there is still strong need to find more appropriate materials, which serve the aims of the program as well as the needs and the expectations of the teachers and the students.

In view of the facts mentioned above, this dissertation study was designed to analyze the perceptions of the tertiary level program designers, teachers, and students concerning academic writing materials they have used during the academic year. In order to have a better and thorough understanding of a variety of points of views globally and to reach more reliable conclusions, the research was carried out in three different educational contexts: one in Hungary, another in Turkey, and the other in Oman.

1.3. The Research Questions

In this quantitative and qualitative study, the following two questions have been investigated:

1. To what extent are the materials – both global and in-house – used in academic writing programs at the tertiary level appropriate to the contextual needs?
    a. To what extent do these materials serve the program requirements?
    b. To what extent are they in parallel with the teachers' teaching techniques and expectations?
    c. To what extent do they meet the needs and the interests of the students?
2. What are the main considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students concerning the academic writing materials used at the tertiary level?
    a. What are the main considerations of the program designers when adopting / developing their academic writing materials?
    b. What are the main considerations of the teachers when using academic writing materials?
    c. What are the main considerations of the students when studying their academic writing materials?

1.4. The Significance of the Study

In this section, the significance of this study is presented in three stages: academic writing, materials evaluation, and research design. The aim is to provide the rationale of the study and its expected role and place in the literature of ELT.

Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002) highlight the fact that the field of EAP has been developing rapidly within ELT research. Accordingly, Hyland (2011) points out that considerable research attention has been devoted to EAP writing in recent years. Nonetheless, despite the increasing level of interest in specific areas of EAP writing, such as writer identity (e.g. Manchon, Roca De Larious, and Murphy, 2009; Sasaki, 2009), collaborative writing activities (e.g. Kroll, 2003; Casanave, 2004), writing in the disciplines (e.g. Hyland, 2009; Gimenez, 2009) or writing genres (e.g. Leki, 2003; Bhatia, 2008), there is very little focus on academic writing materials. Yet, it is an undeniable fact that materials "have a direct influence upon what happens in classrooms, which policy documents, syllabuses and teacher-training courses do not" (Johnson, 1989, p. 7).

Accordingly, this empirical study primarily focuses on academic writing materials, considering the recent developments in EAP and writing pedagogies while establishing the research criteria. Furthermore, both in-house and commercial materials are evaluated in this study in contrast to the majority of other materials evaluation research solely focusing on published textbooks (e.g. Basturkmen, 1999; Yakhontova, 2001; Moreno, 2003; Tribble, 2009).

In addition to the above issues, some of the main considerations in these materials evaluation criteria, which have been used previously, are mentioned by Mukundan, Hajimohammadi, and Nimehchisalem (2011) in their revision of available checklists:

> Despite their crucial roles in language instruction, most if not all the available textbook evaluation checklists have been developed qualitatively often with no empirical evidence in support of their construct validity. Additionally, even when fundamental matters like validity and reliability are accounted for, most of these checklists are impractical. For example, some make use of ELT terminology that sound ambiguous for language instructors with little expertise in the area. A further disadvantage of some of the available checklists is that because of the high number of their items they lack economy and hence practicality (p. 22).

Although some of the available checklists (e.g. Richards, 2001; McDonough and Shaw, 2003) had been taken into account while developing the criteria for this study, a unique set of criteria to evaluate academic writing materials was produced with the help of the supervisor, the program designers, and the curriculum experts. Accordingly, in contrast to some of the similar research in this field, the criteria in this study were checked several times by different experts to meet the requirements of a successful checklist; such as practicality, validity, reliability, and flexibility.

Another significant aspect of this study is the research design. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were developed for this study, even though either quantitative (e.g. Canado and Esteban, 2005; Miekley, 2005; Litz, 2005) or qualitative (e.g. Peacock, 1997; Zabawa, 2001; Krug, 2002; Rubdy, 2003; Driss, 2006; Rahimy, 2007) methods have been adopted in most of the previous literature.

Furthermore, the study is also believed to be significant due to the fact that it deals with both in-house materials as well as global textbooks in three different higher education settings within six departments (three preparatory year programs and three freshman year programs) through a collective case study that adopts a post-use evaluation design, which is not that common in the literature partly because of the difficulties of such a complex research design. All these three institutions from different regions are selected deliberately in order to reflect the unique contextual needs and requirement in these areas.

Lastly, Richards (2001) reports the importance of including the requirements and the needs of the program, the teachers, and the students into the materials evaluation criteria. In this research study, perceptions of these program designers, teachers, and students in the three different settings were seriously taken into consideration, which is expected to enrich the nature of the findings. Within these multiple perspectives, the researcher intends to investigate the universal points involved in the evaluation of academic writing materials.

As a result of these facts, this study is expected to contribute to the literature in the fields of both academic writing and materials evaluation. The main purpose of this research is to provide a new insight into the evaluation of academic writing materials.

In the next chapter, Literature Review, these academic studies mentioned above are reviewed critically in detail with the addition of similar research in the field within two main parts: The Writing Process in ELT and Materials Evaluation.

1.5. The Definition of Terms

- **English for Academic Purposes (EAP):**
  - EAP is, in brief, English language teaching within academic settings "with the aim of assisting learners' study or research" (Hyland, 2006, p. 1).

- **Academic Writing:**
  - A writing process including texts ranging "from short phrases (as in fill-in-the-blank tests) to brief paragraphs (as in essay question exercises and tests), to brief reports of many different kinds, to a full-length research paper" (Brown, 2001, p. 339).

- **Preparatory Year Program (PYP):**
  - One-year (generally two semesters) second language learning programs at universities mainly in Gulf Cooperation Countries (GCC), Turkey, and some European countries such as the Netherlands and Hungary. Also known as foundation year programs; PYP is carried out before the freshman year at the higher education settings.

- **Materials:**
  - Tomlinson (2001) defines materials as anything that can be used to facilitate the learning of a language. They can be in the form of textbooks, handouts and worksheets, CDs and CD-ROMs, video extracts, flashcards, etc. In this study, the term 'materials' is mainly used to describe global textbooks and / or handouts and worksheets used in the academic writing classes at the institutions participating in this study.

- **Materials Evaluation:**
  - It is the systematic evaluation of the materials in relation to their objectives and to the aims of the users of these materials (Tomlinson, 1998). Materials can be evaluated in the material selection period, during, or after using them.

- **Triangulation:**
  - According to Todd (1979), triangulation means measuring something from different perspectives such as different research tools and / or methods, participants, and places. He identifies three purposes for triangulation:
    - To identify valid and reliable findings
    - To compare different findings
    - To identify valid data and sources

- **Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC):**
  - CMC is the communication that takes place between people through computers with the synchronous (i.e. real-time chat and video conferencing) and asynchronous tools (i.e. emails and blogs).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. Introduction

This chapter aims to review previous research on the writing process in ELT and on the materials evaluation that are relevant to the scope of this dissertation. The first part consists of three sections: the writing skill in the ELT curriculum, the developmental stages of teaching / learning writing within a chronological order, and writing within the academic context. In this part, the writing skill is surveyed with references to specific resources, and then the history of process and post-process writing pedagogies are introduced starting from the late 1960s, and finally, the academic writing context and the materials used in this context are analyzed through the major studies in the literature.

The second part consists of two sections: materials in the ELT curriculum and materials evaluation. Firstly, the importance of materials in the ELT context is presented with references to pioneer works in this field. Then materials evaluation models / types, and checklists are reviewed thoroughly along with these studies.

2.1. The Writing Process in ELT

The composing process is an extremely complex undertaking for all those taking part in the process. It involves much more than studying a particular structure, analyzing and imitating rhetorical forms, or outlining one's composition. The process involves not only the act of writing itself, but prewriting and rewriting, all of which are interdependent, and improvement in student writing is related to each of these phases (Zamel, 1982). All these phases and features of the writing process as well as its main roles in academic writing are discussed in the following sections.

2.1.1. The Writing Skill in the ELT Curriculum

Writing has always been an ignored concern in the ELT curriculum in almost all stages despite its importance mainly in the production stage of language use. Written production is also essential in terms of checking the learning points. According to Raimes (1985), instead of serving merely as an adjunct to language learning, writing is useful mainly for practice exercises and the reinforcement of academic tasks; therefore, it has a primary value as a language tool for language users. It is also stated in the report prepared by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers (2010) that writing is a key means of asserting and defending arguments by individuals, showing what they know about a subject, and conveying what they have experienced, imagined, thought, and felt. To meet these goals, it is stated that "students must devote significant time and effort to writing, producing numerous pieces over short and long time frames throughout the year" (p. 5).

The importance of writing in the assessment phase is also crucial along with the teaching / learning process. By means of students' written works, teachers can check different skills and sub-skills such as structural knowledge, comprehension level, lexical level, and thinking skills. Applebee and Langer

(2011) conclude that subject teachers have an understanding of the key areas in which writing can take part in learning, and these teachers consider writing as a valuable tool for assessing students' comprehension, and in many cases, see the unique and particular roles that writing can play within their own disciplines.

Though writing cannot be regarded as an optional skill to be taught outside the class or as an elective course, it is a fact that many teachers are not trained enough to teach writing properly. With regard to this view, Graham (2008) reports that many teachers state that they were not adequately prepared to teach writing in their classes. Around one half of those teachers in Graham's work indicate that they have received almost no preparation to teach writing. As a result of this lack of focus on training teachers in how to teach writing effectively, there are different problematic issues which occur in the writing class. For example, Vygotsky (2004) claims very strongly that:

> the child must be taught to write about what he is deeply interested in and has thought about much and deeply, about what he knows and understands well. The child must be taught never to write about what he does not know, does not understand, and is not interested in. And yet, the teacher sometimes does exactly the reverse and thus kills the writer in the child (p. 52).

Another essential concept in the teaching of second language writing is to teach the critical notion of writing to learn. Fisher and Frey (2008) note that writing to learn differs from other types of writing as it is not a process piece that goes through multiple refinements toward an intended final written product, but a catalyst for further learning opportunities. It involves "getting students to think about and to find the words to explain what they are learning, how they understand that learning, and what their own processes of learning involve" (Mitchell, 1996, p. 93). It is also worth mentioning that there are positive studies to develop ELT curricula in different parts of the world based on the concept of writing to learn, and there is a tendency to use materials allowing teachers to focus on this concept.

All in all, the importance of writing as a skill has been dealt with more in recent reports and studies specifically in those after 2000. In one of these reports by the National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges (2004), it is mentioned clearly that writing is a threshold skill for both employment and promotion for each individual, particularly for salaried employees. One of the respondents taking part in the research contends that writing ability could be a ticket into or out of many situations in life. The same commission also noted in 2003 that:

> if students are to make knowledge their own, they must struggle with the details, wrestle with the facts, and rework raw information and dimly understood concepts into language they can communicate to someone else. In short, if students are to learn, they must write (p. 9).

2.1.2. The Developmental Stages of Teaching / Learning Writing

New paradigms or approaches in writing mainly with communicative considerations seem to cycle in and out of the field. Although it may seem to be symbolizing some random variation, it is probably not a pointless swinging back and forth. It seems to be an eternal struggle of one set of ideas against another, in close relation with the methodological and pedagogical issues both outside and inside the ELT world. In this section, these new paradigms are summarized in detail starting from the first long-lasting paradigm: process or product.

2.1.2.1. Process versus Product

Good writing involves a longitudinal process, which is a constant interplay of generating ideas, writing, editing, and rewriting. Nevertheless, research on composition had traditionally been focused on the written product rather than the writing process specifically until the 1970s, which is also reported by Braddock,

Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer (1963). In many cases, these studies sought to prove the efficacy of one grammar pattern over another; thus, perpetuating the belief that a better pedagogical approach, particularly one that focused on usage, structure or correct form would improve the writing skill (Zamel, 1976). Little attention was paid to other, more important elements such as the purpose, the process of composing itself and the audience for whom the composition is being written. The whole notion of how writers compose – where ideas come from, how they are generated or developed, what the various stages of composing involve – was not taken into account in those preliminary studies. As a result, until the beginning of the 1970s, language users had learned linguistic structures and applied them to write their texts on specific topics, which was a linear process without any revision or feedback.

Then with the pioneer studies of researchers such as Murray (1968, 1972), Macrorie (1970), Emig (1971), Elbow (1973), Coles (1974), and Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, and Rosen (1975), the process movement in ELT writing began to be emphasized more than the old attitudes defending the importance of product. This new trend helped students to discover their own strengths and capabilities, let them choose their subjects to write about and their styles, as well as their writing strategies, with the help of their peers and teachers and by means of feedback. The rise of this process movement in these years led to a process-oriented and student-centered pedagogy rather than to the old product-oriented and teacher-centered pedagogy.

Having analyzed these studies of the 1970s, it is not wrong to claim that to produce quality written products, which requires almost no communication and interaction, without a focus on the whole process is almost impossible. For instance, Chitravelu, Sithamparam, and Choon (1995) remark that students never learned the various processes that successful writers use in the production of a written document in the product-oriented writing class. They argue that this kind of pedagogy is also demotivating as it is not enjoyable and does not cater to the students' need for real self-expression, which is now regarded as a necessary

skill in the learning environment. This pedagogy is also unrelated to the focus on communicative competence which started to be highlighted after the 1970s.

Similarly, some of the issues in the product-oriented ELT class are pointed out clearly by Hyland (2003). He states that presenting formal structures and patterns as short fragments is not authentic at all and can make it difficult for students to develop advanced writing skills and strategies beyond sentence level. Although students can compose accurate sentences through correct language, it does not mean that they can produce appropriate written texts for a particular communicative purpose. While defining the writing instruction of those times, it is correct to claim that structural elements like syntax, grammar, and mechanics were more important than higher-level factors like content, audience, and the purpose of writing.

As mentioned above, the first studies on process writing defending some of these higher-level factors started in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. In those days, Emig's (1971) study with students, including verbal protocols of children thinking aloud as they wrote, is one of the first attempts to investigate what writers do when they compose texts during the writing process. She defines writing as a process to be experienced rather than a product to be evaluated. According to Emig, writing is an unconscious learning process more than conscious teaching. She also focuses on the recursive nature of writing like other researchers (e.g. Zamel, 1976; Elbow, 1973) in her time rather than seeing writing as a linear process to be followed strictly. Elbow (1973) also highlights this developmental process in which writers start at the beginning – before they know the meaning at all – and write their words gradually to change and evolve.

This recursive feature of the writing process has been determined by different researchers and academics through various concepts and / or figures. For instance, in her study on advanced ESL students, Zamel (1982) talks about the three stages during the writing process which are definitely non-linear:

> Although I had anticipated presenting data that would reflect the various stages of the students' composing processes, stages usually characterized as prewriting, writing, and revising, the students' writing behaviors were not entirely amenable to this type of breakdown, a fact which in and of itself attests to the non-linear nature of writing (p. 171).

White and Arndt (1991) detail these three stages as seen in Figure 2. They describe writing as a complex process since writers have to deal with many problems at the same time. They also mention the possible influences that one stage has over another, stating the importance of the audience for whom each text is composed. There is a clear focus on the importance of the necessary knowledge of the reader that a writer should have in their study.

Figure 2: White and Arndt's Process Writing Scheme

This recursive nature of the writing process has been described within different stages and concepts as well as activities (e.g. Tobin, 2001). Figure 3 shows the description by Harmer (1998), who uses the "wheel" metaphor to define the developmental stages in process writing which have been developed in parallel with other student-oriented methodologies of the ELT classroom such as communicative language learning and collaborative language learning.

Figure 3: Harmer's Process Writing Scheme

With his "wheel" metaphor, Harmer explains that language learners move not only around the circumference, but also across the spoke, meaning that purposeful writing activities occur along with the simultaneous stages throughout the process.

Returning to the product or process discussion, it is correct to claim that one should have depended on either process or product in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Researchers were either one of the process-oriented authorities arguing for writers' choice of topics and forms, the necessity of authentic voice, the recursive form of discovery, and their personal expression; or a product-oriented scientist who believed that it is necessary to resist the process attack on rules, conventions, standards, quality, and rigor (Tobin, 2001).

On the other hand, mainly after the 1980s, some academics (e.g. Raimes, 1985; Xiao, 2011) conclude that product should not be completely ignored while focusing on process in writing studies, stating that both are needed to compose quality texts. Accordingly, students should be taught not only higher-level devices to focus on meaning and content, but also basic tools to focus on rhetorical and linguistic features. This view is also valid in today's perspectives towards writing in the ELT class, and product is still an important element of the writing curriculum mainly for testing-assessment purposes specifically in secondary schools and higher education.

To sum up, it is certain that process approaches have had a major impact on the ways writing is both understood and taught in the modern ELT world, transforming narrowly-conceived product models and raising awareness of how complex writing actually is (Hyland, 2003), though the debate remains whether process writing is actually more effective than product writing (Canagarajah, 2002). One of the most comprehensive articles about the history of process writing is Matsuda's (2003) work on process and post-process movements. He explains the shift from product-oriented methodology to process-oriented methodology:

> Process pedagogy arose in the late 1960s and the early 1970s in reaction to the dominance of a product-centered pedagogy, which has come to be known as current-traditional rhetoric. In the bad old days of current-traditional rhetoric, the story goes; students learned modes of discourse and applied them to write their five-paragraph themes on topics assigned by the teacher, which were then graded without the opportunity to receive feedback or to revise. Then, along came the advocates of process pedagogy … of helping students discover their own voice; of recognizing that students have something important to say; of allowing students to choose their own topic; of providing teacher and peer feedback; of encouraging revision; and of using student writing as the primary text of the course (p.67).

2.1.2.2. Writing as a Cognitive Process

With the increase of academic research on cognitive sciences, particularly in second language acquisition, the stages of the writing process were also analyzed considering thought procedures in the 1980s. Several researchers (e.g. Lay, 1982; Jones, 1985; Raimes, 1985; Jones and Tetroe, 1987; Zimmermann and Schneider, 1987; Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1987, 1990; Skibniewski, 1990) have used think-aloud protocols to synthesize the mental processes in the recursive nature of writing in those days. It is important to note that most of these academics are proponents of the process-oriented methodology, and they focus on mental processes to describe the process in a more complete way. In their

works, the process approach emphasizes the cognitive aspects of writing so that learners can understand how to generate ideas and how to develop them within a written structure.

Some of this research gives specific examples from different stages of the writing process, and some of it focuses on the whole process to express the mental formulations during this process. Zamel (1982), giving an example from one of the stages in process writing, asserts that planning cannot be regarded as a unitary stage but a distinctive thinking process which writers use over and over again during their composition. Holding a broader view of process, Kroll (1990) also emphasizes the importance of mental formulation in process writing, and states that "without any mental formulation of what constitutes good writing or an awareness of the steps involved in producing it, students cannot know how to proceed in the task of writing and time could not buy them anything" (p. 152).

In one of the pioneer studies making connections between process writing and cognitive pedagogy, Hayes and Flower (1980), who formulized the writing model developed by Britton et al. (1975), regard writing as a process of problem-solving which is full of communicative tasks. They underline various cognitive skills in writing such as planning and reviewing, and determine the teacher's role as a monitor rather than a director in the writing class. Hayes and Flower's goal-oriented model focuses on the communicative sides of the writing skill, and this model was applied in different studies (e.g. Hayes and Flower, 1986; Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987) later on. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) used Hayes and Flower's model in two respects. They developed a knowledge-telling strategy for young learners and inexperienced writers, and a knowledge-transforming strategy for adults and experienced writers. Knowledge-telling is a think-say method of composing a text and ideas are directly written in a text without any intervention. The produced text lacks higher-level cognitive skills like organization, relevance and coherence, and the revision process is limited to surface-based changes like structural elements after the final text. Knowledge-transforming, in contrast to knowledge-telling, takes the reader into

consideration and it involves the organization of the ideas. Ideas are actively constructed and evaluated considering communicative targets. The revision process is more extensive and involves text-based changes as well as surface-based changes. Bereiter and Scardamalia's studies have an important role in writing research as they emphasize the improvement of more intentional cognition during the process, which enables learners to fulfill the communicative goals of the writing process through mental formulations.

One example of such cognitive studies in writing is the research by Scardamalia, Bereiter, and Steinbach (1984) in which they compare two groups of children; a group given a course of instruction designed according to the principles of process writing and a group continuing with their normal everyday classroom activities. The first group was provided with a set of cards prepared to stimulate more goal-directed planning, leading to fulfilled communicative purposes in the tasks. Examples of these cues were demonstrated first by the teacher and the students were given different planning strategies. The results of the study show that the essays produced by the experimental group students shifted towards a more reflective style of composition, showing more proof of reflective and complex thought than the ones in the control group. Similar results, proving the development of higher-level cognitive skills through process writing activities and exercises, can be seen in the different research (e.g. Graham and Harris, 1989; Beal, Garrod, and Bonitatibus, 1990) done after this study.

After the 1990s, studies (e.g. Breetvelt, van den Bergh, and Rijlaarsdam, 1994; Torrance, Thomas, and Robinson, 1994; Rijlaarsdam and van den Bergh, 1996; Bourdin, Fayol, and Darciaux, 1996; Galbraith, 1996) began to focus more on the coordination of processes like the ones mentioned above, i.e. planning or revision with the other processes of writing, rather than being concerned with the nature of these processes in themselves. As for the effects of all these cognitive studies on the process writing movement and practices in the ELT classes, Johns (1990) summarizes that:

> the influence of the process approaches, especially of cognitive views, upon modern ESL classrooms cannot be exaggerated. In most classrooms, ESL teachers prepare students to write through invention and other prewriting activities …, encourage several drafts of a paper, require paper revision at the macro levels, generally through group work…, and delay the student fixation with and correction of sentence-level errors until the final editing stage (p. 26).

2.1.2.3. Writing as a Socio-Cognitive Process

As mentioned previously, the contribution of cognitivism, which has had very positive impacts on the ELT class, to process writing studies is very clear. Having seen the influence of this movement on process writing, academics started to discuss the effects of the socio-cognitive movement on writing as well, mainly in the 1990s. One of the first resources of this period is written by Bizzell (1992), who claims to diminish the authority of cognitive research on process writing, suggesting that hers is not the only legitimate kind of research in this area, and to encourage reading other kinds of work in composition studies as bearing on composing, in order to emphasize the socio-political effects on composing written products. These views can also be connected with post-process pedagogies supported by different academics (e.g. Trimbur, 1994). Trimbur (1994) uses the term 'social turn' while describing this post-process, post-cognitivist theory and pedagogy that "represent literacy as an ideological arena and composition as a cultural activity by which writers position and reposition themselves in relation to their own and others' subjectivities, discourses, practices, and institutions" (p. 109).

After the increasing effects of Vygotskyan (1978) point of view in ELT, as well as socio-cognitive pedagogies, a huge variety of collaborative activities have been designed to give students experience in the process of writing and its separate components throughout the process, including activities like journal writing, collaboration in small groups, multiple drafting, peer revision, and

writing for different audiences. However, Storch (2005) notes that it definitely requires the re-conceptualization of teaching in the ELT class to truly prepare students for these sorts of writing activities and exercises. It is also strongly believed that, even inexperienced writers may be turned into much more experienced writers in a short period as long as teachers help them reduce the difficulties they face (Shafie, Maesin, Osman, Nayan, and Mansor, 2010).

In this respect, it is also important to note that this period of writing research is quite different from the cognitivist perspectives since some prominent figures in writing (e.g. Kent, 1999; Cumming, 2001; Matsuda, 2003; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005) clearly differentiate this period from process-oriented pedagogy, using the term post-process to identify studies focusing on the social aspects of the writing process. Comparing cognitivist views with these studies, it is not wrong to say that the main philosophy of the cognitivist studies in process writing is to seek ways to improve the learners' higher-level cognitive skills. These studies haven't given up discovering the underlining pedagogies of process writing and they still continue discovering process writing (Schafer, 2001) whereas socio-cognitivists claim to have initiated a completely new era in writing studies.

According to the academics (e.g. Riazi, 1997; Burke, 2010) highlighting the importance of socio-cognitive perspectives in writing, writing can be perceived only from the perspective of social context rather than a single individual's views. Riazi (1997) states that socio-cognitive perspectives examine "how writers – from early childhood through the adult years – form interactive relationships with teachers, peers, and contexts that shape their learning, that become part of their individual thinking and part of what they write, how they write, and for whom they write" (p. 105). Accordingly, Candlin and Hyland (1999) state that it is necessary to have social understanding to perceive the extent to which writers may be seen as independent creative beings. They claim that any comprehensive explanation of individual creativity must incorporate all elements of the rhetorical situation.

It is also worth mentioning that the process movement started to be criticized in this period when social perspectives on writing were so dominant. According to Hyland (2003), the process movement is not satisfactory enough to explain the ways meanings are socially constructed in written texts, and it fails to consider the forces outside the writer which help guide purposes, establish relationships, and ultimately shape the writing process. He, furthermore, notes that:

> the process of writing is a rich collection of elements of which cognition is only one, and to understand it fully and to teach it effectively we need to include in this mix the writer's experiences together with a sense of self, of others, of situation, of purpose and – above all – of the linguistic resources to address these effectively in social action (p. 27).

In his model (see Figure 4), Hyland definitely draws attention to Vygotskyan notions of scaffolding, focusing on the independent construction of written pieces.

Figure 4: Hyland's Writing Scheme

Matsuda (2002), who is not as critical as Hyland regarding process-oriented pedagogies in writing, argues that there are three main complementary elements in the writing process, also considering the developments in the previous decades:

> (i) developing the ability to direct writing towards communicative goals; (ii) developing the ability to coordinate and manage the different processes which make up writing; (iii) developing an understanding of the social context within which the writing process is embedded and of the social process of writing (p. 197).

In his work in 2003, Matsuda also states that the process movement is the most successful pedagogical reform concerning the teaching of writing since it calls attention to aspects of writing that had been neglected in many writing classrooms for so many years.

2.1.2.4. Writing as a Collaborative Process

The main focus of the studies of the last decade after 2000 is the collaborative nature of writing, which takes its roots from Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivism with his emphasis on the role of social interaction in learning and on the concepts underlying the communicative methodologies. Different researchers such as Reid (2001), Storch (2002), Ferris (2003), and Rollinson (2005) deal mainly with the effects of group and peer activities in writing. All this literature has noted the many benefits of collaborative writing activities in the ELT class, and they are closely linked with post-process views with their focus on social aspects of writing.

Storch's (2002) classroom-based study is one of the first practical studies in this field. There are twenty-three adult ELT students completing degree courses in the study. They were given an option to compose their texts in pairs or individually. All pair work, which was the majority choice, was audio-taped and all completed texts were collected afterwards. The pairs were also interviewed

after they completed their writing sessions. The main objective of this study is to determine the reflections on collaborative writing and to compare texts produced individually with the ones written by pairs. The majority of the learners were positive about the pair work activities, and it is found that pairs wrote shorter but more quality texts regarding the issues like task fulfillment and complexity, which require higher-level cognitive skills, in contrast to the other group that work individually.

With the rapid advancements in computer technologies, different tools, programs, and platforms have been introduced through educational technologies, which also enrich the content and scope of the research in writing as a collaborative activity. Miyazoe and Anderson (2010) examine the effectiveness of three different online writing activities in formal higher education settings: forums, blogs, and wikis. Three different data collection tools were used in this quantitative and qualitative study. The survey reveals the students' positive perceptions of the blended course design with online writing, though wikis was the most favored, followed by blogs and forums. Qualitative text analysis of forum and wiki-based writings show progress in students' ability to differentiate English writing styles. The interview script analysis clarifies the different merits students perceive from each of these collaborative activities. The variations provided by blended course design also serve well in meeting the challenges, and are fun for learners.

In this respect, the intervention study by Ainley, Hidi, and Berndorff (2002) has also an important role as it investigates both collaborative writing and intervention. They use an intervention program to improve the students' cognitive skills as well as pre-test and post-test tools. The study involves a hundred and eighty students; eight classes of students from two schools in Ontario, Canada. The majority of students were sixth graders, although some older and younger students also participated in the study. The researchers tried to determine the advantages of collaborative writing activities, and they found that intervention programs including collaborative activities improve the quality of

the learners' writing significantly. The collaborative writing sessions were mainly useful for the male students, which is one of the interesting findings of the research. The study, additionally, indicates that "children's genre-specific liking and self-efficacy of writing are closely associated, and that both of these factors are also associated with their general interest in writing" (Ainley, Hidi, and Berndorf, 2002, p. 1).

Peer review is one of these writing activities that help students to explain their opinions and views more independently; nevertheless, there are reservations in terms of the validity of peer feedback (Atkinson and Connor, 2008). Reid (2001) argues that peer feedback activities provide students with authentic audiences in the second language writing class, and with discussion that leads to discovery and necessary peer feedback. Rollinson (2005) also highlights the benefits of peer review:

> Peer response operates on a more informal level than teacher response. This may encourage or motivate writers or at least provide a change from (and a complement to) the more one-way interaction between the teacher and the student, where the student may end up making revisions without necessarily agreeing with or even understanding the teacher's authoritative comments. The writer receiving comments from peers retains the right to reject comments and is thus more able to maintain the possession of her own texts (p. 25).

Writing as a collaborative process point of view can be regarded as a continuum of the socio-cognitive views on writing, yet it also includes certain aspects of process writing. Moreover, several methodologies discussed currently such as the writing studies through CMC include collaborative perspectives, which can be considered as a bridge between the first movements against the old product-oriented methodologies and the modern views on teaching / learning writing, discussed in this period.

2.1.2.5. Current Issues in Teaching / Learning Writing

As a result of drastic developments in instructional technology from the late 20th century towards the early 21st century, CMC has become one of the most popular areas of investigation for second language writing instruction. No matter were the wide range of devices (ranging from tablet PCs and smart phones to netbooks and notebooks) used in ELT classrooms, students and teachers have started to use technology more commonly nowadays. Previous pen and paper writing activities such as keeping diaries and journal writing are now being replaced with similar collaborative writing activities through tools like blogs and wikis.

Firstly, differences between using pen and paper and word processors in writing activities were analyzed in different studies (e.g. Goldberg, Russell, and Cook, 2003; van Waes and Schellens, 2003). Van Waes (2004) lists several areas where word processors can be helpful for both teachers and students in writing classes:

> In comparison with writers using pen and paper, those using a word processor (i) spent more time on a first draft and less on finalizing a text, (ii) pursued a more fragmentary writing process, (iii) tended to revise more extensively at the beginning of the writing process, (iv) attended more to lower linguistic levels (letter, word) and formal properties of the text, and (v) did not normally undertake any systematic revision of their work before finishing (p. 12).

Secondly, the benefits of using CMC tools in the ELT class have been conveyed by several researchers (e.g. Kajder and Bull, 2003; Martindale and Wiley, 2005; Brescia and Miller, 2006; Kessler, Bikowski, and Boggs, 2012) in the last decade. Most of these studies clearly highlight the areas that can be supported through blogs and wikis such as knowledge construction and collaborative learning. Suzuki (2004), making a comprehensive comparison between diaries and blogs, determines three main advantages of blogs over the previous forms of pen and paper diaries: 1) the unlimited audience numbers that a blog offers; 2)

the interactive and collaborative nature of blogs which enhances the sense of community; and 3) the immediacy feature which makes instant publishing and sharing possible. All the other areas in this comparison can be seen in detail in the chart below:

Table 1: Comparison of Diaries and Blogs (Suzuki, 2004)

	Logs, Journals, Diaries	**Blogs**
Data Entry Modes	pen on paper, word processor, audio-recording	computer keyboard, typing online into web pages / email entries
Writing Style	casual, informal, reflective	casual, informal, reflective
Archiving	entered by date, newest entry last	entered by date, newest entry first
Accessibility	limited by edition number / delayed time access only	unlimited visitor access real time / delayed time by computer
Collaborative Features	personal / collaborative	personal / collaborative / interactive (comments)
Publication	edited prior to publishing	instant publishing (editing possible)

Most of the recent studies in this field have focused on the collaborative aspects of wiki use in writing classes, and they generally convey new ways of teaching and learning writing through CMC with these web 2.0 tools or new web 3.0 platforms. Two of these academics working in this field, Chao and Lo (2011), propose a wiki-based collaborative writing approach to the writing process for ESL students. A five-stage computer-mediated collaborative writing project, including collaborative planning, partitioned drafting, peer-revising, peer-editing, and individual publishing was developed in this research in which fifty-one university students in central Taiwan participated. The researchers, eventually, conclude that a very high percentage of student satisfaction shows positive perceptions of this wiki-based collaborative writing environment and the instructional design of implementing these kinds of wiki-based collaborative

writing programs assist learners to accomplish collaborative writing tasks with less limitation of time. In similar research by Li, Chu, Ki, and Woo (2012), collaborative writing among fifty-nine Chinese students using wikis in Shenzhen, China is synthesized thoroughly. Their investigation of the student collaborative writing process and students' performance on wiki-based writing activities, illustrates that students perceive these collaborative activities as beneficial in boosting their writing motivation, increasing group interactions, and extending their audience.

One interesting area to be highlighted here is that the readiness level to use these kinds of tools is much higher in students than teachers. This situation reminds us of the discussion stated in the previous sections on teacher education and training to teach writing effectively in and out of the class. Lee (2010), using interviews and classroom research data, investigates the teachers' perspectives on their own development as teachers of writing at the end of an in-service writing teacher education program in Hong Kong. He also explores the ways in which teacher education in writing promotes teacher learning. The findings of this research show that writing teacher education can definitely broaden teachers' perspectives on the teaching of writing in today's curricula and help them construct a new identity as second language writing teachers. Nguyen and Hudson (2010) also suggest that pre-service ESL teachers are highly motivated to learn to teach English in general and teaching writing in particular but require mentors to model effective teaching practices and to share their teaching experiences regularly.

One of the current issues in writing is the formative assessment in evaluating the written work of students rather than the assessment of the final product. Especially after the declaration of the Common European Framework for Reference (2001), portfolio use in assessing writing became more important in many countries – specifically in Europe. Genesee and Upshur (1996) define portfolio:

> A portfolio is a purposeful collection of students' work that demonstrates to the students and others their efforts, progress, and achievements in given areas... Second language portfolios can have a very specific focus, such as writing, or a broad focus that includes examples of all aspects of language development. Students should have their own portfolios, which can be a conventional file folder, a small cardboard box, a section of a file drawer, or some other such receptacle (p. 99).

Focusing on their strength as an assessment tool mainly within ongoing assessment programs in a range of educational institutions, Tierney, Carter, and Desai (1991) compare portfolios and other standardized testing tools in the table below:

Table 2: Differences between Portfolios and Standardized Testing

Portfolio	Testing
Represents the range of reading and writing students are engaged in	Assesses students across a limited range of reading and writing assignments which may not match what students do
Engages students in assessing their progress and / or accomplishments and establishing on-going learning goals	Mechanically scored or scored by teachers who have little input
Measures each student's achievement while allowing for individual differences between students	Assesses all students on the same dimensions
Represents a collaborative approach to assessment	Assessment process is not collaborative
Has a goal of student self-assessment	Student assessment is not a goal
Addresses improvement, effort, and achievement	Addresses achievement only
Links assessment and teaching to learning	Separates learning, testing, and teaching

The use of portfolios in writing classes is also critical to the development of the self-evaluation capabilities of the learners as well as for the fostering of an independent learning environment. It also develops a feel of ownership by the writers for their own work. On the other hand, with the increased use of technology, e-portfolios are now becoming more popular than portfolios. Barbera (2009) asserts that e-portfolios contribute to "the continuous improvement that it can offer a student. A student does not see the work as definitive but can steadily improve it over the learning period" (p. 342).

Another issue in writing nowadays is still the discussion of writer – reader interaction, and its effects on the whole writing process. Hyland and Tse (2004) state that effective writers should anticipate the needs of readers, both to follow an exposition and to participate in an interactive dialogue, and occasionally rhetoric devices are used to perform both functions. Socio-cognitive awareness plays an important part in realizing these roles and functions as writers construct their identities from culturally available discourses in the socio-cultural context (Clark and Ivanic, 1997), and this affects the writer identity (see Figure 5).

Figure 5: Aspects in Writer Identity (Carter, Lillis, and Parkin, 2009)

Cunningsworth (1995) regards integration of language skills as the 'fifth skill', and his study is quite significant since he analyzes this within the scope of materials evaluation, suggesting six specific criteria for evaluating language skills in a global textbook. It has always been a hot debate if instructors should teach writing separately from other skills, integrate it with reading as a receptive skill, or consider it as a part of overall skills instruction. Hinkel (2006), on the other hand, argues for the integrated and contextualized teaching of multiple language skills in the ELT class, and specifically for reading, writing, and vocabulary instruction. Likewise, in their study, Lee and Muncie (2006) suggest that integrating reading, writing, and vocabulary makes vocabulary learning durable and improves writing quality. They claim that writing teachers should include as many as possible of the learning conditions to stimulate students' vocabulary production, especially in the early stages of composition writing instruction.

Lastly, peer feedback and teacher feedback are still problematic fields in the writing process. There are new studies (e.g. Poverjuc, 2011; Ali and Kabir, 2012) identifying constructive ways of providing learners with written feedback as well as striving for more effective ways of feedback (e.g. Lee, 2011; Jones, 2011). One of these recent studies by Lundstrom and Baker (2009) aims to determine which is more beneficial to improving student writing: the giving or the receiving of peer feedback in the writing class. The study was conducted at an intensive English institute in the USA with ninety-one students in nine writing classes at two proficiency levels. The "givers" reviewed anonymous papers by different students, but received no peer feedback over the course of the semester while the "receivers" received feedback, but did not review other students' writing in the same period of time. Findings show that the givers made more significant gains in their own writing over the course of the semester than did the receivers. Results also indicate that givers at the lower proficiency level made more gains than those at higher proficiency levels and that slightly more gains were observed on global rather than local aspects of writing.

Hyland (2009), while listing the current research interests in second language writing, mainly focuses on feedback in terms of student preferences and sources of feedback. Whereas the importance of peer and teacher feedback in the writing class has been highlighted in recent studies (e.g. Ferris, 2006; Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Maarof, Yamat, and Li, 2011), there are still controversial views among program designers, teachers and students on this critical issue, which is presented in detail in chapters 4 and 5 as this is one of the most interesting results of this dissertation.

To conclude, it is worth referring to Richards (2002), who writes about the major developments in the last thirty years in ELT. He states that the genre approach, which "looks at the ways in which language is used for particular purposes in particular context, i.e. the use of different genres in writing" (p. 21), has significant influence over the recent studies. He asserts that it is now necessary for second language writers to have a great amount of awareness and knowledge about contextual information as well as linguistic and rhetorical skills and sub-skills. The table below is designed to show Richards' comparison of the past and now:

Table 3: Richards' Comparison of Past and Now in Writing

Past	Now
Focus on grammar and sentence construction	Focus on text types and text organization
Learning by imitating and practicing models	Focus on effective writing strategies
Little difference between teaching of writing and teaching of grammar	Focus on composing processes
Product-based approach	Focus on genres
Feedback provided by the teacher	Use of peer feedback
Mastery of functional patterns the goal at higher levels	
Personal writing often emphasized	
Attempts to avoid errors through controlled and guided writing	

2.1.3. The Teaching / Learning of Writing within the Academic Context

Academic writing is at the heart of teaching and learning in a higher education setting, as students are assessed largely by what they write, and the need to learn both general academic conventions as well as disciplinary writing requirements is necessary to be successful in their departmental studies (Coffin, Curry, Goodman, Hewings, Lillis, and Swann, 2003). However, in contrast to these significant views, writing has always been a neglected part of second language learning programs at the tertiary level (Johns, 1981). Eighty respondents from five universities in Christison and Krahnke's (1986) research, who have completed the intensive language programs, indicate that they have used writing skills only 10% of all their time spent in their academic tasks. In this section, research on EAP programs is analyzed as well as the materials used in writing courses for these programs. Considering the fact that the dissertation includes only tertiary level programs and students, teachers and program designers in these programs, research on similar courses has been synthesized. A broader view of writing courses in these programs is presented within the main issues explained in the relevant literature.

2.1.3.1. Research within the Academic Writing Context

It is inevitable that academic writing requires certain skills and capabilities that lead students to be successful in their current and future studies, and also in their life-long learning process. These advanced skills and capabilities comprise the attitudes, knowledge, skills, and strategies that enable language learners to produce writing that satisfies the expectations of the academic discourse community in their own specific context (Campbell, 1998). In order to act as efficient instructors and writers in these educational contexts, different methodologies and pedagogies might work separately and / or in parallel with each other, which reminds us of the previous discussion of product and process pedagogies mainly in the 1990s and the 2000s.

Considering these different pedagogies, Hasan and Akhand (2010) implemented an interventionist study to examine the effects of the product and the process approaches to writing on learners' performance. Two classes at a university in Bangladesh participated in the study. Firstly, one class was instructed in the product-oriented approach, and the other received instruction in the process-oriented approach. Later, a collaborative approach was adopted. Data were collected from the learners' performance in group works, discussions, observations of learners' strategy use, and from the end products. The findings indicate that the combination of product and process-oriented pedagogies outperformed the other presentations of the learners. There is corroborating evidence to support the view that the blend of both approaches tends to facilitate learners in undertaking a writing task to be developed. Davies (1988), furthermore, proposes a combination of product and process in her discussion of the creation of a genre-based syllabus for academic writing. This is true also for other important academics in the field such as Swales (1990).

The disciplines of these tertiary level students play an important part in their overall writing processes. Hyland (2009) points out that the fact that students in different fields draw on different resources to develop their arguments in their texts, establish their credibility and persuade their readers “means that EAP teachers need to take the disciplines of their students, and the ways these disciplines create texts, into account in their classroom practices” (p. 21). However, it is extremely important for the students to have enough linguistic input within their academic discipline. For instance, Evans and Morrison (2011) examine the findings of a longitudinal study of the learning and use of English at an English medium university in Hong Kong. The aim of the investigation is to track the learning experiences of a group of twenty-eight undergraduate students and to identify the challenges they face when studying for their degrees in a second language. This article explores language related problems the students encounter in the process of adapting to an English medium learning environment during the first term of the academic year. The evidence suggests that the students’ principal sources of difficulty are comprehending and using specialist

vocabulary within their own disciplines, understanding their professors' academic requirements, and processing and producing key disciplinary genres. Gimenez (2009) also draw a similar conclusion in his research through questionnaires and comments. Having identified the discipline-specific genres that nursing and midwifery students are requested to produce, he conveyed the difficulties students are faced with and finally examined the best possible ways the students can be helped to produce these genres. Similar results about the difficulty in comprehending the content particularly due to linguistic and structural barriers can also be noticed in other studies (e.g. Salamonson, Koch, Weaver, Everett, and Jackson, 2010).

On the other hand, it is still a debatable fact whether EAP teachers should instruct writing classes with regard to different disciplines or not. About this critical issue, Spack (1988) argues that:

> English teachers cannot and should not be held responsible for teaching writing in the disciplines. The best we can accomplish is to create programs in which students can learn general inquiry strategies, rhetorical principles, and tasks that can transfer to other course work (pp. 40-41).

It is strongly believed that in order to reach a clear conclusion on what extent to which EAP instructors should deal with different academic disciplines, a needs analysis should be thoroughly performed while designing language programs, and there needs to be close cooperation between language teachers and professors in different departments.

In the academic context, Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) point out that students are required to produce specific writing genres such as a detailed essay, a summary, a critical review, and a research paper. To be successful in all these complex genres, they need to be highly motivated and provided with the necessary facilities. However, McKinley (2006), after an in-depth qualitative study conducted with English majors at a reputable university in Japan involving classroom observations, interviews, and the analysis of students' written texts,

concludes that students were provided with academic writing classes, but that the lack of emphasis on the importance of writing skills (in comparison to speaking skills, for example) seemed to greatly hinder their writing skills development. McKinley (2007) carries out similar research later on in the same context, and concludes that the overall results are quite similar to the previous research, and that there need to be extensive writing centers in each higher education setting in the country.

Considering elements like motivation and facilities, several researchers (e.g. Wingate and Tribble, 2012) seek different implementations in English-speaking contexts from those in ESL contexts. For example, Storch (2009) analyzes factors that may be motivating for students to undertake tertiary studies in Australia. In his research, the writing scripts of twenty-five students who did not access the formal language support programs offered by the university were analyzed using a range of qualitative and quantitative measures. The study reveals that after a semester of study at the university, the learners' writing improved mainly in terms of structure and the development of ideas. There is also some improvement in the formality of the learners' language but there is no evidence of improvement in linguistic accuracy or complexity. Strategies used to incorporate source materials also remain largely unchanged, with learners continuing to copy verbatim from sources and acknowledging sources incorrectly. A number of factors were put forward to explain these findings. These factors include the short duration of the study (only one semester) as well as perhaps the absence of feedback.

Another important area for the academic writing today is the pre-writing activities which are usually done through the integration of reading. Considering the reading – writing relationship in the writing programs, the texts are generally considered to be used as stimulus for the students to produce ideas about the topic they write about. This is one of the most critical considerations of both researchers and practitioners today since many students face difficulties to find relevant facts and opinions in their writing task. Accordingly, Daud (2012)

claims that the writer needs to have analytical and critical thinking skills in order to realize this process effectively:

> … critical thinking in academic writing is a manifestation of an author's ability to understand and analyze the ideas, evaluate and synthesize the arguments in a variety of sources before making any conclusions, and then presenting them clearly to an audience. It entails the ability to: understand key concepts and ideas; distinguish the main ideas and arguments from the subordinate ones; judge their relevance and provide reasons; judge the credibility of sources of information; and be able to paraphrase them and later draw conclusions based on all the justifications made (p.22).

All in all, it is important to note that similar current concerns about writing instruction are also valid in the academic writing context in general. Some common research areas on these issues within academic settings are the benefits of CMC tools (e.g. Stapleton, Helms-Park, and Radia, 2006; Sun and Cheng, 2012), the role and functions of collaborative writing activities (e.g. Shafie et al., 2010), and the successful integration of different skills (e.g. Liu, 2000) within writing instruction. All these critical issues were considered thoroughly while determining the scope of the present study as well as the main focus points taken into account in the preparation of data collection tools which is described in the next chapter in detail.

2.1.3.2. Materials within the Academic Writing Context

As this dissertation is primarily concerned with the perceptions of tertiary level program designers, teachers, and students about the materials they use in their writing classes, this part of the literature is one of the most important parts in this chapter. This section aims to provide insights about the views on academic writing materials as well as some specific research studies in the field.

Tribble (2009) categorizes EAP writing materials as intellectual / rhetorical which focus on the writer within process methodology; social / genre-focused

that highlight the writer – reader interaction within Vygotskyan methodologies; and those based on Academic Literacies principles, which "incorporates both of the other models into a more encompassing understanding of the nature of student writing within institutional practices" (Lea and Street, 1998, p. 158).

While using materials in academic writing, it is essential to consider the students' current and future needs. Vincent (1990) notes that successful writing course materials include styles appropriate to student needs and interests, and those that support students to correct their own mistakes themselves within the framework of the positive development of their writing skills and strategies. In order to achieve these academic goals and objectives, Flowerdew (2000) advises genre-based materials for teaching academic writing. He indicates that it is necessary to consider the generic move structure and the problem-solution patterns in these materials as these two features co-occur. Moreover, he stresses the importance of acknowledging the variation within genres of the types and ordering of move structures, and the variation in linguistic realizations of these move structures which are determined by contextual factors. Based on his findings, Flowerdew makes suggestions for some activities to sensitize students to some key organizational aspects of the genre under discussion. Nevertheless, he also clarifies that knowledge of a genre is not an end in itself, but should be regarded as the starting point for helping students to acquire the necessary competencies in a particular genre.

Another suggestion comes from Stapleton (2005), who discusses the importance of web-based CMC tools for academic writing courses. He mainly questions the concern about the suitability of using web-sources in academic writing in his research with Japanese, Russian, and Bulgarian tertiary level students at around the upper-intermediate level of English. Considering writer – reader interaction, it is implied in this work that writers need to find publishers to reach a wide range of audience for their pieces of work before the era of World Wide Web. Nevertheless, this notion has changed a lot recently mainly because of four major developments:

- user-friendly browsers
- sophisticated search engines
- user-friendly software for web page creation
- increasingly cheaper computers and network access

Nonetheless, it is important to stress that most of these recommendations have stemmed from the continuous discussions on whether to use global or in-house materials in academic writing classes. There has never been a clear consensus on this issue in the literature. Academics like Tribble (2009) consider global materials prepared for higher education settings as educationally valuable to students that are mainly in liberal arts composition programs, where assessment is based on this kind of personal writing; on the other hand, he finds these materials less helpful to those students in need of support in the development of evidence-based writing skills. Similarly, Lockett (1999) notes:

> The tendency towards reliance on superficial, intuitive or impressionistic notions, which gloss the real nature of academic writing has, it must be said, to some extent been purveyed by the very textbooks / writing handbooks which purport to give students useful guidelines and insights into the writing process. This sense of the relative inadequacy of some of these "secondary sources" further underlines the need for consideration of more "primary" descriptive material (p. 50).

Bridwell-Bowles (1995), having a similar point of view with Lockett and Tribble, claims that in-house materials for academic writing courses can help instructors to make the EAP classrooms vital places where students learn not only various conventions of academic writing, which are specifically useful for their current and future studies, but also the power of communication to change and transform various concepts. Harwood (2005), in his article on EAP writing materials, also discusses the certain limitations of textbooks "at least as far as EAP materials are concerned, since the unsoundness of most textbooks outweighs many, if not all, of the benefits textbooks can confer" (p. 158). One of his strongest claims in this article is that many commercial publishers' main concern today is marketability rather than focusing on educational values,

stressing that the future EAP writing textbook writers "will base their materials on books which were commercially successful, but pedagogically unsound" (p. 152). He adds that it is almost impossible to publish a successful global textbook considering the latest research because of the rapidly changing learning pedagogies. The views of textbook proponents and opponents can be seen in the table below:

Table 4: Pro- and Anti-Textbook Views (Harwood, 2005)

Strong anti-textbook	Weak anti-textbook	Pro-textbook
Textbook content, no matter how unsound and inaccurate it may be, is reified, officially sanctioned, and beyond criticism of both teachers and learners	There is scope for both teachers and learners to be misled by textbook content	Teachers and learners make their own minds up about the accuracy of a textbook's content
The individual teacher is in a better position than the textbook writer to determine an appropriate syllabus for their learners. No matter how much structure the textbook can provide, if its syllabus is unsound, teachers and learners will suffer	While the textbook can provide structure, its syllabus should be flexible enough to allow the local teacher to input additional locally appropriate content	Textbooks provide the teacher and learner with a more considered syllabus and structure than week-by-week planning on the part of the teacher
Textbook writers' (and publishers') knowledge of applied linguistics research is patently lacking	Textbooks are taking far too long to incorporate the findings of applied linguistics research	Textbooks are products of years of research and dialogue between teachers, writers and publishers
Textbooks do not make life easier for the teacher since the material will not be appropriate for local contexts and is unsound	Textbooks may make life easier for the teacher if the material is locally appropriate and pedagogically sound	Textbooks make the overworked teacher's life easier by doing their work for them
The fact a textbook is a commercial artifact means the pedagogical soundness of the materials will inevitably suffer	The fact a textbook is a commercial artifact means the pedagogical soundness of the materials may suffer	There is no inherent tension between sound pedagogy and product marketability

In addition, Stoller, Horn, Grabe, and Robinson (2006) assert that EAP professionals engage in materials development activities, since textbooks fall short in addressing specific language learning needs in higher education. They assume that in-house materials are adjusted over time in response to evolving student populations, research findings, trends in the field, and external mandates such as from administrators, governmental offices, or publishers.

On the other hand, some other academics like Bahumaid (2008), accepting the limitations of the global materials mainly due to their cultural inappropriateness and the too demanding and challenging nature of some tasks and activities for the second language teachers and learners, claim that their merits outweigh those of in-house materials. These academics highlight the strong research, longitudinal piloting processes and reviewing phases of these global materials.

It has always been a discussion point for academics (e.g. Bridwell-Bowles, 1995; Lockett, 1999; Harmer, 2001; Stoller, Horna, Grabe, and Robinson, 2006; Tribble, 2009; Mukundan, 2009) whether textbooks have more advantages or disadvantages for teachers and language learners. Tomlinson (2012) remarks that global textbooks are needed to save time and money, and it is ideal to have them as teachers want to have everything they need in one source. Yet, "in attempting to cater for all students at a particular age and level, global course books often end up not meeting the needs and wants of any" (p. 158). He concludes that, in contrast to these criticisms against global textbooks, 65% of the teachers always or frequently use a textbook according to a survey by British Council (2008).

In conclusion, it is worth focusing on the fact that there is no consensus in the literature about whether global textbooks or in-house materials are more useful for academic writing programs. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to use in-house materials at higher education settings to supplement or replace academic writing textbooks because of the different needs and requirements in terms of leraners, institutions, and other contextual factors. In this respect, Tribble's (2009) survey review is an extensive study on current published resources (see Table 5).

Table 5: Summary of Main Features of Current Academic Writing Textbooks (Tribble, 2009)

Focus	Author	Title	Publisher	Orientation	Apparent Target Users	Main Methodology	Comment
Writing	Greetham, B. (2008)	*How to Write Better Essays (Second edition)*	Palgrave Macmillan	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Mother tongue speakers of English in pre-university or higher education	Process writing	Assumes general applicability, strong emphasis on study skills and writing process.
Writing	Hamp-Lyons, L. and B. Heasley (2006)	*Study Writing (Second edition)*	Cambridge University Press	Social / Genre	Pre-sessional or in-sessional higher education courses	Analysis to Scaffolding to Independent Production	Focuses on a range of disciplinary texts. Emphasis on evidence based, factual writing.
Writing	Blass, L., H. Friesen, and K. Block (2008)	*Creating Meaning: Advanced Reading and Writing*	Oxford University Press	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Journalistic reading material linked to tasks. Texts drawn on as examples in writing tasks. Major emphasis on essay as main text type.
Writing	Savage, A. and M. Shafiei (2007)	*Effective Academic Writing 1, The Paragraph*	Oxford University Press	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Moves from 'topic – comment' paragraph structure through to five paragraph composition.

Table 5 (Contd.)

Writing	Savage, A. and M. Shafiei (2005)	*Effective Academic Writing 2, The Short Essay*	Oxford University Press	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Essay level work moves from journalistic readings, through discussion to text development / editing.
Writing	Savage, A. and M. Shafiei (2006)	*Effective Academic Writing 3, The Essay*	Oxford University Press	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Final volume deals with major essay types (process, cause –effect, comparison – contrast, argumentative).
Writing	Zemach, D. E. and C. Islam (2006)	*Writing in Paragraphs*	Macmillan Education	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Linguistically undemanding opinion based writing.
Writing	Zemach, D. E. and L. A. Rumisek (2003)	*Academic Writing: From Paragraph to Essay*	Macmillan Education	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Opinion-based writing leading to five-paragraph compositions.
Writing	McCormack, J. and J. Slaght (2005)	*English for Academic Study: Extended Writing and Research Skills*	Garnet Education	Social / Genre	Pre-sessional or in-sessional higher education courses	Reading to writing + Analysis to Scaffolding to Independent production	Focus on projects and reports in social science settings. Emphasis on evidence based, factual writing. Strong integration of academic source readings with writing.

Table 5 (Contd.)

Writing	Butler, L. (2007)	*The Longman Academic Writing, Level 1 Fundamentals of Academic Writing*	Pearson Education	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-college or pre-university programs	Process writing	Paragraph-level opinion-based writing.
Writing	Hogue, A. (2008)	*The Longman Academic Writing, Level 2 First Steps in Academic Writing*	Pearson Education	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-college or pre-university programs	Process writing	Introduction to rhetorical modes (listing, instruction, description, reasons and examples, opinion).
Writing	Oshima, A. and A. Hogue (2007)	*The Longman Academic Writing, Level 3 Introduction to Academic Writing (Third edition)*	Pearson Education	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Major paragraph types (narrative, descriptive, process, comparison / contrast) leading to essay.
Writing	Oshima, A. and A. Hogue (2006)	*The Longman Academic Writing, Level 4 Writing Academic English (Fourth edition)*	Pearson Education	Intellectual / Rhetorical	Pre-university or Freshman Year writing programs	Process writing	Major essay types (process, cause-effect, comparison-contrast, argumentative). Sentence grammar (parallel structures; noun, adverb, adjective, participial clauses).

Table 5 (Contd.)

Four Skills	Cox, K. and D. Hill (2007)	*EAP Now! Preliminary*	Pearson Education Australia	Social / Genre	Pre-college or pre-university programs	Listening, reading, and discussion + Analysis to Scaffolding to Independent production	Focus on factual writing / educational genres. Covers report, explanation, argument, correspondence, discussion, procedure, review, historical account, problem to solution.
Four Skills	Harrison, R. (2006)	*New Headway Academic Skills 1, reading, writing and study skills*	Oxford University Press	Social / Genre	Pre-college or pre-university programs	Reading and discussion + Analysis to Scaffolding to Independent Production	Focus on factual writing / educational genres: report, description, summary. Work with data. Study skills + vocabulary development.
Four Skills	Philpot, S. (2006)	*New Headway Academic Skills 2, reading, writing and study skills*	Oxford University Press	Social / Genre	Pre-college or pre-university programs	Reading and discussion + Analysis to Scaffolding to Independent Production	Focus on factual writing / educational genres: report, description, discursive essay, formal, informal emails. Work with data.
Four Skills	Philpot, S. and L. Curnik (2007)	*New Headway Academic Skills 3, reading, writing and study skills*	Oxford University Press	Social / Genre	Pre-college or pre-university programs	Reading and discussion + Analysis to Scaffolding to Independent Production	Focus on assessed essay types: comparison – contrast, persuasion, description, evaluation, discursive. Work with data. Grammar of written language.

2.2. Materials Evaluation in ELT

There are different aspects affecting the successful implementation of ELT practices such as teacher training and development, testing-assessment, and materials. Throughout the ELT curriculum, materials are essential elements, and "do more than simply lubricate the wheels of learning" (Nunan, 1988, p. 98). Nunan, furthermore, states that they could provide models of ideal practices, act as curriculum models, and fulfill a continuous language teacher development role.

Due to the importance of materials within the ELT curriculum, different aspects of materials have always been potential topics for academic research such as materials adaptation, materials development, and evaluation. According to Hutchinson (1987), materials evaluation is of such importance that it has significant influence over teacher practices in the class. He further notes that materials evaluation could also help teachers raise their awareness of their own teaching situations. Accordingly, apart from the physical characteristics of materials, teachers should be able to consider how their materials fit the needs of their own methodologies as well as their institution's overall curriculum (Litz, 2005).

2.2.1. Materials in the ELT Curriculum

Regardless of the variety of their possible forms or formats (e.g. global textbooks, in-house materials, CDs / CD-ROMs / MultiROMs / DVD-ROMs, flashcards, hand-outs, posters); it is not wrong to claim that all these materials are the essential core of any ELT program as was highlighted several times previously.

For instance, Williams (1983), Sheldon (1988), Hutchinson and Torres (1994), and Littlejohn (2011) argue that materials are essential tools and even the heart of any ELT program, and teachers should know not only how to use them effectively, but also how useful they can be for both them and their students. That is why almost all big international and regional publishers provide series of teacher training and development sessions for their commercial textbooks, particularly on how to achieve the best from them in the ELT classroom. Still, materials should be regarded as practical guidelines and tools to be used when necessary by practitioners, and should not be considered as manuals to be strictly followed in every step of the teaching process. In this aspect, Gabrielatos (2004) has a very strict point of view, claiming that some language teachers take materials as "the bible, a guide, a crutch, a necessary evil, or a burden" (p. 28). Harmer (2001) uses the term 'unthinking textbook use' to explain this unfortunate situation, and notes clearly that:

> all teachers see course books in the wrong light – as monolithic manuals which have to be followed to the letter, like play scripts. But course books are not like that and never have been. Like any lesson plan, they are proposals for action, not instructions for use. Teachers look at these proposals and decide if they agree with them (p. 8).

Tomlinson (2001) also writes about the opponents for global textbook use, mentioning their strong points of views and opinions that materials cannot cater for the diverse needs of various language users in different contexts, they impose the uniformity of syllabi and pedagogies, and they gradually remove initiative and power from teachers. Some of these claims about low-quality global textbooks and their main features are summarized by Hong Xu (2004) in this useful chart:

Table 6: Disadvantages of Textbooks

Disadvantages: Bad textbooks are	Ansary and Babaii (2002)	Britton, Gulgoz, and Glyan (1993)	Hargis (1998)	Mikk (2000)	Richards (2001)	Woodward (1993)
a disaster for a nation				√		
confining: inhibiting teachers' creativity, being too difficult for students	√			√		
not a response to all differing students' needs	√			√	√	
expensive					√	
deskilling teachers: making teachers slaves to others' judgments about what is good and what is not	√				√	
unclear, incoherent: missing important elements or links		√				
inauthentic: being prearranged sequence & structure that may not be realistic and situation-friendly	√				√	

Table 6 (Contd.)

irrelevant or uninteresting: being unclear, incoherent, missing important elements or links or distorting content	√	√	√	√
not catering for a variety of levels: satisfying every type of learning style, and every category of learning strategy that often exist in the class	√			
paralinguistic: not substituting for good language in the text		√		
written poorly		√		
not giving the desired results			√	

Some researchers (e.g. Alptekin, 1993; Renner, 1997) mainly criticized global textbooks because of a range of socio-cultural issues such as cultural bias in the content and gender-related bias. Gray (2000), on the other hand, defends textbooks, highlighting the fact that they serve as ambassadorial cultural artifacts, which is completely in contrast with the view mentioned in the previous sentence.

Having a more optimistic point of view, Cunningsworth (1984) points out that no textbook or material could exactly meet the needs of a particular teaching / learning language situation. Teachers should have to find their own ways of using them, and should make adaptations when necessary. So, there is no concept of a perfect material which meets all our requirements, but rather of the best possible fit between what they offer and what institutions, teachers and students need.

Accordingly, the usefulness of materials cannot be denied in second language learning classes as long as they are used efficiently. It should always be considered that they usually entail an enormous amount of editorial expertise, precious time and tremendous effort to be developed and produced after extensive research, different sorts of piloting procedures, and reviewing processes (Wild, 1991). Other academics like Cunningsworth (1995) and Haycroft (1998) also state the great value of materials in the teaching and learning process. It is, sometimes, time and cost-effective to benefit from textbooks contrary to the views above (Cunningsworth, 1984; McDonough and Shaw, 2003; Tomlinson, 2012). On the other hand, Hong Xu (2004) collates positive perspectives of the same academics toward the good materials as well in his second chart:

Table 7: Advantages of Textbooks

Advantages: Good textbooks are	Ansary and Babaii (2002)	Britton, Gulgoz, and Glyan (1993)	Hargis (1998)	Mikk (2000)	Richards (2001)	Woodward (1993)
accurate: containing correct, truthful, factual and accurate information			√			
a way to unite a nation: sharing national experience				√		
inexpensive: providing learning materials in an inexpensive way	√					
clear: presenting information in such a way that users understand it the first time			√			
complete: including all necessary information and only that information, being an ever-present part of classroom life			√			√
concrete: including appropriate examples, scenarios, similes, analogies, specific language, and graphics			√			
modeling language and providing input					√	
efficient					√	

Table 7 (Contd.)

field-tested in some schools				√		
tools for learners	√					
a resource or a general outline for teachers						√
long-term investments				√		
a source for novice teachers: meaning security, guidance, and support	√					√
organized: so that information is presented that makes sense to users			√			
ways to teach ideas of democracy and human rights: giving a sense of purpose	√			√		
a medium for high quality serious education: maintaining quality	√			√	√	
a source of useful learning and teaching tasks: helping users do tasks related to their work	√		√			

Table 7 (Contd.)

a framework which regulates and times the programs: sequencing and standardizing instruction	√			√	
a source that helps users retrieve information quickly and easily		√			
models of style: using correct and appropriate writing conventions and word choices		√			
a syllabus: providing structures for a program or dominating the classroom	√		√	√	√
a means of training teachers			√	√	
providing a variety of learning activities				√	
visually appealing: using visual elements to enhance meaning and attractiveness		√		√	

Hutchinson and Torres (1994), moreover, include perspectives of learners in their research study, and conclude that learners consider textbooks as a:

> framework or guide that helps them to organize their learning both outside and inside the classroom during discussions in lessons, while doing activities and exercises, doing homework and preparing for tests. A textbook enables them to learn better, faster, clearer, easier and more (p. 318).

There are several key roles and benefits of materials in the ELT curriculum, although these roles might change according to different methodologies (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Ur (1996) states that textbooks provide language practitioners and users with framework, syllabus, guidance, and autonomy. Similarly, Allright (1981) claims that materials are as necessary as teachers and learners in the learning curve as seen in his diagram below, arguing that materials directly affect all possible learning environments.

Figure 6: The Interaction Scheme for Opportunities to Learn (Allright, 1981)

As for materials roles, Cunningsworth (1995) and Richards (2001) highlight their use as appealing presentation materials and resources for communicative activities in and out of the class. In addition to these, they contain useful ideas for teachers to set their syllabi in general and main objectives in particular, which implies their support role. Additionally, Byrd (2001) stresses that materials provide most of the content for the teaching / learning activities that shape much of what happens in the ELT class, and, Garinger (2001) focuses on their crucial roles in lessening preparation time through ready-made activities. Considering language learners, materials are quite beneficial resources for self-directed learning, leading learners to perform as autonomous individuals rather than in traditional student roles.

2.2.2. The Main Issues in Materials Evaluation

Having been presented with a brief overview of materials in ELT and materials evaluation, there is a need for more insight into materials evaluation practices and the concerns regarding them since these are required to better understand one of the main aspects of this dissertation. However, it should be noted that these practices are sometimes too complex since materials evaluation is not fundamentally based on definite formulas, grids or systems (Sheldon, 1988). Allright (1981) highlights this complexity by writing about the impossibility of meeting all specific needs through a pre-packaged set of decisions which are embodied in materials. Accordingly, Sheldon (1988), and McDonough and Shaw (2003) conclude that materials evaluation is a very important professional activity for all ELT teachers. Inal (2006), for example, stresses that a mistaken selection in materials often results in the unsuccessful implementation of the whole program since in-house training facilities are generally very limited. Similarly, Harmer (2001) states that “previous decisions about the exact syllabus and the textbook to be used can often tie teachers to a style of teaching and to the content of the classes” (p. 256).

In parallel with these views, Nunan (1991) notes that, evaluating materials, beliefs, and preferences about the nature of language and learning are also as important as matching possible materials with the goals and objectives of the program. Another necessary part of evaluation is the involvement of the different participants, and Clarke (1989) considers this as the neglected possibilities of engaging particularly learner opinion and creativity. Thus, it is not wrong to state that there are different variables within materials evaluation, and "in any kind of evaluation, the decision finally made is likely to be the better for being based on a systematic check of all the important variables" (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987, p. 96). In the next two sections, these variables are analyzed in detail within different evaluation models / types and checklists.

As well as these variables, there are limitations in materials evaluation since most of the literature on materials evaluation focuses on procedures of evaluating materials and on the development of principled criteria and checklists with lots of suggested items. Moreover, very few of them present "the findings of actual evaluation of the materials for the obvious reason that most evaluations are confidential to publishers, to Ministries of Education or to institutions" (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010, p. 16). Another limitation is the fact that the majority of the studies focus on commercial textbooks, and few deal with in-house materials. Within the checklist prepared for this study, it is assumed that both kinds of academic writing materials could be synthesized in detail.

2.2.3. Materials Evaluation Models / Types

The materials evaluation process has generally been considered to rely on certain stages and phases, and these stages have been presented through different evaluation types, models, and frameworks. One of the first models used in this aspect is the four-stage one by Hutchinson and Waters (1987), who focus on the objectivity in materials evaluation, in which they see the overall evaluation primarily as matching:

Figure 7: Hutchinson and Waters' Materials Evaluation Model

One of the most commonly used materials evaluation models is Cunnigsworth's (1995) three stages to differentiate these evaluation types; pre-use evaluation, in-use evaluation, and post-use evaluation. Pre-use evaluation is considered to be the most difficult stage since there is no experience of material use due to the fact that it is carried out to determine the material to be used before a course starts. It is matching the material "against a specific requirement including the learners' objectives, the learners' background, the resources available, etc." (Cunningsworth, 1995, p. 14). Tomlinson (1998) considers pre-use evaluation as a type in which "the evaluator identifies a set of criteria which is used to reach a decision regarding which book to adopt and how it needs to be adapted" (p. 220). He defines in-use / whilst-use evaluation type as the one in which the main focus is on the awareness and the description of what teachers and learners have actually been doing since the material was adopted. The main purpose of this evaluation is to measure the potential of what teachers and learners could do with these materials in the classroom (Rubdy, 2003). In this evaluation, it is possible to check various areas like:

- Clarity of instructions
- Attractiveness of topics and texts
- Flexibility of the language items and tasks
- Motivation of the students

McGrath (2006) develops a systematic approach to in-use evaluation using a record-keeping system and observation sheets. A record sheet could show the parts of the material which have been used or not used by the teacher in class. This sheet could also include explanations for why these parts have not been used and how they can be adapted to suit the learners' needs more efficiently. As with observation sheets, teachers could write down the types of difficulties that their students are having with the materials as well as their own reactions to the material.

Considering post-use evaluation, which is carried out at the end of a specific term when the material has been used, it is generally used to decide if the material will be used again or not, or what kinds of adaptations are needed for the material to be used in forthcoming classes. According to Tomlinson (2003), "it can measure the actual outcome of the use of the materials and thus provide the data on which reliable decisions about the use, adaptation or replacement of the materials can be made" (p. 25); he also claims that this type of evaluation is the most valuable evaluation. In addition to these uses, post-use evaluation provides teachers with the opportunity to reflect and revise their own teaching processes, leading them to be reflective teachers. Some possible areas to be checked in this evaluation are:

- The linguistic achievements of the students
- The skills and sub-skills that the students have gained
- To what extent the material got the students prepared for exams
- The areas that haven't been dealt with through the material

Litz's (2005) quantitative study in South Korea which includes eight university instructors and five hundred tertiary level students is a good example of post-use materials evaluation research. Through questionnaires, he seeks the perceptions about the pedagogical values of the materials as well as other issues like layout and design. As the current study was carried out towards the end of the academic year in all of the three contexts involved, it can also be regarded as a post-use materials evaluation study.

Another very well-known model is suggested by McDonough and Shaw (1993, 2003) who developed three stages for materials evaluation: external evaluation, internal evaluation, and overall evaluation. External evaluation, which can be regarded as an initial evaluation, is generally implemented to check two aspects of the materials: 1) the claims made on the cover of the materials; and 2) the introductory information. The evaluator could reach conclusions about different aspects of the material through this basic information like:

- Language level
- Target audience
- The context for which the material has been developed
- Main methodologies
- Available components
- Layout and design
- Cultural issues

Then the evaluator should make an "in-depth investigation into the materials" (McDonough and Shaw, 1993, p. 75), which is called an internal evaluation. McDonough and Shaw (2003) summarize this second stage:

> The essential issue at this stage for us is to analyze the extent to which the aforementioned factors in the external evaluation stage match up with the internal consistency and organization of the materials as stated by the author/publisher (pp. 66-67).

While implementing an internal materials evaluation, these factors can be synthesized thoroughly:

- Flow of the content
- Unit structure
- Skills and sub-skills covered
- Appropriacy of topics and texts
- Activities and exercises
- Testing-assessment tools
- Learning styles and strategies

The last stage, the third, of the evaluation, according to McDonough and Shaw (2003) is an overall evaluation through which the evaluator can focus on the integration of the material with the overall language syllabus as well as its overall role in the general ELT curriculum of the institution(s). There are four factors in this stage:

- Usability factor
- Generalizability factor
- Adaptability factor
- Flexibility factor

Researchers like Murdoch (2000) and Atkins (2001) used McDonough and Shaw's model in their studies in Asian countries. In the current study, these three stages above are used with the necessary modifications and changes so that the checklist of items is relevant to the research questions and the scope of the study. In his research, Atkins (2001) looks at the external characteristics of the material including the book's introduction, table of contents, the claims made on the cover of the student's and teacher's books, the publisher's catalog and the internet homepage. Then, internal analysis starts, during which the presentation of the skills in the material, appropriateness of discourse, authenticity of listening topics, the appropriateness of speaking materials and the effectiveness of the teachers' guide have been analyzed. His basic findings are that the material is

still based on PPP (presentation, practice, production), the teacher's guide should provide alternative ways for teaching the same lesson, and the book could be adapted and edited to provide a usable textbook.

Ellis (1997) is another important figure in this field with his well-known two kinds of materials evaluation: predictive evaluation and retrospective evaluation. The first evaluation is carried out by teachers and / or program designers to evaluate the available materials "to determine which are best suited to their purposes" (p. 36). Therefore, it is almost the same as the pre-use evaluation mentioned by Cunningsworth (1995) above. Retrospective evaluation is also very similar to the post-use evaluation since it checks if the material has worked well or not in the learning environment. Ellis (1997) states that most of the literature has dealt with predictive evaluation types and models, and most of the retrospective evaluation research has been carried out on language programs rather than materials (e.g. Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001). He points out that retrospective evaluation also checks the validity of predictive evaluation. While discussing his retrospective study, Ellis (1997) refers to micro-evaluation and macro-evaluation studies, two terms used before by McDonough and Shaw (1993) in order to define their internal evaluation and external evaluation:

Figure 8: McDonough and Shaw's Materials Evaluation Model

In the same article, Ellis (1997) defines these two materials evaluation types clearly with specific examples from previous studies and implementations:

> A macro-evaluation calls for an overall assessment of whether an entire set of materials has worked. To plan and collect the necessary information for such as empirical evaluation is a daunting prospect. In a micro-evaluation, however, the teacher selects one particular teaching task in which he or she has a special interest, and submits this to a detailed empirical evaluation. A series of micro-evaluations can provide the basis for a subsequent macro-evaluation. However, a micro-evaluation can also stand by itself and can serve as a practical and legitimate way of conducting an empirical evaluation of teaching materials (p. 37).

In micro-evaluation, generally specific tasks and activities in the material are evaluated, and Ellis (1997) determines seven steps in evaluating a task: choosing a task to evaluate, describing the task, planning the evaluation, collecting the information for evaluation, analyzing the information, reaching conclusions and making recommendations, and writing the report.

Ayman's (1997) evaluation of in-house EAP materials considering perceptions of tutors and students is a good example of macro-evaluation studies. In her case study, she asks questions about physical appearance, coverage and content, organization and linkage, level, activities, supporting resources, and the teacher's book of these materials to ninety upper-intermediate level students and forty-five teachers at a higher education setting in Turkey. The questionnaires are followed by interviews with both students and teachers. Though the results are positive concerning the materials in general, there are some specific issues for development about the content and the teacher's book.

There are other frameworks (e.g. Grant, 1987) which either mainly influence or were influenced by the evaluation models mentioned above. In the next section, both theoretical views on the checklists and several practical studies that have used them are presented.

2.2.4. Materials Evaluation Checklists

One of the main critical points for a reliable and valid study of materials evaluation is the list of items it uses as a checklist. A checklist – quantitative or qualitative – is a very useful research instrument that helps ELT practitioners and researchers to evaluate language teaching materials for any stage of the evaluation. Even though it is much easier to have more in-depth information through qualitative checklists generally having open-ended questions, quantitative scales like Likert style rating scales make quantitative checklists more objective and more reliable instruments than qualitative ones. Still, Mukundan and Ahour (2010) indicate that most of the checklists used in the literature are qualitative (e.g. Sheldon, 1988; Harmer, 1991; Hemsley, 1997; Richards, 2001; McGrath, 2002; Driss, 2006). In the present study, checklists for teachers and program designers include both quantitative (e.g. Likert style items) and qualitative items (e.g. open-ended questions) in order to find out more detailed input from these participants. Qualitative data from students have been obtained through interviews which were also been held with teachers and program designers.

Moreover, in order to be especially useful for development and evaluation purposes in these sorts of research studies, these criteria should be unambiguous, answerable, specific, and valid (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2004). In addition to these, the checklist needs to be focused, and the number of items used should be limited to manageable proportions so as not to be too detailed (Cunningsworth, 1995) or distracting. To be positioned within these requirements, different methods have been implemented for the checklists in this empirical research, such as having the views from a variety of experts in the field as well as those of the program designers, piloting studies with a representative number of samples, and simplification and translation in the language of the items in the checklist used.

Many researchers evaluating educational materials – global or in-house – have used these checklists; nevertheless, McDonough and Shaw (2003) strongly suggest considering local contexts and considerations while developing these criteria and checklists. It is very unlikely that a published checklist like the ones mentioned above could be used without modifications and / or adaptations in research (Richards, 2001) since there can be no one ideal framework for the evaluation of materials in various contexts. In this aspect, Tomlinson (2001) argues that the checklist used must be determined by the specific reasons, the objectives, and the circumstances of the evaluation study. Accordingly, even though the framework by McDonough and Shaw (2003) was the basis used in the current study, significant adaptations were made due to the specific nature of the study within the academic writing context and the materials used in this context, and these adaptations are conveyed in detail in the next chapter – Method.

Accordingly, the master thesis by Al-Yousef (2007) is a very good example of an adapted checklist since he uses Cunnigsworth's (1995) framework, which contains forty-five questions, covering a wide variety of criteria such as the aims and the objectives, the design and the layout, the language content, the language skills, and the methodology as well as practical considerations such as the cost and the obtainability, as the basis of his checklist. However, he makes necessary adaptations and modifications to his checklist which he calls "Textbook Evaluation Tools", and implements it using a hundred and eighty-four teachers and students in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. This evaluation was followed up with unstructured interviews.

While presenting his framework with these forty-five questions mentioned above, Cunningsworth (1995) points out four necessary criteria to evaluate materials in the second language programs:

- They should correspond to the learners' needs, and match the program aims and objectives.
- They should reflect the uses (present or future) which learners will make of the language, help learners equip to use language effectively for their own purposes.
- They should consider students' needs as learners and should facilitate their learning processes rather than imposing a rigid method.
- They should have clear roles as support for learning. Like teachers they mediate between the target language and the learner.

As seen above, one of the first common checklists used in materials evaluation was prepared by Tucker (1975). He conveys three critical areas in order to have a successful checklist: 1) a set of criteria consistent with basic linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical values; 2) a rating scheme providing a method for judging the comparative evaluations of the material; and 3) a chart or graph showing a quick display of the evaluator's judgments on the analysis of the material. Besides, it is also worth mentioning that Tucker (1975) was the first to start to write about external and internal evaluation frameworks mentioned previously.

Though it is dated in the 1970s, Azizifar, Koosha, and Lotfi (2010) used Tucker's framework to evaluate two textbooks used in secondary schools. They made some adaptations to Tucker's framework considering that his evaluation is more appropriate to structural syllabi while they mean to analyze communicative competence in their materials. They excluded the general criteria in the framework and kept the relevant items based on pronunciation, grammar, and content since these are the areas to be targeted in the research. Consequently, they state that the shortcomings of their materials "to accord with the communicative aspects of language teaching – or specifically syllabus design and text construction – are more revealed through applying the content criteria" (p. 140).

On the other hand, local and universal elements in these checklists have always been questioned, so Richards (2001) proposes some major issues to be covered among all these items in the checklists:

- **Program factors**, questions about the concerns of the program. For example, Item 10 in the questionnaires for the current study: "The material serves the program objectives and requirements in terms of the writing class."
- **Teacher factors**, questions about teacher concerns. For instance, Item 37 in the questionnaires for this research: "The content of the material can be adapted easily."
- **Learner factors**, questions about learner concerns. For example, Item 27 in the questionnaire for students in the present study: "I can develop my writing skills and strategies (i.e. brainstorming, planning, editing, and revising) through a variety of activities and tasks in the material."
- **Content factors**, questions about the content and organization of the material. For instance, Item 21 in the questionnaires for the present study: "There are clear linguistic (i.e. grammar) tips and guidelines for the students to help them through their writing process."
- **Pedagogical factors,** questions about the principles underlying the material. For example, Item 26 in the questionnaires for this study: "There are free writing activities and tasks in the material that improves students' imagination and creativity."

As seen above, Richards' (2001) universal elements are quite helpful as a basis in developing specific checklists for research purposes in materials evaluation; whereas Sheldon (1988) emphasizes that a global list of criteria can never apply in most environments.

Previously, Grant (1987), who regards materials evaluation as an ongoing process, presents a model he called CATALYST due to the first letters of his eight criteria:

> **C**ommunicative? Is the text book communicative? This question aims to find out whether the students after using this book will be able to use the language to communicate.
>
> **A**ims? Does it fit in with the aims and objectives?
>
> **T**eachable? Does the course seem teachable? Does it seem reasonably easy to use, well organized, and easy to find your way round?
>
> **A**vailable Add-ons? Are there any useful add-on-additional materials such as teacher's books, tapes, workbooks, etc.?
>
> **L**evel? Does the level seem out right?
>
> **Y**our impression? What's your overall impression of the course?
>
> **S**tudent interest? Are the students likely to find the book interesting?
>
> **T**ried and tested? Has the course been tried and tested in real classrooms? Where? By whom? What were the results? How do you know? (pp. 119-120)

As for the evaluation model to be used with this CATALYST test, Grant (1987) suggests three stages in applying these questions: initial evaluation, detailed evaluation, and in-use evaluation.

The questionnaires developed for the present study have some items relevant to Grant's model such as "The material has useful additional resources (i.e. extra resources, guidelines) to fit into the program." (relevant to Available Add-Ons), "The material is appropriate to the English language level of the students." (relevant to Level) or "The material includes attractive and up-to-date topics / themes and texts that hold the attention of the students." (relevant to Student interest).

Another checklist offered in this field is by Littlejohn (1998, 2011), whose items are based on three aspects: 1) What is there?, 2) What is required of users?, and 3) What is implied? At the first level, there are items that seek information about the physical properties of the material such as layout, durability, availability, and

illustrations. At the second level, a detailed task analysis is required, including all language related exercises and activities in the material. At the third level, items seek to gather information about the approach, the philosophy and the overall aims of the textbook. As observed in the ordering, there is a move from a more objective way of analysis towards a more subjective evaluation.

Ur's (1996) set of general criteria for assessing any language teaching textbooks includes a list of several criteria composed of nineteen items. Some of these items, which she called features, are about aims and objectives, methodological approach, layout and design, topics and tasks, clarity of instructions, coverage of syllabus, content, review and test sections, authentic language use, good pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar explanation and practice, fluency practice in all four skills, learning strategies, and guidance for teachers. Her rating is based on a five point scale: very important, fairly important, not sure, not important, and totally unimportant, and this framework is generally considered to be user-friendly and easy to adapt.

One of the most common checklists used in materials evaluation studies is the one by McDonough and Shaw (2003). While stating their three-stage evaluation model – external evaluation, internal evaluation, and overall evaluation – they also suggest possible items to be put into these three stages. Some of these items, which are also used in the development of the questionnaires of the present study, are listed below:

- **External Evaluation**
    - Is the language level of the material appropriate to the target users?
    - What is the teaching / learning context in which the materials are to be used?
    - How has the language been presented and organized into teaching units / lessons?
    - What visual materials does the book contain?

- **Internal Evaluation**
    - What form does the presentation of skills in the material use?
    - Do you feel that the material is suitable for different learning styles?
    - Are the materials sufficiently transparent to motivate both students and teachers?
    - Where reading / "discourse" skills are involved; is there much in the way of appropriate text beyond the sentence?
- **Overall Evaluation**
    - Is it easy to adapt the material to different learning situations?

There are several other academics (e.g. Hu, 1998; Gearing, 1999; Kilickaya, 2004; Rahimy, 2007; Chan, 2009) proposing their own checklist models. For example, another checklist proposed in materials evaluation is the one prepared by Ellis and Ellis (1987). They suggest three main criteria: relevance, accessibility, and cohesion. In Dougill's (1987) checklist, the main headings are the framework, the units, the subject matter, the form and the course components. Sheldon (1988) provides an expansive checklist including fifty-three questions classified under seventeen main criteria: rationale, availability, user definition, layout / graphics, accessibility of the units and exercises, linkage, selection and grading, physical characteristics, suitability, authenticity, sufficiency of exercises or activities, cultural bias, educational validity, practice and revision, flexibility, guidance and overall value for money. The assessment in Sheldon's checklist is based on a four point scale: poor, fair, good, and excellent. Some others such as Cunningsworth (1995) suggest specific checklists such as the ones for materials on vocabulary development or there are several checklists (e.g. Sheerin, 1989; Jones, 1993; Reinders and Lewis, 2006) about self-access materials.

Mukundan and Ahour's (2010) work on textbook evaluation checklists is quite useful to obtain an impression of all the remarkable checklists in the field since 1970s in chronological order (see Table 8).

Table 8: Textbook Evaluation Checklists (2000s)

Checklist	Section	Quantitative	Qualitative	Running words
Byrd et al. (2001)	4	Yes	-	163
Richards (2001)	3	-	Yes	222
Zabawa (2001)	10	Yes	Yes	585
Garinger (2001)	2	-	Yes	196
Garinger (2002)	4	-	Yes	218
Ansari et al. (2002)	4 (Outline)	-	-	160
Krug (2002)	3+1TG	-	Yes	498
Los Angeles Uni. School District Textbook Evaluation (2002)	2	Yes	-	338
McGrath (2002)	4	-	Yes	81
McDonough et al. (2003)	2	-	Yes	333
Rubdy (2003)	3	-	Yes	1692
Canado et al. (2005)	4	Yes	-	626
Litz (2005)	7	Yes	-	2534
Miekley (2005)	2+1TG	Yes	-	1357
Nuttall (2005)	General	-	Yes	266
Diss (2006)	5	-	Yes	99
Rahimy (2007)	3	-	Yes	207
Textbook Evaluation based on ACTFL standards (2008)	2	Yes	Yes	911
Textbook Evaluation form – Crystal Springs Books (2008)	17	Yes	-	677

They analyzed forty-eight checklists, and nineteen of these, as seen above, were prepared in the 2000s. All these checklists reviewed and partially used in this study are selected based on references made to them in academic works. The main aim of this study is to present the typical lengths of checklists in materials evaluation studies, and to state the most frequent criteria within them.

Another similar study was carried out by Mukundan, Hajimohammadi, and Nimehchisalem (2011), who focus on the main considerations for developing materials evaluation checklists. Based on their extensive review of relevant literature, these researchers have created a tentative classification of materials evaluation criteria as seen in Figure 9. They determined two main areas in their criteria: general attributes and learning / teaching content. They concluded that it is possible to refine these criteria through quantitative and qualitative studies such as focus group interviews.

Figure 9: Classification of Textbook Evaluation Criteria
(Mukundan, Hajimohammadi, and Nimehchisalem, 2011)

Having analyzed different checklists since the 1970s, Jalali (2011) concludes that there are common items in almost all well-known checklists produced: practical consideration, aims and objectives, vocabulary explanation and practice, grammar presentation and practice, approaches, periodic review and test sections, appropriate visual materials available, interesting topics, clear instructions, content presentation, plenty of authentic language, skills, and encouragement for learners to develop their own learning strategies and to become independent learners.

In general, the main tendency today, while creating checklists, is to benefit from the different checklists developed previously, and to have the relevant items necessary for the study. These adaptations are generally made considering the unique aspects of each study. For instance, Rahman (2012) has developed twenty-two multiple choice items in a four point Likert scale, using different categories determined by various academics like Sheldon (1988) and Cunningsworth (1995). To analyze various aspects of the textbook used such as content, presentation, organization, and exercises, the questionnaire was applied to twenty-two teachers at the preparatory year program. He concludes that "the book needs some modification, addition, subtraction, hence a total revision" (p. 714).

Another study at the same time using different checklists was carried out by Khafaji (2004), who evaluates the materials used to teach English to secondary level students. Three checklists have been used in this research; Cunningsworth's (1995) checklist to evaluate the textbook as a whole, Littlejohn's (1998) framework to evaluate one unit of the textbook with reference to the sections related to this particular unit in the teacher's guide, and a checklist adopted from both to evaluate the reading skill in the material. Consequently, the evaluator states that the materials have failed to provide the students with an adequate source of interesting and academically purposed substance to achieve their aims and objectives in the program. Furthermore, it is revealed that the teacher's guide's total control over the teachers resulted in having materials taught with

less diversity and flexibility. Lastly, it is demonstrated that the audio-lingual approach, which is the underlying approach in teaching the materials evaluated, has been a factor in limiting the capabilities of accomplishing the aims and objectives of learning the second language in that specific context.

It is positive that researchers develop their own checklists in view of contextual needs, considering previous frameworks; however, the reliability and the validity of these kinds of checklists should also be borne in mind with specific considerations. In this respect, Tomlinson and Masuhara (2004) propose the following conditions to check the practicality of the criteria in the checklist, claiming that very few of the checklists used satisfy these conditions:

- Is each question an evaluation question?
- Does each question only ask one question?
- Is each question answerable?
- Is each question free of dogma?
- Is each question reliable in the sense that other evaluators would interpret it in the same way?

Bahumaid (2008), for instance, develops a unique model which is a kind of customizing procedure for material evaluators called the MIRACLES Test that entails:

- **M**anageability of the evaluation form
- **I**ntegratedness of the evaluation form
- **R**elevance of the evaluation criteria to the course, teacher, and learner
- **A**pplicability of the evaluation criteria
- **C**larity and specificity of the evaluation criteria
- **L**ogicality of the evaluation criteria
- **E**xtent of coverage of the evaluation criteria
- **S**coreability of the evaluation criteria

In Chapter 3, the practical studies to check the validity and the reliability issues of the data collection tools used in the present study are presented in detail.

As a result of this literature review, it is not wrong to claim that the number of post-use evaluation studies in academic writing materials, specifically on in-house materials, is not that large considering the number of similar studies in other areas of ELT.

In the next chapter, Method, the methodological background of the present study is discussed in detail making clear references to the relevant literature summarized in this chapter to make the necessary connections between this research and the literature.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.0. Introduction

This chapter aims to present the research design, the data collection and the analysis procedures of the present study in detail. In the first part of the chapter, the research questions, the overall research methodology, and the participants, as well as their institutions, are presented along with the rationale for their selection. Some background information about the research methodology and the three different higher education institutions in which the study was carried out is also provided.

In the second part, the data collection tools and the data analysis procedures are discussed. Also in this part, the checklist prepared for this empirical study and the whole data collection process are explained with specific references to the relevant literature examined in the previous chapter. It is expected that this part will provide some essential information about the research methodology in order for researchers and practitioners to reach a coherent understanding regarding the findings of the study, which are presented in Chapter 4.

3.1. The Research Design

This empirical research is a collective case study analyzing the perceptions of the program designers, the teachers, and the students at the tertiary level concerning the materials they have used in their academic writing courses through both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools: questionnaires and interviews.

3.1.1. The Research Questions

As mentioned in the Introduction, the following two main research questions – along with the three sub-questions for each – guide the present study:

1. To what extent are the materials – both global and in-house – used in academic writing programs at the tertiary level appropriate to the contextual needs?

    a. To what extent do these materials serve the program requirements?
    b. To what extent are they in parallel with the teachers' teaching techniques and expectations?
    c. To what extent do they meet the needs and the interests of the students?

2. What are the main considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students concerning academic writing materials used at the tertiary level?

    a. What are the main considerations of the program designers when adopting / developing their academic writing materials?
    b. What are the main considerations of the teachers when using academic writing materials?
    c. What are the main considerations of the students when studying their academic writing materials?

3.1.2. The Research Methodology

The present research is a collective case study which was carried out in six departments (preparatory year programs and freshman year language programs) of three state universities in three different settings and regions – Budapest, Hungary; Ankara, Turkey; and Rustaq, Oman – during which quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative (semi-structured interviews) data collection tools were implemented.

According to Yin (2003), case studies are the type of research that is used to conduct an empirical investigation of a contemporary phenomenon (i.e. event, activity, program, material) within their natural context using multiple sources of data and evidence. He further emphasizes their wide range of use in academic studies pertaining to the social sciences, particularly in recent years. On the other hand, like any other research methodology, case studies also have several advantages and disadvantages as summarized in the following table by Lauckner, Krupa, and Paterson (2007):

Table 9: The Strengths and Weaknesses of Case Studies

Strengths	Weaknesses
Appropriate for examining a "contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2003, p. 13), which describes the context-specific practice of OTs working in CD	Poorly defined data analysis process (Yin, 2003), but can follow any number of analysis methods (Merriam, 1998)
Enables the exploration of complex situations, allowing for the gathering of multiple perspectives, from a range of sources, including contextual information	On-going debate of whether case study constitutes a method describing what is studied oral research tradition outlining how the case is approached
Particularly useful when looking at a process; and case studies answer "how" questions (Yin, 2000), which is compatible with the research question of this study	
There are a range of case study types that can be used to gather required data (Yin, 2000; Stake, 1995)	

Table 9 (Contd.)

Multiple case study with variety across cases ensures richness and depth in order to understand the shared phenomenon of interest (Anaf, Drummond, and Sheppard, 2007; Stake, 2000, 2006)

Stake (1995) lists the types of case studies based on the purpose of the inquiry:

- instrumental case studies to provide insight into an issue
- intrinsic case studies to gain a deeper understanding of the case
- collective case studies to inquire into a particular phenomenon within a number of cases

Anaf, Sheppard, and Drummond (2007) report that a collective case study design can promote richness, depth, and complexity that are drawn from the multiple events that help a researcher to understand the phenomenon of interest that is shared among the diverse cases. Dörnyei (2007) also notes that multiple case designs are worth using to avoid "the heightened vulnerability of this method [case study] in terms of idiosyncratic unpredictability and audience criticality" (p. 155). Yet, collective case studies risk reducing complex cases to a few comparable variables, resulting in the loss of the idiosyncrasies of the individual cases (Stoecker, 1991). On the other hand, Creswell (1998) argues that no more than four settings should be examined to allow individual cases to be adequately explored. Thus, the variety of settings was limited to three cases in this research.

Collective case study design has been used widely in different ELT research (e.g. Sert, 2008; Parra, 2009; Troudi and Alwan, 2010; Kane, 2010; Kissinger, 2011; Xie and Sammon-Lohse, 2012) recently, as well as in materials evaluation studies (e.g. Johnson, Kim, Fang, Nava, Perkins, Smith, Soler-Canela, and Lu, 2008). Johnson et al. (2008), for instance, investigate the textbook evaluation techniques of novice and experienced teachers, and use think-aloud protocols to support the design. Similarly, the data obtained in this study through the questionnaires, are supported with the semi-structured interviews.

The main reason for adopting a collective case study design in this longitudinal research is to achieve an in-depth analysis of the materials used within a variety of perspectives and settings. Another critical reason to use a case study approach is that there is no clear prescription and / or prediction in this research since the whole purpose is to explore the cases in the academic writing context thoroughly. Lastly, it was noticed that most of the materials evaluation studies (e.g. Ayman, 1997; Yakhontova, 2001; Thein, 2006) had been carried out in single places, but it is expected to give more insights into the future studies if different voices in different regions have been taken into account considering the fact that most of the concerns in academic writing and materials evaluation in ELT are universal concepts and issues.

One concern about case studies is the ethical considerations such as confidentiality. All participants, all of whom are above eighteen, were asked in writing and orally to be volunteers in this study, and individuals who did not want to be were excluded. Also, all necessary information (i.e. consent forms – see Appendix A) about the ethical issues was shared with the Applied Ethics Research Center at Middle East Technical University before the research, and similar procedures were implemented with the authorities in the other two universities.

Another consideration while using case studies in multiple settings is the amount of time to be spent on each case. In order to use the time efficiently, convenient places among the candidate institutions in these three completely different regions have been selected carefully, and all appointments with the participants were arranged meticulously in each setting thanks to the support and the understanding of the relevant institutional authorities, who also helped the researcher with the necessary permissions to implement the research.

On the other hand, due to its subjective nature, case studies are generally supported with either quantitative or qualitative research tools in the social sciences. Stake (1995) notes three points about the differences between these

two: 1) quantitative work seeks to explain while qualitative work seeks to understand; 2) the personal and impersonal role of the researcher differs in the two research styles; and 3) the quantitative researcher seeks to discover knowledge while the qualitative researcher seeks to construct it. For this study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were developed and implemented to explore the cases since the main purpose is not only to explain and to discover the situations, but also to understand and to construct them.

3.1.3. The Participants

All the participants in this research are program designers, teachers, and university students at preparatory year programs (PYP) and freshman year programs (FYP) at Eötvös Lorand University, Middle East Technical University, and Colleges of Applied Sciences. In the PYPs, students are generally mixed in terms of their main disciplines ranging from Engineering and Architecture to Education and International Relations; however, in the FYPs, students at these institutions attend all English language courses, including the academic writing lessons, in their own departments such as Mathematics, Computer Engineering or Dentistry.

There are four major reasons for the selection of these three universities (and the two departments within each university) for this study. Firstly, the number of cases in these kinds of collective case studies should be manageable (Harling, 2002): "Too few and generalization is impossible; too many and depth of understanding is difficult to achieve" (p. 2). Accordingly, a representative number of participants at three universities was determined to participate in this study. Secondly, the majority of recent materials evaluation studies are carried out either in Asian countries – specifically in the Far East (e.g. Murdoch, 2000; Atkins, 2001; Ranalli, 2002; Otlowski, 2003; Litz, 2005; Davies, 2006; Brunton, 2009; Lawrence, 2011) – or in English native-speaking countries such as Australia and Canada (e.g. Basturkmen, 1999; Hong Xu, 2004; Vellenga, 2004).

However, since roughly only one out of every four users of English in the world is a native speaker of the language (Crystal 2003), most interactions in English – even in the academic world – take place in non-native speaking contexts. Thus, academic contexts within non-native speaking countries in the Middle East, Turkey, and Central Europe have been identified for this study. Thirdly, one-year preparatory programs at universities, in which around twenty hours or more of intensive English per week is offered, are unique to GCC such as the UAE and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and a few central European countries, to some extent, such as Hungary and the Netherlands. These intensive second language programs are worth investigating since they are relatively new courses in relation to the usual ELT programs before the freshman year. Finally, all three of these institutions are very well-structured, well-known and prominent state universities specifically in their own countries and their second language learning courses are extremely popular. Besides, they all support EAP courses, and the role of academic writing is significant in their overall curricula. As a result of these factors, most of the secondary school graduates take various exams to be able to attend these well-respected institutions. These institutions were selected from among six candidate universities having similar features. Realizing at the first meetings that there are three institutions that are more suitable for the scope of the research and its purposes, these three were selected to be involved in this research.

Finally, as mentioned by Richards (2007), effective language materials are developed with consideration of a number of factors, including teacher, student, and contextual variable. Accordingly, it is important to stress that all relevant bodies connected with the materials evaluation – program designers, teachers, and students – were involved in the present study in contrast to most of the previous materials evaluation studies that contain views of only teachers (e.g. Law, 1995; Vellenga, 2004; Frederickson and Olsson, 2006; Johnson et al., 2008) or students (e.g. Peacock, 1998; Yakhontova, 2001), or rarely both (e.g. Guntek, 2005). This variety of all relevant points of view is expected to contribute to the richness and the thoroughness of this research.

3.1.3.1. Eötvös Lorand University, Budapest – Hungary

Eötvös Lorand University (ELTE) – www.elte.hu, founded in 1635 in Trnava, is the largest university in Hungary with more than 30,000 graduate and undergraduate students. According to the Academic Ranking of World Universities (2011), it is by far the best university in Hungary. Around 10% (approximately 27,000 in 2011), which is the highest figure in the country, of all national applications are made to ELTE. Some of the reasons for this high number of applicants are that the diplomas issued by ELTE are acknowledged worldwide, and its course credits can be transferred to any university in a European Union country. Its English language programs are also quite popular, and famous academics like Zoltan Dörnyei, and Peter Medgyes who still delivers lectures in graduate programs, have taught there.

The PYP at ELTE is fairly new compared to the other departments and eight faculties, and has a limited number of students – around 35 – who are mainly from a variety of countries. The program is organized and run by the University's School of English and American Studies. The main objectives of the program are to offer a course with a strong emphasis on language improvement which all participants will find useful in the sense that it prepares them for beginning their studies, and to equip students with the basic linguistic, cultural, and study skills necessary for beginning their studies at ELTE. There are twenty-four lessons in a week, and in-house writing materials are used in certain classes. Most of the students start the two-semester program at the A2 (Elementary) level, and cover two or three levels throughout the year. The majority of the students at the PYP – twenty-five – participated in this research study, and four of them took part in interviews. Furthermore, two volunteer teachers and one program designer participated in the study; these three participants were all interviewed.

The number of FYP students at ELTE is more than 9,000, and they are required to be at least at B1 level to start their undergraduate studies. Their English

classes are mainly EAP courses, and their disciplines are given careful consideration while designing these courses. Collated materials from different resources are used in the writing classes. In the present study, eighty-two freshman year students participated, and fourteen of them took part in interviews. In addition to these, three teachers and one program designer participated in the study, and all these teachers and the program designer took part in the interviews. All the students in the study are randomly-selected participants from the volunteer teachers' classes.

3.1.3.2. Middle East Technical University, Ankara – Turkey

Middle East Technical University (METU) – www.metu.edu.tr, founded in 1956 in Ankara, is one of the most prestigious universities in Turkey with more than 25,000 students. According to the Webometrics World Universities Ranking (2012), it is the best university in the country, and it is the leading higher education institution in Turkey regarding the number of engagements in European Union Framework Program projects. Due to the high demand to attend METU, most of the departments accept only the top 1% of more than 1,500,000 applicants taking the National University Entrance Examination every year.

The PYP at METU aims to provide its students with basic language skills so that they can pursue their undergraduate studies without major difficulties in terms of language. The program is a two-semester one – sometimes followed with a summer school due to the low performance of some students – and the number of students in attendance is around 3,000. In-house writing materials developed by the academic staff are used in the program. Students generally start at A1 or A2 levels (Beginner or Elementary), and complete the program at least at B2 level (Upper-Intermediate). Two hundred and twenty-one of these students participated in this research study, and nine of them participated in the interviews afterwards. They were all selected randomly from among the different groups. Also, fourteen teachers participated in the research, five of whom were

interviewed. In addition to these, two program designers took part in the research, both of whom were interviewed.

There are five faculties at METU, and all English language lessons at these five faculties, including the FYP, are designed by the Department of Modern Languages. There are more than seventy well-qualified instructors in the department, over 75% of who hold MA or PhD degrees from different second language programs. The freshman year English language program at METU focuses on academic skills at B2 (Upper-Intermediate) level, and academic writing books written by curriculum experts in the department are used. Five volunteer instructors teaching at five different faculties in the university, along with their a hundred and twelve randomly-selected students, participated in this study; three of these teachers and eight students as well as the two program designers who also completed the questionnaires beforehand, participated in the interviews.

3.1.3.3. Colleges of Applied Sciences, Rustaq - Oman

Colleges of Applied Sciences (CAS) – www.cas.edu.om – contains six colleges with more than 8,000 students, the largest of which is located in Rustaq where the present study was implemented. All of these colleges are directly administered by the Ministry of Higher Education; this assures the quality of the seven programs offered at CAS.

There are around 300 students at the PYP in CAS Rustaq and they are expected to cover basic linguistic structures and academic skills that are necessary for their disciplines. Commercial textbooks are used in these programs; students generally start the program at A1 or A2 level (Beginner or Elementary), and complete the year at B1 (Intermediate) level. Seventy-two of these students from different departments participated in the present study, and six of them were interviewed. Moreover, three teachers – all of whom were interviewed –

participated in the study as well as the program designer who also participated in the interview. All the selections were made randomly from among volunteer students and teachers.

In the FYP at CAS Rustaq, around 600 students attend the EAP-oriented language courses, and academic writing is focused on in this two-semester program through commercial textbooks. Sixty-six of these students – randomly-selected – participated in the research study, and five of them were interviewed. Furthermore, three volunteer teachers – all of whom were interviewed – participated in the study along with the program designer who also participated in the interview.

3.2. The Data Collection

This research is a post-use evaluation study, which is regarded as the most valuable (Ellis, 1998), reliable (McGrath, 2002), and remarkable (Tomlinson, 2003) type of data collection design in materials evaluation, partly because post-use evaluation designs (or retrospective evaluation) help the evaluator to reflect on the quality of the material after it has been used in a particular learning / teaching situation (Mukundan et al., 2011). The materials analyzed in the study were used at these institutions in the 2011 – 2012 academic year.

As mentioned previously, this study has utilized both quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures. Academic research involving "the integration of quantitative and qualitative research has become increasingly common in recent years" (Bryman, 2006, p. 97). Accordingly, this present research aims to benefit from both of the data collection types, taking into account the different remarkable strengths of each type as well as the scope of this research (Burns, 2000):

- **Quantitative Research Design**
    - Precision through reliable measurement
    - Control through sampling and design
    - Statistical techniques allowing for sophisticated analyses
- **Qualitative Research Design**
    - Close researcher involvement allowing for an insider's view
    - New insights through descriptions and narrations
    - In-depth description of reality

On the other hand, methodological triangulation in the research was achieved, since the results of the questionnaires were addressed and strengthened through the semi-structured interviews. While analyzing two hundred and thirty-three social science articles, Bryman (2006) discerns that, along with triangulation, complementarity and expansion have also been provided with the combination of these two designs. Furthermore, in the present study, data was obtained from the program designers, the teachers, and the students to achieve data triangulation, which provides a multi-perspective view of the area under investigation (Denzin, 1978). According to Yin (2003), data triangulation is one of the three principles of data collection that can help deal with the problems of construct validity and reliability in case studies.

3.2.1. The General Analysis of the Materials

A macro-evaluation model was implemented in this research study rather than a micro-evaluation model, which is regarded as "too localized and having too small a scale, and so theoretically uninteresting" (Ellis, 2011, p. 234), owing to the fact that the overall aspects of the materials were taken into consideration in view of the contextual requirements.

The first meetings with the relevant authorities at these institutions were held in the previous academic year (2010 – 2011) so that all the research dimensions, the

procedures, and the permissions were discussed thoroughly along with decisions being made on a tentative timeline.

Then, after some mutual information exchange about both the research and the programs, the program objectives and the academic writing materials were obtained from these institutions at the beginning of the academic year. The questions about the objectives and materials were asked to the relevant groups at the institutions, and correspondence continued throughout the academic year.

Having analyzed all the materials used in these academic writing programs, the researcher started to develop the questionnaire items for the program designers, the teachers, and the students towards the end of the first semester (Fall Term in the 2011 – 2012 academic year).

3.2.2. The Questionnaires

In order to develop the framework of this study, the relevant literature, and particularly the models previously used, was analyzed thoroughly. Consequently, the model developed by McDonough and Shaw (2003) was regarded as the basis for the framework mainly because of the following facts:

- The need to analyze both external and internal factors of the material as well as to analyze overall factors
- The flexibility to be devised for academic pedagogies and materials regardless of their being commercial textbooks and in-house materials (Murdoch, 2000)
- The adaptability for both pre-use and post-use evaluation designs
- The tried and tested model for similar research studies by several researchers (e.g. Atkins, 2001; Lawrence, 2011)

While developing the items in the checklist, the items in McDonough and Shaw's (2003) study were adapted, and Richards' (2001) five factors were

considered whether they were all encountered or not (see Appendix B for a full questionnaire). In the adaptation phase, the following thirteen main criteria were determined with regard to the current issues in EAP writing materials:

- **The External Evaluation**
  - A. Learning Context
  - B. Language Level
  - C. Additional Resources
  - D. Needs and Objectives
- **The Internal Evaluation**
  - E. Class Motivation
  - F. Relevant Content
  - G. Guidelines and Input
  - H. Activity Types
  - I. Learning Styles
  - J. Integration with Other Skills
  - K. Feedback and Assessment
- **The Overall Evaluation**
  - L. Usability
  - M. Adaptability

The total number of checklist items is thirty-nine (within three main categories and thirteen main criteria as seen above) in the questionnaires. Accordingly, there are three items in each criterion, for example:

A. Learning Context

1. The content of the material is relevant to my students' current and future studies.
2. The design and layout of the material is appropriate to my students' age group.
3. The material doesn't contain culturally offensive or inappropriate topics / themes or texts.

This is an acceptable number (39), since the number of items in well-known and widely-used "checklists ranges from 12 to 53" (Huang, 2011, p. 61). This is quite important in terms of practicality as suggested by Cunningsworth (1995): "It is important to limit the number of criteria used, the number of questions asked, to manageable proportions, otherwise we risk being swamped in a sea of details" (p. 5). In this research study, students completed the questionnaires within fifteen minutes while it took teachers fifteen – twenty minutes, and program designers around twenty – twenty-five minutes to complete them. All these periods had been determined as the ideal timings by the researcher, the supervisor, and the program designers.

In addition to these thirteen criteria and thirty-nine items, there are general questions at the beginning of the questionnaires for demographic information like the age, the gender, and the experience of the participants, as well as open-ended questions mainly in the questionnaires of the program designers and the teachers, such as:

- Please write briefly about your main approach / philosophy to teaching writing. Have you made any shifts / changes in your approaches to teaching writing? Please mention also about these shifts.
- To what extent is the material appropriate to the learning context / environment?
- To what extent are you satisfied with the variety of activities and tasks in the material? What kind of activities and tasks do you focus on your writing classes?

Throughout this development process of the checklist criteria and items, several opinions and perspectives were received from a variety of elements and experts like:

- The supervisor of the dissertation.
- The program designers / coordinators in these six departments of the three universities.
- Previous works in both academic writing and materials evaluation, since the researcher must be aware of the relevant theories to ensure validity (Messick, 1994).
- The previous teaching experience (primarily at the tertiary level courses such as "Coursebook Evaluation" and "Academic Writing") of the researcher.
- The colleagues / researchers working in relevant fields.

This collaborative process helped to eliminate any ambiguities, to bring to the researcher's attention any omitted topics and issues, and to examine the face validity, which was also examined by reviewing the literature. Several revisions were undertaken following the feedback from these experts; for example, some possible unclear and unfamiliar concepts like 'stimulus', 'schemata' and / or 'summative' were all changed, which "contributes to the clarity and, in turn, to the reliability of the instrument" (Mukundan et al., 2011, p. 23).

Then the questionnaires (questionnaires for the program designers, questionnaires for the teachers, and the questionnaires for the students) were either translated into the local language (e.g. the teachers' questionnaires at METU – see Appendix C) or simplified in terms of language use and format (e.g. students' and teachers' questionnaires at ELTE and CAS – see Appendix D) based on the recommendations by the program designers. The translated questionnaires had also been translated back into the source language by a professional translator in order to eliminate any potential problems due to linguistic and / or cultural differences. The translations and simplifications were then checked by two native speaker experts, who have PhD (Turkish) and MA (British) degrees in applied linguistics. These experts also have huge experience in proof reading of academic research papers and different sorts of language books.

The questionnaires consist of a four point Likert scale with the following choices: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), and Strongly Agree (4). The aim for this style of rating is to have definite conclusions in terms of agreement and disagreement to avoid central tendency which is "the inclination to rate people in the middle of the scale even when their performance clearly warrants a substantially higher or lower rating" (Grote, 1996, p. 138). For instance, in a five point scale, an evaluator will more probably assign 3 (Mukundan et al., 2011).

As seen from the categories in the previous pages, McDonough and Shaw's (2003) three general stages have remained the same in the checklist for this research. In terms of the main criteria and items, Table 10 demonstrates some of the items which were kept, were changed, were omitted, and were added along with brief notes to clarify the rationale behind these adaptations.

Lastly, before the administration of these questionnaires, a pilot study was conducted to "ensure that the criteria are sufficient, answerable, reliable and useful" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 32). In this study, all of the students' questionnaires were piloted using a representative number of participants from each group (e.g. forty-two students at the PYP, and twenty students at the PYP at METU) in order to check the internal consistency of the items. The Cronbach Alpha value was calculated to be between 0.88 and 0.92 for the overall sections in the checklist, which means that there is a high internal consistency among the items. However, four of these items were revised and reworded as a result of the piloting process based on the comments students had made at the end of the questionnaire. For example, the students had difficulty in comprehending the question about the age appropriacy in Item 2, and then the item was reworded.

The questionnaires were implemented at the end of April / early May 2012 by either the researcher or the teachers, or both in cooperation with the program designers.

Table 10: Examples from the Adaptation of the Checklist Items Used in McDonough and Shaw's Model

Items Kept Similar

- *External Evaluation, B. Language Level, Item 4 (Questionnaire for Teachers):*
    - The material is appropriate to the English language level of my students.
        - **Rationale:** Critical for academic writing materials, specifically in the higher education context

- *Internal Evaluation, I. Learning Styles, Item 25 (Questionnaire for Program Designers):*
    - The activities and tasks in the material address various learning styles and intelligence types (i.e. linguistic, visual, and logical) considered in the program.
        - **Rationale:** Current issue in the field of academic writing research

- *Overall Evaluation, L. Usability, Item 35 (Questionnaire for Students):*
    - The material is easy to use and well-organized.
        - **Rationale:** Essential for both kinds of materials: global and in-house.

Table 10 (contd.)

Items Changed

- *External Evaluation, A. Learning Context, Item 3 (Questionnaire for Program Designers):*
  - The material doesn't contain culturally offensive or inappropriate topics / themes or texts.
    - **Rationale:** "Representation of Minority Groups" is a sensitive issue in some contextual settings in the study

- *Internal Evaluation, I. Learning Styles, Item 28 (Questionnaire for Students):*
  - I can improve my reading and listening skills along with writing skills with the help of the material.
    - **Rationale:** The question about the "Listening Skills" was designed only for global integrated skills textbook evaluation

- *Overall Evaluation, M. Adaptability, Item 37 (Questionnaire for Teachers):*
  - The content of the material can be adapted easily in my writing class.
    - **Rationale:** The question was reworded to make it suitable for the evaluation of academic writing materials

Table 10 (contd.)

Items Omitted

- *External Evaluation*
  - The Author's Views on Language and Methodology
    - **Rationale:** Since the majority of the resources are in-house and / or collated, no specific author

- *Internal Evaluation*
  - The Presentation of the Skills in the Material
    - **Rationale:** Since this is a question developed for integrated skills textbooks, not directly relevant to academic writing material

- *Overall Evaluation*
  - Generalizability
    - **Rationale:** Not necessary for academic writing materials due to the variety of specific contextual requirements

Table 10 (contd.)

Items Added

- *External Evaluation, D. Needs and Objectives, Item 11 (Questionnaire for Teachers):*
    - The material helps students focus on the writing process (i.e. plan, draft, edit, revise) in the class as well as the end product.
        - **Rationale:** Mixture of methodologies is a current issue in academic writing

- *Internal Evaluation, G. Guidelines and Input, Item 21 (Questionnaire for Students):*
    - There is sufficient amount of input (i.e. information, ideas) to help me compose the writing tasks in the material.
        - **Rationale:** The sufficient amount of input for students is one of the current issues in academic writing

- *Overall Evaluation, L. Usability, Item 34 (Questionnaire for Program Designers):*
    - The material structure is in parallel with other materials in the English language program.
        - **Rationale:** This is an important issue for the integration of the writing

3.2.3. The Interviews

To have a better and more comprehensive understanding and analysis of the participants' opinions and thoughts concerning their academic writing materials, semi-structured interviews were held with randomly selected participants who had completed the questionnaires. Primarily, the open-ended sections of the questionnaires were analyzed thoroughly before these interviews. These two sources provided the qualitative data in this study.

Compared to structured and unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews are mainly based around a set of determined topics or a loosely defined series of questions, "allowing the conversation a certain amount of freedom in terms of the direction it takes, and respondents are also encouraged to talk in an open-ended manner about the topics under discussion or any other matters they feel are relevant" (Borg, 2006, p. 203).

Some other significant strengths of semi-structured interviews in the social sciences are listed below:

- Open-ended questions help the interviewer to record, summarize and analyze the responses more easily. In addition to these, open-ended questions allow participants to best voice their experiences unconstrained by any perspectives of the interviewer or past research findings (Creswell, 2008).
- The interviewer can ask specific questions to elicit certain information so that implicit or unobservable aspects of the participants' lives can be explored.
- The flexibility in semi-structured interviews allows participants themselves to "raise additional or complementary issues, and these form an integral part of the study's findings" (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992, pp. 261-262).

Dörnyei (2007) also summarizes the benefits of using semi-structured interviews in the second language research:

> … 'semi-structured interview' type, which offers a compromise between the two extremes: Although there is a set of pre-prepared guiding questions and prompts, the format is open-ended and the interviewee is encouraged to elaborate on the issue raised in an exploratory manner (p. 136).

Considering these facts, semi-structured interviews were adopted as one of the two main data collection tools to complement the data collected from the questionnaires. All the interviewees were selected from among volunteers who had completed the questionnaires. Based on the previous information from the program designers and the teachers, the students were interviewed individually, in pairs, and in groups owing to the different cultural and contextual sensitivities among these three regions. All of the program designers, the teachers, and the students were also asked to select the type of interviews they would like to participate in; that is, individually, in pairs, and in groups to provide a more comfortable environment for them to share their feelings, ideas and thoughts freely.

Before all these interviews, a brief interview guide with some open-ended questions (see Appendix E for the full list of structured questions) was prepared by the researcher considering the following facts:

- Research questions for the dissertation
    - E.g. "What were your main considerations when adopting or developing this writing material?" – for the program designers
- Responses in the questionnaires
    - E.g. "Why do you think that free writing activities are not suitable for the students in your context?" – for the teachers
- Main concerns in academic writing materials
    - E.g. "Why do you prefer to have writing tasks about your own major / context?" – for the students

The main functions of the interview guide, according to Dörnyei (2007), are: a) to ensure that the domain is properly covered and nothing important is left out by accident; b) to suggest appropriate question wordings; c) to offer a list of useful probe questions to be used if needed; d) to offer a template for the opening statement; and e) to list some comments to bear in mind.

During the semi-structured interviews, these lead questions in the interview guide were asked first and were often followed by more specific questions to elicit further information, such as:

- What are the specific needs and interests of these Engineering students in terms of academic writing?

Accordingly, most of the time, the dialogues between the researcher and the participants were developed to be unstructured, for instance:

- Participant: I don't think that free writing should be a part of the material.
- **Researcher: Because?**
- Participant: Because of our program, academic writing program… you know, not so much focus on general English content.
- **Researcher: So, do you think that it's not possible to integrate free writing in an academic writing material?**
- Participant: Depends on the program. But… not suitable for ours. Maybe in the prep year program.

As seen in this sample dialogue above, open conversations were primarily fostered during these interviews, and the researcher tried to use some prompts to have an in-depth understanding of the points stated by the participants. Moreover, the researcher aimed to build a rapport for each respondent at the beginning of the interviews so that the participants could talk about a specific criterion in the checklist in detail, which is quite important to achieve high validity in the interviews.

Almost all of the interviews were conducted one or two weeks after the implementation of the questionnaires in order that the researcher has sufficient time to review the responses of the program designers, the teachers, and the students. The tentative interview questions were shared with the program designers so that their initial feedback could be received about the content, the timing, and the clarity. Furthermore, before the administration phase, all the interview questions were piloted with a representative number of participants in each case in order to check if there is any ambiguous or irrelevant item in them. As a result of this piloting; for instance, some unclear questions were reworded:

- What types of writing activities do you use more in your academic writing class?
    - Do you generally prefer to use controlled, guided or free writing activities in your writing class?

The interviews were all conducted during the last week of the academic year in May in order to obtain an overall evaluation of the materials used throughout the year. The interviews with the students lasted less than twenty minutes, they lasted around twenty minutes with the teachers, and more than twenty minutes with the program designers. These are the ideal timings recommended by the supervisor and the program designers.

All the interviews, conducted according to the interview schedule, were audio-recorded with the initial consent of the participants to have more reliable information, and, in addition, extensive notes were taken when needed. Recording an interview can provide a detailed record of the interview; however, taking notes during the interview and having the questions ready to be asked can be used as a backup (Creswell, 2008). All these interview administration processes and procedures were shared with the participants via emails and then orally before each interview. Moreover, the places of all these interviews had been determined by the participants, and they were conducted at their own departments.

Lastly, the following points, mentioned by Robson (2002), were considered carefully during the interview processes:

- Listen more than you speak.
- Put questions in a straightforward, clear and non-threatening way.
- Eliminate cues which lead interviewees to respond in a particular way.
- Enjoy it (or at least look as though you do).

3.3. The Data Analysis

This study produced both quantitative and qualitative data through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. During the data analysis process, 616 questionnaires (24,024 items in total), and 29 interview sessions with the participation of 73 program designers, teachers, and students (482 minutes in total) in all three cases were analyzed.

Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations in each case were calculated for each item, and then criterion, to describe the overall picture of how the participants rated the materials in terms of the thirteen main criteria in the checklist. Furthermore, the items in the background information and open-ended sections were also analyzed, and statistics were determined in the specific fields, such as the number of years for the program design, the teaching of writing, and the English language learning experience. All of these detailed calculations were made through SPSS 16.0 to summarize the sets of numerical data.

Data recorded through interviews were also collated, subjected to content analysis which is "an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication, following content analytic rules and step by step models, without rash quantification" (Mayring, 2000, p. 2). Accordingly, all the data coded were categorized under the thirteen core criteria.

During the content analyses and at the end of them, the coding procedure and conclusions were checked with several program designers and teachers when needed in order to have inter-coder agreement. Afterwards, the responses to the open-ended questions in the questionnaires and recordings of the interviews were analyzed thoroughly to reach specific conclusions for the primary considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students concerning their academic writing materials. The main purpose for this was to obtain the necessary data to draw reliable conclusions regarding the second research question.

This chapter is expected to provide all the details needed to comprehend the background of the research method. The figure below also demonstrates the overall research design along with the research tools and the participants. In the next chapter, Findings, the results of the data collected and analyzed in this study are presented in detail and discussed in view of the research questions as well as the relevant literature.

Figure 10: The Research Design

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.0. Introduction

This chapter aims to present the findings of the present study in two main parts in view of the research questions of the study: the appropriacy of the materials to the contextual needs of the program designers, the teachers, and the students; and the main considerations of these participants concerning academic writing materials. Firstly, the demographical statistics of the participants are introduced at the beginning of the chapter.

In the second part, the appropriacy of the materials is analyzed considering the program requirements, the teachers' teaching techniques and expectations, and the needs and the interests of the students. Findings for each of these three perspectives are categorized in three stages (the external evaluation, the internal evaluation, and the overall evaluation) within each of the three cases.

In the third part, the findings on the main considerations of the participants concerning academic writing materials are presented mainly based on the responses to the open-ended questions in the questionnaires and the interviews. Findings for these considerations are presented in three categories (the program designers, the teachers, and the students) within each case, considering the three sub-questions of the second research question.

4.1. The Analysis of the Background of the Participants

There are three main contextual settings in this research study: ELTE (Case 1), METU (Case 2), and CAS (Case 3). In each case, there are two sets of participants according to their departments: the PYP and the FYP. In addition to these, in each of these two groups – the PYP and the FYP, the participants are categorized as: the program designers, the teachers, and the students. The background information (e.g. gender, age, experience) concerning these participants was collected in the first part of the questionnaires and is presented within each case in this section.

In Case 1, the total number of participants in the PYP is twenty-eight. Twenty-five of these participants are the students, two of them are the teachers, and the other one is the program designer. In the FYP, there are totally eighty-six participants, eighty-two of whom are the students, three are the teachers, and the other one is the program designer.

The number of male and female students in this research for Case 1 is approximately 40% male to 60% female in the PYP; while this ratio is 29% male to 71% female in the FYP. On the other hand, most of the students at the PYP (84%) and the FYP (96%) are between the ages of 19-24. As for their level of English, all of the students at the PYP consider themselves to be Pre-Intermediate / Intermediate learners, and they (64%) have generally been learning English for around 5-8 years. The FYP students are generally either Upper-Intermediate (49%) or Advanced (51%), and most of them (56%) have been studying English for 9-12 years.

Both of the participating teachers at the PYP in Case 1 are female; however, the program designer is a male. All of the teachers and the program designer in the FYP are female. Regarding their ages, teachers at the PYP are between 41-50, while the program designer is over 51. In the FYP, two of the teachers are between 31-40 and the other one is between 21-30, while the program designer is over 51. The teachers at the PYP teach Pre-Intermediate / Intermediate classes,

and they each have a teaching experience of more than 16 years, whereas the FYP teachers generally teach Upper-Intermediate / Advanced level classes, and most of them (67%) have been teaching English for less than 6 years. On the other hand, both Case 1 program designers are quite experienced with over 16 years of experience. In Case 1, primarily in-house materials, collated or developed by the instructors, are used in both programs. It is highlighted that these materials were produced as a result of the extensive needs analysis, and they are constantly updated in view of the feedback from the teachers and the students.

Table 11 illustrates the overall demographic statistics of the students, the teachers, and the program designers – both in the PYP and the FYP – who participated in this research for Case 1.

In Case 2, the total number of student participants is three hundred and thirty-three and the number of female and male participants is almost equal. The majority of these students are between 19-21: 59% for the PYP and 90% for the FYP. Most of them have been learning English for approximately 9-12 years. The PYP students are generally Intermediate, while the FYP students are primarily Upper-Intermediate.

Twelve of the fourteen teacher participants are female in the PYP, and 56% of them are between the ages of 31-40. In the FYP, only one of the five teacher participants is male, and none of them are over 40. Only two of the teachers in the PYP have been teaching English for more than 16 years; all the other teachers have an experience of between 1-15 years. As for the program designers in the PYP, they are between the ages of 41-50, and their program design experience varies between 6-10 and 11-15 years. The program designers in the FYP are both below the age of 40, and their program design experience is between 1-5 years. In Case 2, primarily in-house materials, collated or developed by the instructors, are used in both programs. It is highlighted that these

materials were produced by the faculty staff, and the one for the FYP is collated as a book.

Table 12 demonstrates the overall demographic statistics of the students, the teachers, and the program designers who participated in this research study for Case 2.

In Case 3, the total number of student participants is seventy-two in the PYP and sixty-six in the FYP. The majority of these students are female in both programs, and only 15% of them in the FYP are over 21. Except for 6% of the students in both programs, students have been studying English for more than 5 years. The English level in the PYP is approximately Pre-Intermediate / Intermediate, whereas the level varies between Intermediate – Advanced in the FYP in this case.

There are three teacher participants from each of the departments, and they all represent a variety of age groups from 21-30 to 50+. Half of these six participants are male, and the other half are female. Both program designers, each of whom has an experience of less than 6 years, are female. In Case 3, the teachers have been teaching English for at least 6 years. In this case, primarily global materials are used in both programs. It is highlighted that these materials were supplemented with the handouts and the resources collated by the teachers mainly for their own classes.

Table 13 below describes for Case 3 the overall demographic statistics of the students, the teachers, and the program designers who participated in this research.

Table 11: Demographic Statistics of the Students, the Teachers, and the Program Designers (Case 1)

	Gender	**Age**	**Experience**	**Language Level** ***(of Students)***	**Type of Materials**
Students – PYP	10 (40%) Male 15 (60%) Female	11 (44%) – 19-21 10 (40%) – 22-24 4 (16%) – 25+	6 (24%) – 1-4 years 16 (64%) – 5-8 years 3 (12%) – 9-12 years	13 (52%) – A2-B1 12 (48%) – B1-B2 - (0%) – B2-C1	
Teachers – PYP	- (0%) Male 2 (100%) Female	- (0%) – 31-40 2 (100%) – 41-50 - (0%) – 51+	- (0%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years 2 (100%) – 16+ years	1 (50%) – A2-B1 1 (50%) – B1-B2 - (0%) – B2-C1	- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 2 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House
Program Designer – PYP	1 (100%) Male - (0%) Female	- (0%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50 1 (100%) – 51+	- (0%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years 1 (100%) – 16+ years		- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 1 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House

Table 11 (contd.)

Students – FYP	24 (29%) Male 58 (71%) Female	3 (4%) – 16-18 67 (80%) – 19-21 12 (16%) – 22-24	21 (26%) – 5-8 years 46 (56%) – 9-12 years 15 (18%) – 13+ years	- (0%) – B1-B2 42 (51%) – B2-C1 40 (49%) – C1+	
Teachers – FYP	- (0%) Male 3 (100%) Female	1 (33%) – 21-30 2 (67%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50	2 (67%) – 1-5 years 1 (33%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years	- (0%) – B1-B2 2 (67%) – B2-C1 1 (33%) – C1+	- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 3 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House
Program Designer – FYP	- (0%) Male 1 (100%) Female	- (0%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50 1 (100%) – 51+	- (0%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years 1 (100%) – 16+ years		- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 1 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House

Table 12: Demographic Statistics of the Students, the Teachers, and the Program Designers (Case 2)

	Gender	**Age**	**Experience**	**Language Level** ***(of Students)***	**Type of Materials**
Students – PYP	109 (49%) Male 112 (51%) Female	78 (35%) – 16-18 131 (59%) – 19-21 12 (6%) – 22-24	28 (13%) – 1-4 years 69 (31%) – 5-8 years 124 (56%) – 9-12 years	55 (25%) – A2-B1 116 (52%) – B1-B2 50 (23%) – B2-C1	
Teachers – PYP	2 (14%) Male 12 (86%) Female	3 (21%) – 21-30 8 (56%) – 31-40 3 (21%) – 41-50	8 (56%) – 6-10 years 4 (29%) – 11-15 years 2 (15%) – 16+ years	4 (29%) – A2-B1 7 (50%) – B1-B2 3 (21%) – B2-C1	- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 12 (85%) – Mostly In-House 2 (15%) – Only In-House
Program Designers – PYP	- (0%) Male 2 (100%) Female	- (0%) – 21-30 - (0%) – 31-40 2 (100%) – 41-50	- (0%) – 1-5 years 1 (50%) – 6-10 years 1 (50%) – 11-15 years		- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 2 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House

Table 12 (contd.)

Students – FYP	54 (48%) Male 58 (52%) Female	7 (6%) – 16-18 101 (90%) – 19-21 4 (4%) – 22-24	20 (18%) – 5-8 years 66 (59%) – 9-12 years 26 (23%) – 13+	14 (13%) – B1-B2 61 (54%) – B2-C1 37 (33%) – C1+	
Teachers – FYP	1 (20%) Male 4 (80%) Female	3 (60%) – 21-30 2 (40%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50	1 (20%) – 1-5 years 2 (40%) – 6-10 years 2 (40%) – 11-15 years	1 (20%) – B1-B2 4 (80%) – B2-C1 - (0%) – C1+	- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 5 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House
Program Designers – FYP	1 (50%) Male 1 (50%) Female	1 (50%) – 21-30 1 (50%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50	2 (100%) – 1-5 years - (0%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years		- (0%) – Only Commercial - (0%) – Mostly Commercial 2 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House

Table 13: Demographic Statistics of the Students, the Teachers, and the Program Designers (Case 3)

Students – PYP	28 (39%) Male 44 (61%) Female	36 (50%) – 16-18 36 (50%) – 19-21 - (0%) – 22-24	5 (6%) – 1-4 years 27 (38%) – 5-8 years 40 (56%) – 9-12 years	31 (43%) – A2-B1 41 (57%) – B1-B2 - (0%) – B2-C1	
Teachers – PYP	2 (67%) Male 1 (33%) Female	1 (33%) – 31-40 1 (34%) – 41-50 1 (33%) – 51+	3 (100%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years - (0%) – 16+ years	2 (67%) – A2-B1 1 (33%) – B1-B2 - (0%) – B2-C1	- (0%) – Only Commercial 2 (0%) – Mostly Commercial 1 (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House
Program Designers – PYP	- (0%) Male 1 (0%) Female	1 (100%) – 21-30 - (50%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50	1 (100%) – 1-5 years - (0%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years		- (0%) – Only Commercial 1 (0%) – Mostly Commercial - (100%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House

Table 13 (contd.)

Students **– Freshman Year**	24 (36%) Male 42 (64%) Female	4 (6%) – 16-18 52 (79%) – 19-21 10 (15%) – 22-24	4 (6%) – 1-4 years 16 (24%) – 5-8 years 46 (70%) – 9-12 years	16 (24%) – B1-B2 22 (33%) – B2-C1 28 (43%) – C1+	
Teachers **– Freshman Year**	1 (33%) Male 2 (67%) Female	1 (33%) – 21-30 1 (34%) – 31-40 1 (33%) – 41-50	2 (67%) – 1-5 years - (0%) – 6-10 years 1 (33%) – 11-15 years	2 (67%) – B1-B2 1 (33%) – B2-C1 - (0%) – C1+	1 (33%) – Only Commercial 2 (67%) – Mostly Commercial - (0%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House
Program Designers **– Freshman Year**	- (0%) Male 1 (0%) Female	1 (100%) – 21-30 - (50%) – 31-40 - (0%) – 41-50	1 (100%) – 1-5 years - (0%) – 6-10 years - (0%) – 11-15 years		- (0%) – Only Commercial 1 (100%) – Mostly Commercial - (0%) – Mostly In-House - (0%) – Only In-House

4.2. The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Contextual Needs

This part examines the first research question which concerns the appropriacy of the materials to the contextual requirements, factors, and needs. Accordingly, there are three main analyses: the one focusing on the responses of the program designers, another on the responses of the teachers, and the third one on the responses of the students within each of these three cases.

The responses of the participants are categorized into the thirteen main criteria, each of which has three items (totally 39 items). The data analyses to be presented in this section are from both the questionnaires and the interviews, although the figures represent merely the average scores and percentages of each criterion obtained from the questionnaires. Descriptive statistics of each item including frequencies, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations are also presented in Appendix F. In addition to these, some of the notes are directly quoted from the participants with the following coding system:

- **1**: Case 1 (ELTE); **2**: Case 2 (METU); **3**: Case 3 (CAS)
- **PD**: Program Designers; **T**: Teachers; **S**: Students
- **1 / 2 / 3** …: The participants in the chronological order of the interviews
    - For example: "**(2 PYP: T3)**" means the third teacher in the interview in the PYP of Case 2.
- In order to differentiate the data collected from the questionnaires from the interviews, lower-case characters, such as "**(2 pyp: t3)**", are used for these data from the open-ended questions of the questionnaires.

4.2.1. The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements

The first sub-question of the first research question is discussed in this part:

- To what extent do these materials serve the program requirements?

4.2.1.1. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements in Case 1

This first section, including Figure 10 below, presents the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1:

- **The External Evaluation**

  All the items with regard to the first four criteria are agreed to by the program designer, and the main reason for this is explained as their updated in-house materials developed in consideration for their specific context, even though they do not contain discipline-specific content. The only important issue seems to be the students' mixed-level of English: "… in our case the problem is that – although there is some streaming – we have students in our groups whose English is much better or worse than the group average" (1 pyp: pd1).

  Considering the additional materials, there seems to be limited amount of resources partly because of the lack of necessary funds to maintain a rich self-access center in the department. On the other hand, it is clearly stated that the material is appropriate to the program requirements and objectives, and to prepare students for the school-leaving exam.

Figure 11: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 1)

This section presents the external evaluation of the FYP materials, in which all the marks are either Agree or Strongly Agree as seen in Figure 11 below:

- **The External Evaluation**

  The most striking response ratio (100% Strongly Agree) is with regards to the first criterion – Learning Context. The program designer highlights that this appropriacy is primarily because of the fact that "updated materials are collated by the instructors who have considered the current and future needs of the students while developing these resources" (1 FYP: PD1).

  Considering the language level of the students, the program designer mentions the difficulty to cope with the different levels of the students, which is quite similar to the PYP. Again, as in the PYP, the teachers supplement the materials themselves considering the needs and requirements in their own classrooms.

  As for the appropriacy of the materials to the contextual needs and objectives, the program designer either agrees or strongly agrees with all the items. She clearly emphasizes the need to combine different methodologies to meet the program requirements (Item 11 – about process writing).

Figure 12: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 12 below, presents the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1:

- **Internal Evaluation**

The program designer maintains that the topics are of practical use in the writing class due to the successful updates in the content, since the topics and the texts are constantly modified. He also notes that:

> … a wide range of topics and themes, such as applying for a job, answering advertisements, inquiring about the details of an offer, etc. No changes are necessary … these resources are really state-of-the-art quality both in terms of the topics and tasks (1 PYP: PD1).

The program designer, agreeing that there is sufficient amount of linguistic and rhetoric guidelines and input in the materials, states that "mostly the activities are guided but this is good because that's what the exam requires" (1 PYP: PD1). In this respect, the program designer emphasizes that free writing is mainly required for the students' future studies; however, there are plenty of guided activities and tasks, which is a positive feature.

The exam requirements and the focus on these requirements were mentioned frequently by the program designer, who thinks that "there is no special emphasis on various learning styles and different interaction types due to these requirements" (1 pyp: pd1). The balance of the integration of the language skills in their materials is also arranged considering these requirements according to the program designer, which demonstrates the priorities in the program.

Items 31 and 33 in the Feedback and Assessment criterion are strongly agreed to by the program designer, and he also agrees with the statement in Item 32, which is about self-evaluation opportunities. Yet, he further explains that most of the feedback is given by the teachers.

Figure 13: Findings in the Internal Evaluation for the PYP Program Designer (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 13 below, describes the internal evaluation of the FYP materials based on the responses of the program designer:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  Although the program designer notes that the "discipline-specific topics are more motivating" (1 fyp: pd1), she believes that some of the themes or tasks and activities in the materials are not that attractive for the students. This is because of the fact that the materials do not contain topics and texts that are relevant to the students' daily lives. She asserts that this relevance is not that important within their EAP writing program.

  The program designer disagrees with Item 19 – about the linguistic tips and guidelines in the materials – since the writing skill in their program does not focus on structural elements. She also maintains that most of the input is provided by the instructor in the class, not the materials.

The program designer strongly agrees that there are controlled writing activities in the materials, adding that the free writing activities are not that plentiful. Still, she notes that free writing is not required in most areas of EAP. Another comment by the program designer on the priorities of their writing program is about the consideration of the learning styles. She strongly agrees with Item 27, which concerns materials input; however, she disagrees with Item 25, which is about the consideration of various learning styles and intelligence types. In this respect, she emphasizes the issue of multiple intelligences is not a priority in their program.

The program designer strongly agrees that the materials foster written and spoken interaction. However, she states that the materials do not directly assist students in improving their listening skills and grammar. She adds that "the main objective of their writing program is to provide the students with the required writing skills and strategies" (1 FYP: PD1), and they cover other language skills in different classes.

Figure 14: Findings in the Internal Evaluation for the FYP Program Designer (Case 1)

This section presents the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1, which is indicated in Figure 14 as well:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  The program designer emphasizes that the materials are fully integrated with the other materials in the program. The only item which is disagreed in this stage is the opportunity for the students to personalize the activities and tasks in the materials.

Figure 15: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 15, presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  Among the last six items, the only item the program designer disagrees with is the flexibility of the materials. She states that this was not their priority while developing these resources.

Figure 16: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 1)

4.2.1.2. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Program Requirements in Case 2

This section describes the external evaluation of the PYP materials, which is also demonstrated in Figure 16:

- **External Evaluation**

The two program designers mention that the program focuses not only on the complex EAP structures, but also basic linguistic and organizational skills. Both program designers strongly agree that the content of the materials is appropriate to the language level of the students despite the differences in proficiency levels of students. It is also stated that the material, with online resources, is already sufficient for these students:

> In our Self Access Center (which is also online), students can find a great number of writing material. Yet, as mentioned before, we as the administration do not send any extra materials to class, as one portfolio handout per week was a load of work already (3 drafts!) (2 pyp: pd1).

83% of the responses represent strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the program objectives. However, it is noted that the students are not ready to benefit from the materials in all respects due to the lack of study skills, such as critical thinking.

Figure 17: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Program Designers (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 17, describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2 in view of the program designers' responses:

- **External Evaluation**

  The main reason for the 100% agreement / strong agreement rate in the appropriacy of the materilas to the learning context is that the materials are developed by the book writing committee – "a group of very talented faculty members" (2 FYP: PD2). Still, though 67% of the responses indicate that there is strong agreement over the appropriacy of the materials to the language level of the students, mixed-level classes might be a problem for the teachers as previously mentioned in Case 1.

  The main reason for the 67% disagreement rate in the third criterion is the fact that the number of hours is not adequate enough to require additional resources. However, one of the program designers states that "a lot of times I do make additions to the tasks / topics in the book" (2 fyp: pd1).

  Regarding the appropriacy of the materials to the needs and objectives of the program, all the items are marked Strongly Agree, and the program designers consider the materials as "a very good source" (2 FYP: PD1). They highlight the fact that the materials were designed after a comprehensive needs analysis process.

Figure 18: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Program Designers (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 18, presents the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2 based on the responses of the program designers:

- **Internal Evaluation**

All the responses reveal that there is substantial agreement that the material includes motivating texts. Furthermore, 67% of the responses represent the strong agreement concerning the relevance of the content to the students' needs and interests whereas the rest show agreement.

Both program designers strongly agree that there is a sufficient amount of guidelines and input in the material since it is connected with the main textbook used in the program:

> The material is designed to build upon previous input / knowledge / practice, and form a continuum throughout the semester. Students receive the necessary input in terms of lexis / structure and information. They practice outlining / brainstorming / writing drafts to see progress and self-editing as well as peer-editing. The material with all drafts is kept in a portfolio to allow for a better outlook on the overall performance in this skill (1 pyp: pd2).

However, it is also mentioned that "there seems to be a lack of knowledge on the part of the students to produce ideas" (2 PYP: PD1).

The only disagreement regarding the activity types in the materials is on Item 24, which is about the free writing materials and tasks in the materials to improve the students' imagination and creativity. The main rationale behind this is the fact that "students will not be required to write using their imagination in the academic world" (2 PYP: PD2).

Only 17% of the responses show disagreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning styles of the students. The program designers further explain that there are a variety of activities which employ different learning styles. Considering the integration of the language

skills, the only disagreement is on the first item in which it is emphasized that the amount of listening is not sufficient.

Lastly, both program designers strongly agree that the materials include an adequate number of opportunities for the students to receive a variety of feedback as preparation for the tasks. There are formative (i.e. portfolio) and summative assessment tools to evaluate the works.

Figure 19: Findings in the Internal Evaluation for the PYP Program Designers (Case 2)

This section describes the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2, which is also indicated in Figure 19:

- **Internal Evaluation**

All the items are agreed to by the program designers, and they note that most of the topics "are adequate enough to spark a class discussion or to provoke students' thoughts for a writing task" (2 FYP: PD1). 83% of the responses demonstrate agreement on the relevance of the content, and it

is stressed that real life topics such as leadership, media, and power shift are appreciated. 67% of the responses indicate that there is strong agreement that there are clear rhetoric guidelines in the materials, and the amount of input is sufficient. One response shows strong disagreement on the linguistic tips and guidelines primarily because this is not a priority in the program. 66% of the responses indicate strong agreement on the variety of the writing tasks; however, one of the responses demonstrates the lack of free writing activities. Even though half of the responses (100% for Item 27) indicate strong agreement, the program designers disagree that the activities address various learning styles. 87% of the responses agree / strongly agree with the integration of language skills, and it is indicated that specifically listening, reading, speaking, and vocabulary are equally focused on, along with writing skills. Half of the responses show the agreement on the items (mainly Item 33), and 17% of them indicate strong agreement. The program designers state that the preference of the students is the feedback from their teachers.

Figure 20: Findings in the Internal Evaluation for the FYP Program Designers (Case 2)

This section describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2:

- **Overall Evaluation:**

  The strong agreement rating considering the usability of the materials, as seen in Figure 20, is 83%; the only disagreement is on the use of extra writing materials (Item 36). All of the responses, furthermore, indicate agreement / strong agreement on the adaptability of the materials.

Figure 21: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Program Designers (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 21, presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2 based on the program designers' points of views:

- **Overall Evaluation:**

  The majority of the responses, in the last two criteria, show agreement / strong agreement, and this shows the satisfaction with the usability and the adaptability of the materials.

Figure 22: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Program Designers (Case 2)

4.2.1.3. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Programs Requirements in Case 3

This section describes the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3, which is also indicated in Figure 22, based on the responses of the program designers:

- **External Evaluation**

  Though all the items in the first criterion (Learning Context) are marked Agree or Strongly Agree, it is also emphasized that cultural appropriacy is an important issue because of the contextual sensitivities. With regard to the appropriacy of the materials to the language levels of the students, the main consideration is the mixed language levels of the students. In particular, the need for more online resources is emphasized due to the tendency of the learners to use online learning materials in the region.

  Considering the appropriacy of the materials to the needs and objectives of the program, though Items 11 and 12 are agreed to by the program designer, she does not believe that the materials serve the program requirements, since it does not offer the variety of activities which are necessary in terms of the curricular goals.

Figure 23: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 3)

This section describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3:

- **External Evaluation**

Even though the program designer claims that the materials are not that relevant to the students' current and future studies, she agrees that the design and layout, as well as the cultural appropriacy, are at an acceptable level.

Considering the language level of the materials, the program designer agrees with the first item, and strongly agrees with Item 6; but there is strong disagreement with Item 5, which concerns the challenge level of the content to improve the students' English language level.

The program designer, as seen in Figure 23, disagrees with all the three items considering the additional resources, and emphasizes that there should be "guidelines for writing a report" (3 FYP: PD1) and "guidelines for conducting primary research" (3 FYP: PD1).

Although the program designer strongly agrees with the fact that the materials foster the process writing pedagogy, and help the students produce quality pieces of written work, she notes that "the grammatical points discussed in the book are not adequate and are too repetitive" (3 fyp: pd1).

Figure 24: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 3)

This section, including Figure 24, describes the internal evaluation of the PYP materials used in the academic writing classes in Case 3:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  Items 13 and 15 are marked Agree and Item 14 is marked Disagree concerning class motivation, which demonstrates that there is no real satisfaction or dissatisfaction over this. Considering the relevance of the content, all three items are agreed to; however, the materials seem to lack a focus on the themes with regard to the students' disciplines.

  It is strongly believed that there are enough linguistic tips and guidelines in the materials, and the program designer also agrees that "there is enough input and organization tips" (3 PYP: PD1), but there is a need for more samples so that the students can examine a greater number of models. In addition to this, though she states that there are plenty of controlled activities, she is not satisfied with the number of guided and free activities.

  The program designer agrees that the activities and the tasks in the materials employ different interaction types, and help the students develop their writing skills and strategies. Nevertheless, she does disagree that the materials address various learning styles and intelligence types due to the lack of variety in the types of activities. She argues that some activities are too repetitive and stereotypical.

  The only item disagreed regarding the integration with the other language skills concerns the materials input which assists the students in improving their reading and listening skills due to the fact that there is almost no listening support whereas there is a clear integration of reading and writing.

Considering the criterion on feedback, the only agreement concerns the students' feedback from their peers and teachers; however, there is a focus on teacher feedback. The program designer thinks that it is partly because of the culture that the teacher is considered to be the main source of knowledge.

Figure 25: Findings in the Internal Evaluation for the PYP Program Designer (Case 3)

This section describes the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3:

- **Internal Evaluation**

The most striking disagreement in this internal evaluation concerns the class motivation, for which the program designer marks all of the items Strongly Disagree, as indicated in Figure 25, emphasizing that this is the most critical concern she has. In addition to this, she disagrees with Items 16 and 18 primarily because the materials are not at all "relevant to the students' majors" (3 FYP: PD1). She argues that "IT and business topics should be included" (3 FYP: PD1).

Regarding the criterion about the guidelines and input, there is a similar dissatisfaction with the challenge level of the grammatical points; the PYP program designer emphasized this fact as well.

Although the program designer believes that the materials assist the students in developing their writing skills and strategies, she disagrees with Item 25, which is about the variety of activities and tasks addressing different learning styles and intelligence types, and Item 26, which regards the variety of activities and tasks for different interaction types. There is also strong dissatisfaction with the integration of the materials with other language skills.

Lastly, the program designer agrees that the students have opportunities for feedback from their peers and teachers as well as self-evaluation opportunities. However, again, the main feedback is conveyed by the teachers who "mark the essays and write their comments on them" (3 PYP: PD1).

Figure 26: Findings in the Internal Evaluation for the FYP Program Designer (Case 3)

This section describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3:

- **Overall Evaluation:**

  As indicated in Figure 26, there is no disagreement in any of three items regarding the usability of the materials. Nevertheless, even though the program designer agrees with the last two items, she disagrees that the materials can be adapted easily to the program as the number of program hours is relatively too many considering the content of the materials.

Figure 27: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Program Designer (Case 3)

This section presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3:

- **Overall Evaluation:**

  The program designer agrees with Items 35 and 36, but she disagrees with Item 34 which concerns the integration of the materials with other materials in the English language program. She, as demonstrated in Figure 27, agrees with all three items on the adaptability of the materials.

Figure 28: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Program Designer (Case 3)

To sum up, in the external evaluation of the materials in Case 1, both program designers agree / strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their program requirements, which is quite similar to the findings in Case 2. However, there is considerable dissatisfaction in the global materials used in Case 3 in terms of cultural appropriacy, language levels, and additional resources. It is important to highlight that in-house materials are used in the first two cases.

Regarding the internal evaluation, although the agreement ratings are more than disagreement in all the three cases, there are common areas with some disagreement among these cases: learning styles, activity types, and integration with other skills. It is obvious that learning styles are not considered much in the selection / development of academic writing materials, and free writing activities are not focused in these materials. As for the integration of writing with other language skills, reading seems to be the main way of providing the students with the necessary input, and speaking is used more in the pre-writing stage. On the other hand, it is notable that global materials are not considered to be successful in motivating and engaging the students, specifically in the FYP of Case 3 in which the program designer strongly disagrees that the content of the global materials they use are attractive and / or interesting for their students.

Lastly, the items in the overall evaluation are mostly marked with Agree and Strongly Agree, and there is no specific dissatisfaction in these items.

4.2.2. The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations

The data relevant to the sub-question of the first research question, which is on the appropriacy of the materials to the teachers' techniques, is presented below:

- To what extent do these materials serve the teachers' teaching techniques and expectations?

4.2.2.1. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations in Case 1

This section describes the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2, which is also demonstrated in Figure 28, based on the responses of the teachers in the questionnaires and the interviews:

- **External Evaluation**

  Though there is strong agreement on Items 2 and 3, the teachers do not think that the materials are relevant to their students' future studies due to the variety of disciplines they are in. They, furthermore, think that some of the activities and tasks in the materials are too challenging for some of their students.

  Though there is strong agreement on the first two items regarding the additional materials, the teachers strongly disagree with Item 9, stating they "would like to use extensive online materials" (1 pyp: t2).

  Considering the appropriacy of the materials to the contextual needs and objectives, there is agreement / strong agreement on Items 10 and 11, but the teachers regard the material as not that beneficial in assisting the students to produce quality works.

Figure 29: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 1)

This section describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1 based on the teachers' responses in the questionnaires and the interviews:

- **External Evaluation**

  67% of the responses show strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning context, and all three teachers believe that they are age-related, and both the students' interests and academic standards were considered in the developmental phases of the materials.

  As for the appropriacy of the materials to the language levels of the students, the responses are primarily (56%) Strongly Agree as seen in Figure 29; however, all the teachers state that they have students with a wide variety of second language proficiency levels. Furthermore, considering the additional resources, the teachers declare that their "students have a definite need for example tasks and essays so as to use the structural patterns and ideas from these models" (1 FYP: T1-2-3).

  The majority of the teachers (67%) strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to the curricular objectives; however, they have some suggestions, such as printing the materials as a book and adding more self-study resources.

Figure 30: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 30, describes the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1, considering the responses of the teachers:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  The teachers both agree / strongly agree that the "topics are personalized and interactive" (1 pyp: t1). However, they disagree that the materials have texts and tasks relevant to the students' fields of study, but agree that the materials provide the students with the necessary skills and strategies. They strongly agree that the materials include topics and texts related to the students' daily lives.

  Though the agreement / strong agreement rating is 100% for Items 20 and 21, the teachers disagree with Item 19, stating that there need to be more linguistic guidelines. Furthermore, they think that the free writing activities are not sufficient due to the focus on accuracy in the lower levels. Nonetheless, the teachers agree / strongly agree that the number of controlled and guided activities is sufficient.

  The teachers agree that the activities in the materials employ different interaction types, and help the students develop their writing skills and strategies. Nevertheless, they disagree that the materials address various learning styles and intelligence types due to the lack of variety in the activities. According to the teachers, there is almost no listening support in the materials, whereas there is a clear integration of reading and writing.

  According to the teachers in Case 1, there is a focus on teacher feedback, whereas the peer feedback and the self-evaluation opportunities are limited.

Figure 31: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 31, presents the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  Almost all the teachers (78%) agree that the materials are adequate to hold the attention of the students, to engage them, and to increase students' level of interest. Moreover, the agreement / strong agreement rating is around 78% according to the teachers who claim that topics, such as learning languages, social networking, and work life are more relevant to the students than smoking or health issues.

  There is a similar satisfaction (67%) with the guidelines and input which the teachers emphasize stating that the materials "walk the students through the writing process" (1 fyp: t3). There are similar responses with regards to the activity types, and all the teachers agree that there are plenty of controlled activities in the materials. The number of guided

activities is also sufficient, but there are few free writing activities and tasks to improve the students' imagination and creativity.

67% of the responses show that there is agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to different learning styles; there is only 1 response that shows disagreement. However, the teachers, in general, regard the materials as "raw material" (1 FYP: T3), and believe that it should be their job primarily to use the materials to employ different learning styles.

The Disagree / Strongly Disagree rating regarding the integration of the materials with other language skills is only 33%; and the main concern is the focus on listening.

Lastly, the majority of the responses (67%) indicate that there is strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to enable the students to obtain feedback from their peers and teachers, to find self-evaluation opportunities, and to achieve preparation for the written examinations of the program.

Figure 32: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 32, describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials based on the teachers' responses in Case 1:

- **Overall Evaluation:**

  Only 17% of the responses indicate agreement on the usability factor, the rest show disagreement / strong disagreement mainly because of the format of the materials. They prefer to have all the resources used in the writing class in a book format.

Figure 33: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 33, presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1:

- **Overall Evaluation:**

  There is no substantial disagreement / strong disagreement concerning the usability and the adaptability of the materials, and the teachers are primarily pleased concerning the flexibility of their writing materials.

Figure 34: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 1)

4.2.2.2. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectation in Case 2

This section describes the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2:

- **External Evaluation**

The main concern regarding this stage is about the future studies of the students, as the materials are not discipline-specific:

> Most of the topics in the materials are relevant but when we consider the discourses, our students need more 'graph interpretation' based writings because they will be writing reports when they go to their departments (especially engineering students) (2 pyp: t13).

The majority of the teachers (74%) are satisfied with the language level of the materials, and one of them states that "none of the tasks were too easy or too difficult for the English language level of my students" (2 pyp: t11). However**,** they expect to have more sample written paragraphs.

As seen in Figure 34 below, almost half of the teachers (48%) agree, and 26% of them strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their expectations, though there are notes, such as "the pre-writing stage needs more material with which the student can raise his schemata" (2 pyp: t8).

Figure 35: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 35 below, describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2:

- **External Evaluation**

  73% of the responses indicate either agreement or strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning context, but the teachers also stress that one common concern is that "students sometimes feel that the content of the materials may not be related to their current studies" (2 fyp: t2). Their main concern, regarding the level of the materials, is the mixed language levels of the students.

  Considering the additional resources, the teachers claim that the materials themselves are sufficient, and some are satisfied with the online file sharing program which enables them "to share extra materials prepared by individual instructors" (2 FYP: T1-2)

  The teachers, furthermore, believe that the materials are appropriate to their own teaching techniques and expectations. They specifically like "the detailed input sections + sample essays / paragraphs" (2 fyp: t5) in their writing materials.

Figure 36: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 2)

This section describes the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2, which is demonstrated in Figure 36:

- **Internal Evaluation**

The majority of the teachers (74%) agree that the materials are not sufficient to maintain the students' attention, to motivate and engage them, and to increase the students' interest.

The agreement / strong agreement rating, with regards to the relevance of the content, is 59% according to the teachers who claim that the materials "would help the students develop their intellect as well as challenge them in terms of perspective" (2 PYP: T2). Some teachers claim that the materials would be more relevant if it had topics, such as "technology, university life, and music or sports" (2 PYP: T3).

The majority of the teachers (around 75%) is satisfied with the guidelines and the input as well as the activity types in the materials. However, the dilemma between free writing and EAP is also observed during the interviews: "More free writing may be more interesting to treat, although it may be difficult to fit in with academic preparation" (2 PYP: T4). One of the reasons not to have free writing activities is summarized by another teacher:

> It [the material] focuses on guided / controlled activities. I would prefer to encourage students to do more creative writing, but unfortunately that does not fit the 'proficiency' [the end of the year exam] goals (1 pyp: t8).

53% of the responses reveal that there is disagreement / strong disagreement on the appropriacy of the materials to different learning styles. One of the teachers claims that "there is no variety, actually" (2 pyp: t7). She further explains that "all writing tasks follow more or less the same pattern, which makes the writing activities / tasks very mechanical" (2 pyp: t7).

The disagreement / strong disagreement with regards to the integration of the materials with other language skills is 36%, and some teachers claim that the materials are "designed in a way that improves students' reading and comprehension skills along with some guided grammar and vocabulary enhancement activities" (2 PYP: T1). On the other hand, the teachers all believe that speaking is fostered during the pre-writing phases.

Lastly, the majority of the responses (93%) indicate that there is agreement / strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to enable the students to obtain feedback from their peers and teachers, to have self-evaluation opportunities, and achieve preparation for the written examinations of the program. There is a significant period of time allocated for feedback in the class as a result of the new changes in the overall language curricula. It is also emphasized that the teachers "sometimes avoid designing activities for the students to achieve peer feedback because of time constraints" (2 PYP: T2).

Figure 37: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 37, presents the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  Most of the teachers (80%) agree that the materials are sufficient to hold the attention of the students (Item 13), to motivate and engage them (Item 14), and to raise interest and curiosity among the students (Item 15). There is no strong disagreement with these items regarding the class motivation.

  Considering the relevance of the materials, almost half of the responses (47%) show agreement, and there is also strong agreement (13%). It is expressed that the students usually enjoy topics related to power such as media, notions, leaders, and money.

  There is great satisfaction (80%) with the guidelines and input in the materials, which has been highlighted by the teachers stating that "everything is explained step-by-step in details and supported by examples" (2 FYP: T3). The agreement / strong agreement rating for Items 22, 23, and 24 is also very high (73%), and most of these teachers (60%) strongly agree that the materials include a wide variety of activities and tasks. Besides they often state that they focus more on controlled and guided writing activities. These teachers maintain that "considering the objectives of the course, free writing activities (such as multi-genre) were eliminated" (2 fyp: t4). On the other hand, some of the teachers state that "more free writing activities can be added so that the students can freely write what they want to and practice their skills without being restricted with format issues" (2 FYP: T1).

  40% of the responses reveal that there is strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to different learning styles and interaction types, and there is no strong disagreement with any of the items. On the

other hand, some teachers assert very strongly that their materials "need to look serious" (2 FYP: T1) since writing at the university "is a serious job" (2 FYP: T1).

The agreement / strong agreement rating with regard to the integration of the materials with other language skills is 73%; there is no item marked Strongly Disagree among the three items in this criterion. The teachers all agree that the level of integration with other skills – except for grammar – is sufficient considering their teaching techniques and expectations.

The majority of the responses (73%) indicate that there is agreement / strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to lead the students get feedback from their peers and teachers, to find self-evaluation opportunities, and to get prepared for the writing parts of their exams in the second language program. It is also emphasized clearly that the teachers prefer to give both written and oral feedback as long as the time available is sufficient.

Figure 38: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 2)

This section describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2, which is demonstrated in Figure 38:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  Around 75% of the responses indicate agreement / strong agreement over the usability of the materials. The teachers argue that they don't face "any difficulty in adapting the materials to their context" (2 PYP: T2).

Figure 39: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 39, presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2 in view of the teachers' responses:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  87% of the responses indicate that there is agreement / strong agreement over the usability of the materials as there is a "strong emphasis on academic writing" (2 FYP: T4). In addition to this, except for only 1 response, almost all the teachers (93%) stress that the materials are easy to be adapted to their situations.

Figure 40: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 2)

4.2.2.3. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Teachers' Teaching Techniques and Expectations in Case 3

This section describes the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3 based on the teachers' responses, which is demonstrated in Figure 40:

- **External Evaluation**

  67% of the responses show agreement while 33% of them indicate disagreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the context. The main concerns are about the cultural inappropriacy and the lack of the required academic skills. Again there is no strong agreement or strong disagreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the language level of the students. The ratings are very similar, and this is primarily because of the mixed language level of the students.

  However, 89% of the responses indicate that the teachers disagree with Items 7, 8, and 9; this reveals that they cannot find additional resources to meet their expectations.

  67% of the responses indicate agreement while 33% of them indicate disagreement on the appropriacy of the global materials to the contextual needs and objectives.

Figure 41: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 3)

This section, including Figure 41, describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 41:

- **External Evaluation**

  33% of the responses indicate strong disagreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning context whereas 44% of the responses indicate agreement / strong agreement. The main issues are the lack of focus concerning the topics and texts for the disciplines of the students, and the cultural inappropriacy of some of the content.

  There is no remarkable response concerning the appropriacy of the materials to the language level of the students primarily because there is a wide range of language levels. Likewise, the rate of disagreement / strong disagreement (56%) and agreement / strong agreement (44%) is very similar in Items 7, 8, and 9. The teachers claim that "resources with regard to essay format and grammar are highly needed" (3 FYP: T2).

  The majority of the teachers (67%) agrees / strongly agrees that the materials are appropriate to the teachers' teaching techniques and expectations. They are in general satisfied with the process approach that the material adopts.

Figure 42: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 3)

This section, including Figure 42, presents the internal evaluation of the PYP materials based on the responses in the questionnaires and the interviews:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  The majority of the teachers (78%) agree that the materials are not adequate to hold the attention of the students, to engage them, and to increase their interest and curiosity. In addition to this, a large number of responses (89%) indicate the dissatisfaction of the teachers concerning the relevance of the materials content to their students. They strongly believe that the focus of the materials is "the outside world" (3 PYP: T3), in which their "students are weak" (3 PYP: T3).

  One of the teachers stresses that "the students on the academic side are given assignments which are not very logically ordered" (3 pyp: t1). There is also another note from the teachers that their students need more ideas with regard to the tasks they should write on.

  67% of the responses indicate the teachers' disagreement with the variety of activities they use. They believe that the materials mainly focus on controlled writing activities, but their students need more guidance during the writing process.

  The agreement and the disagreement ratings are very similar regarding the appropriacy of the materials to the learning styles of the students. However, the teachers generally maintain that there should be greater variety in the materials to address various learning styles and intelligence types; also the materials should employ different interaction types. Similarly, there is no noticeable teacher agreement or disagreement on the materials' integration with other language skills. The teachers generally use the planning phase to foster oral interaction, but they generally state the need for more input for their students before the writing phase.

Considering the last criterion in the internal evaluation, the only agreement concerns the feedback for the students from their peers and teachers; however, there is a focus on teacher feedback whereas "peer feedback and self-evaluation opportunities are limited in the materials" (3 PYP: T1).

Figure 43: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 3)

This section describes the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3:

- **Internal Evaluation**

The majority of the teachers (67%) agree that the materials are not adequate enough to maintain the attention of the students, to engage them, and to increase their interest. Moreover, almost all of the teachers (89%) complain about the irrelevant topics in the materials, such as the weather, sleeping habits, architecture, and fairy tales, all of which are unnecessary in view of the majors of many students.

56% of the responses show disagreement with the appropriacy of the guidelines and the input in the materials to their specific teaching

situation, and there is no strong disagreement from the teachers in this criterion.

89% of the responses indicate that there is a sufficient number of controlled, guided, and free writing activities and tasks in the materials. In particular, the teachers are satisfied with the variety of free writing activities and tasks. Similarly, 78% of the responses indicate that there is an agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to different learning styles; there is only 1 response (11%) that shows disagreement. The teachers are also satisfied with the opportunities to foster oral interaction in these materials.

Lastly, as seen in Figure 43, all the teachers agree / strongly agree that the materials lead students to get feedback from their peers and teachers, to evaluate their own works, and to get prepared for the writing parts of the exams. The teachers, in general, are glad to have all these kinds of options to give feedback.

Figure 44: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 3)

This section describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  Two teachers state that "there is no real integration" (3 PYP: T1-T2) in the materials with other materials in the program. Furthermore, as seen in Figure 44, the majority of the teachers (67%) disagree that the materials can be adapted to their teaching situation. Therefore, most of the time, they need to prepare extra resources.

Figure 45: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Teachers (Case 3)

This section presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3, which is indicated in Figure 45:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  67% of the responses show that there is agreement or strong agreement on the usability of the materials. Similarly, except for 2 responses, almost all the teachers (78%) stress that the materials are easy to adapt to their situation. The only main difficulty is due to cultural sensitivities.

Figure 46: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Teachers (Case 3)

To conclude, in the external evaluation of the materials, there seem to be some different perspectives between the program designers and the teachers, since the teachers are not as satisfied as the program designers. A few of the common issues raised by the teachers are the lack of mixed ability options for the students with different language proficiency levels, the irrelevance of the materials to the disciplinary fields of the students, and the inadequate facilities to use additional online materials. Furthermore, the teachers in Case 3 highlight a critical issue for them, which is the cultural inappropriacy of some of the texts and the images.

With regards to the internal evaluation, there are similar points of views with the program designers' concerns like learning styles, activity types, and integration with other skills. However, the teachers seem to be more concerned about the class motivation and the relevance of the content. Most of the teachers, specifically in Cases 2 and 3, argue that their students do not find the topics, texts, and activities interesting at all primarily due to the fact that they are not that relevant to their fields of studies. In Case 3, in particular, global materials are criticized due to their irrelevant topics which do not appeal to the students in the IT and Business departments.

As for the usability, there seems to be a demand from the teachers to use the in-house materials in book format in terms of practicalities; and the adaptability of the materials is not satisfactory in Case 3 due to the cultural sensitivities there.

4.2.3. The Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and the Interests of the Students

The data relevant to the sub-question of the first research question about the appropriacy of the materials to the needs of the students are presented:

- To what extent do these materials meet the needs and the interests of the students?

4.2.3.1. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and the Interests of the Students in Case 1

This section, including Figure 46, presents the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1 in view of the students' responses in the questionnaires and the interviews:

- **External Evaluation**

70% of the responses show sizeable agreement / strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning context in Case 1. Most of the students are gratified to see tasks specially designed for their own needs and interests. Similarly, the students consider the language level of the material as very suitable for their English level.

In addition to these, students are content with the additional writing resources – both on-site and online – through which they can practice the writing process, which is clearly noticed in the substantial agreement / strong agreement (88%) ratings.

Considering the last criterion in the external evaluation, 80% of the responses indicate agreement on the appropriacy of the material to the students' needs and language learning objectives.

Figure 47: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 47, describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1:

- **External Evaluation**

  92% of the responses indicate the very high agreement / strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the students' learning contexts of the students. Almost all of the students are very satisfied with the tasks and activities specially designed for their own needs and interests. Likewise, 90% of the students consider the language of the material as the right level for their English – which is mainly Intermediate to Upper-Intermediate.

  The majority of the students (69%) think that they are provided with lots of additional resources to practice writing outside class. They, in particular, like the online resources.

  Most of the students (80%) agree / strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their learning needs and objectives. They are aware of the fact that the materials have been developed considering their language learning needs.

Figure 48: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 1)

This section presents the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1, which is demonstrated in Figure 48 below:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  The 76% Agree / Strongly Agree rating reveals that the materials are sufficient to motivate students in class. Moreover, 85% of the responses indicate that the students agree / strongly agree on the relevance of the materials to their learning needs and objectives.

  Besides 65% of the responses indicate agreement with the appropriacy of the guidelines and the input of the materials to the learning context; however, there is no strong disagreement in the first two items in this criterion; Item 18 which concerns the presence of linguistic guidelines and Item 19 which concerns rhetoric tips and guidelines.

  62% of the responses show that there is satisfactory number of controlled, guided, and activities in the materials, whereas the rest reveals dissatisfaction. Some students are specifically happy about the creativity aspect of the process. Furthermore, more than half of the students agree that the materials address different learning styles, and it employs a variety of interaction types.

  73% of the responses demonstrate that there is agreement / strong agreement among the students on the materials' integration with other language skills. For instance, there are only 3 responses showing disagreement on the integration of the materials with grammar and vocabulary.

  Lastly, 64% of the responses reveal the agreement on the benefits of feedback and written assessment, and there are only 2 responses showing disagreement / strong disagreement for Item 32 which is on self-evaluation.

Figure 49: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 49, presents the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  There is no remarkable response concerning the attractiveness of the materials; and the students, in general, believe that this is because they have a strong need for academic English. However, most of the students (74%) are gratified to see texts and tasks which are closely linked to their own disciplines. It is obvious that they do not only relate the materials to their current and future studies, but also to their daily lives.

  77% of the responses show agreement / strong agreement with the appropriacy of the guidelines and the input of the materials to the learning context; however, the strong disagreement rating is only 2%. The 37% strong agreement rating, for instance, indicates noticeable satisfaction with the rhetoric tips and the guidelines.

69% of the responses show that there is a sufficient number of a variety of writing activities. However, the students emphasize the limited number of free activities. Considering the appropriacy of the materials to the learning styles of the students, 71% of the responses reveal that there is an agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to different learning styles; there is no remarkable strong disagreement response rate. Moreover, the agreement / strong agreement rating regarding the guidelines and the input in the materials is 68%. The teachers are mainly satisfied with the opportunities to foster oral interaction. Students are particularly pleased with the written and the oral interaction.

The most substantial strongly agreement rating (37%) in the internal evaluation for the FYP materials is found with regard to the feedback and assessment parts in the materials. There is no strong disagreement among the students over the opportunities in the materials for both peer and teacher feedback. However, some of the students regard self-evaluation and peer assessment as a "waste of time" (1 FYP: S8-S9-S10-S11) as teacher feedback is of greater value to them.

Figure 50: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 1)

This section, including Figure 50, describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 1 based on the students' responses:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  73% of the students' responses indicate agreement / strong agreement over the usability of the materials. Similarly, the majority of the students (76%) agrees / strongly agrees that the materials can be easily adapted to their situation.

Figure 51: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 1)

This section presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 1, which is demonstrated in Figure 51 below:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  81% of the responses indicate that there is agreement / strong agreement over the usability of the materials. The majority of the students (74%) stress that the materials are easy to adapt to their situation. There is only 1 strongly agree response for Item 37 – on the adaptability of the content.

Figure 52: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 1)

4.2.3.2. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and the Interests of the Students in Case 2

This section, including Figure 52, demonstrates the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2:

- **External Evaluation**

  78% of the responses indicate sizeable agreement / strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning context. The majority of disagreement concerns the Item 1, since the students in the engineering departments, for instance, claim that "the materials are not relevant to their disciplines" (2 PYP: S 1-2-3).

  The substantial agreement option (64%) reveals that the students consider the language level of the material suitable for their English level. However, 60% of the students state that they are not provided with a sufficient number of additional resources to practice writing outside the class, focusing on their tendency to use CMC.

  Most of the students (71%) agree / strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their learning needs. They specifically like the communicative aspects of the material.

Figure 53: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 2)

This section presents the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2, which is indicated in Figure 53:

- **External Evaluation**

  77% of the responses indicate substantial agreement / strong agreement on the appropriacy of the materials to the learning contexts of the students. The majority of the students are quite satisfied with the tasks and activities specially designed for their own needs and interests. Besides, 83% of the students consider the language level of the materials the correct level for their English. They all agree that they are able to do the activities and tasks in the materials with their current English level.

  The majority of the students (72%) think that they are provided with a sufficient number of additional resources to practice writing outside class; only 10% of the responses reveal strong disagreement.

  Most of the students (74%) agree / strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their learning needs and objectives. Nevertheless, several students mention that they would rather have more information about their departmental themes.

Figure 54: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 54, demonstrates the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2:

- **Internal Evaluation**

The most striking response regarding the first criterion is the 46% disagreement option. Some of the students think that the topics are "boring" (2 PYP: S4-S5-S6-S7) mainly due to the irrelevance of some of the content to their disciplines.

Although the agreement rate (50%) seems to be quite high regarding the relevance of the content, only 9% of the responses demonstrate that the students strongly agree on the relevance of the materials to their learning objectives. This is mainly due to the fact that the materials are not designed considering the disciplines of the students:

> In my opinion, the writing materials are very useful and they help us to prepare for our exams (mid-terms or proficiency). However, they would be more useful if they are related to our departments. I wish the materials included more information about my department (2 pyp: s83).

56% of the responses show agreement with the appropriacy of the guidelines in the materials to the learning context, and there are also some students (13%) that strongly agree with the items. Most of the students stress the development of their organizational skills is thanks to the materials. Furthermore, 60% of the responses indicate that there is a sufficient number of various activities and tasks in the materials. However, most of the students do not think that they can develop their imagination and creativity through these activities and tasks.

There is no significant agreement (52%) or disagreement (48%) regarding the appropriacy of the materials to the learning styles of the students. The students are primarily satisfied with the different interaction types.

54% of the responses demonstrate that there is agreement on the materials' integration with the other language skills; however, 37% of the students maintain that this integration is not sufficient. They generally think that there should be more integration with speaking. They are also glad to have the detailed grammatical information in the materials.

In the last criterion of this stage, 73% of the responses reveal the students' agreement / strong agreement on the benefits of feedback. Nonetheless, they believe that peer assessment is not necessary, since they eventually get feedback from the teachers.

Figure 55: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 2)

This section, including Figure 55, demonstrates the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2:

- **Internal Evaluation**

There is no significant difference in the responses concerning the attractiveness of the material for the students: 51% disagreement and 49% agreement. Some students find the few visuals, such as caricatures,

attractive. Similarly, regarding the relevance of the content in the materials, no significant difference is observed for this criterion. Though the materials used are EAP materials, most of the students relate the content to their daily lives. In addition to these, 59% of the responses show agreement with the appropriacy of the guidelines and the input in the material to the learning context. This is the highest rate of any option in the students' internal evaluation.

59% of the responses indicate that there is a sufficient number of various activities in the materials. The strong disagreement is 12%, and some of this disagreement is due to some students' stating that some tasks take too long to complete. Moreover, 64% agreement / strongly agreement shows that the students believe the activities address various learning styles, employ different interaction types, and help them develop their writing skills and strategies. Nonetheless, the students, in particular, want to have more information and input on structural elements: "it is better if it [the material] focuses also on vocabulary and grammar" (2 fyp: s29).

Figure 56: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 2)

This section presents the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 2, which is indicated in Figure 56:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  68% of the responses demonstrate student agreement / strong agreement concerning the usability of the materials. As for the adaptability of the materials, there is no significant difference between the agreement (55%) and the disagreement (45%) ratings.

Figure 57: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 2)

This section demonstrates the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 2:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  A large number of responses (58%) show that there is agreement over the usability of the materials. Most students think that the materials are easy to use and well-organized. As seen in the figure below, there is no significant difference between the agreement (51%) and the disagreement rating (49%) ratings in terms of adaptability of the materials.

Figure 58: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 2)

4.2.3.3. The Findings on the Appropriacy of the Materials to the Needs and the Interests of the Students in Case 3

This section, including Figure 58, describes the external evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3:

- **External Evaluation**

  There is no significant finding with regard to the appropriacy of the materials to the learning contexts of the students; disagreement is 47%, while agreement is 53%. Nevertheless, 57% of the responses from the students reveal that the materials are appropriate to their language level of the students. It should also be noted that this appropriacy depends mainly on different groups of students having a variety of English language levels.

  The majority of the students (66%) think that they are provided with a sufficient number of additional resources to practice writing outside class. Most of them (71%) agree / strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their learning objectives. It is interesting to find out that most of the disagreement concerns the appropriacy for both process and product pedagogies.

Figure 59: Findings in the External Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 3)

This section, including Figure 59, describes the external evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3:

- **External Evaluation**

  52% of the responses demonstrate significant agreement with the appropriacy of the materials to the learning context. The majority of the students are specifically satisfied with the design and the layout of the academic writing materials. Moreover, 62% of the students consider the language level of the materials as correct for their English level – B1 to C1. However, some of them claim that the materials are below their English language level, while some others think that it is above their level.

  The majority of the students (76%) state that they are provided with a sufficient number of additional writing resources to practice writing outside class. In addition, as indicated in the figure below, 58% of the students agree / strongly agree that the materials are appropriate to their specific learning needs and objectives. They state that the "materials are quite beneficial in enabling them to produce quality essays" (3 FYP: S1-2-3).

Figure 60: Findings in the External Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 3)

This section, including Figure 60, describes the internal evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  56% of the responses demonstrate that the materials contain topics, texts, activities, and tasks that motivate students. Most of the students state that the activities and tasks are motivating and engaging. Furthermore, the majority of the students (66%) maintain that the content is relevant to their academic and daily lives.

  With regard to the guidelines and the input, there is no significant agreement or disagreement over the appropriacy of the guidelines and the input of the materials to the learning context. Again, the responses for agreement (53%) and disagreement (47%) are very similar regarding the activity types. Most of the students think that the materials contain a sufficient number of various controlled activities and tasks.

  The majority of the students (70%) believe that the materials are appropriate to learners with different learning styles. The students are primarily pleased to be able to develop their writing skills and strategies thanks to the activities and tasks in the material. Most of the students (62%) are also glad to have the opportunity to develop other language skills along with writing. In particular, they strongly believe that they have improved their vocabulary range thanks to their academic writing materials.

  Lastly, 54% of the responses reveal the students' agreement on the benefits of feedback and written assessment which enable them to produce quality written products. Some of the students also state disagreement to some extent with Item 32, which concerns self-evaluation opportunities.

Figure 61: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 3)

This section describes the internal evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3, which is demonstrated in Figure 61:

- **Internal Evaluation**

  There is no significant difference between agreement (52%) and disagreement (48%) ratings with regard to the first criterion in the internal evaluation. However, students primarily note that the topics and the texts are attractive and up-to-date, and these maintain their attention in the class. Similarly, the disagreement rating (47%) is very similar to the agreement rating (53%) considering the relevance of the materials to the students' academic studies and daily lives.

  61% of the responses indicate an agreement on the benefits of the guidelines and the input for the students whereas 39% of the students disagree with this. During the interviews, the satisfaction of the students with the linguistic guidelines and tips is observed.

Regarding the activity types in the materials, the substantial agreement rate (56%) is noticeable. Furthermore, the 66% agree / strongly agree rating indicates that the students mostly believe that the activities in the materials address various learning styles, employ different interaction types, and help them develop their writing skills and strategies.

The agreement / strong agreement rating for the guidelines and the input in the materials is 62%, and the rest (38%) indicate disagreement / strong disagreement. The students, in particular, are gratified with the clear development of their vocabulary range thanks to the texts and tasks in their writing materials.

Lastly, 60% of the responses reveal that students consider the feedback and the written assessment opportunities in the material beneficial for them. Only 2% of the responses show strong student disagreement with theses aspects of the materials, although they state that most of the feedback sessions are carried out by their teachers and themselves.

Figure 62: Findings in the Internal Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 3)

This section, including Figure 62, describes the overall evaluation of the PYP materials in Case 3:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  52% of the responses indicate student agreement concerning the usability of the material. Similarly, in terms of the adaptability of the materials, there is no significant difference between the agreement (51%) and the disagreement (49%) rating.

Figure 63: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the PYP Students (Case 3)

This section presents the overall evaluation of the FYP materials in Case 3:

- **Overall Evaluation**

  More than half of the responses (62%) show that there is agreement / strong agreement among the students concerning the usability of the materials. Most of the students state that they do not frequently use any other materials in their writing classes. There is also mostly agreement (58%) among the students considering the adaptability of the materials.

Figure 64: Findings in the Overall Evaluation of the FYP Students (Case 3)

Last but not least, in the external evaluation of the materials according to the students, the satisfaction can be noticed in the first two cases in which in-house materials are used. The students specifically like the topics and texts, as well as tasks, which are relevant to their academic disciplines. Moreover, they generally find the level of the material right for their English proficiency level. Similar to some of the teachers, mainly in the PYP of Case 1, the students have high demand for using more computer assisted language learning tools.

With regards to the internal evaluation, the students highlight a few issues which are not considered that highly by their teachers and / or program designers. Firstly, they state the strong need to have more sample written products for them to experience a variety of ideas and structures which they can benefit from furing their writing process. Secondly, they mention the need for linguistic structures and patterns, since they feel more confident as long as they have the necessary grammatical knowledge and vocabulary range. Lastly, similar to some of the teachers, they state that they would be more engaged and motivated if more audio-visual materials were used as input. One of the most remarkable notes from the students is about the feedback and assessment criterion. As well as the program designers and the teachers, they also mention that they generally focus on the feedback from the teacher. However, the majority of the students emphasize that they do not understand the need to have self-evaluation and / or peer feedback, since they always have feedback from their teachers, which they value much more than any other feedback and assessment activities. Lastly, with regards to the role of free writing in their writing studies, most of the students except for the PYP students of Case 1, argue that there are few free writing activities and tasks in their material, and they find these activities more enjoyable than the others.

In terms of usability and adaptability, none of the responses regarding these two criteria in the three cases are noticeable in any of the categories including the students.

4.3. The Main Considerations concerning the Academic Writing Materials

In this part, the relevant data collected from specific parts of the questionnaires – mainly open-ended questions – and the interviews are described in order to explain the findings related to the second research question, which is stated below:

- What are the main considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students concerning the academic writing materials used at the tertiary level?

Firstly, the core considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students were identified in the questionnaires, and then these considerations were focused on during the interviews. The results of these data collection procedures are presented in this section in three categories: the program designers, the teachers, and the students. These categories are again grouped in two (the PYP and the FYP) for each of the three cases. The same coding system – lower-case characters such as "(3 fyp: s4)" for the responses in the questionnaires, and capitals such as "(3 FYP: S4)" for the ones in the semi-structured interviews – for the direct quotations from the participants is applied as the previous part.

4.3.1. The Main Consideration of the Program Designers concerning the Academic Writing Materials

In this section, the relevant data to the first sub-question of the second research questions is presented:

- What are the main considerations of the program designers when adopting / developing their academic writing materials?

4.3.1.1. Findings on the Main Considerations of the Program Designers in Case 1

In the PYP, the very experienced program designer lists their prime considerations while adopting / developing the writing materials as below:

- **Learning Context:** The program designer discusses the unique features of their program: the students coming from a variety of socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds and the one-year intensive language and culture classes.
- **Language Level:** In the program, there is some streaming, but there are "students in … groups whose English is much better or worse than the group average" (1 pyp: pd1).
- **Needs and Objectives:** The program designer thinks that their students' "need for writing is most likely to be for academic purposes, and also as an examination skill" (1 pyp: pd1).
- **Relevant Content:** The students in the program need to have topics and themes such as "applying for a job, answering an advertisement, inquiring about the details of an offer, etc." (1 pyp: pd1), as well as basic academic skills.
- **Usability:** The writing classes should be "fully integrated in the language practice classes" (1 PYP: PD1). The program designer further explains that "the course is specifically geared at integrating these skills" (1 PYP: PD1).
- **End-of-Term Exam Requirements:** He believes that, generally, writing class results should be in parallel with the end-of-term exam requirements.

The last consideration is an additional item the program designer suggests. He argues that the students' prime motivation in most of the writing classes is the exams. Accordingly, product pedagogy is seen as important as process pedagogy.

The program designer in the FYP in Case 1 identifies the four areas below as the prime considerations in the development of their writing materials used in the program:

- **Learning Context:** The program designer emphasizes the importance of material appropriacy to the students' current and future studies and to their learning requirements.
- **Language Level:** It is also vital that the material should be at the same language level as the average level of the students which is generally different from class to class.
- **Needs and Objectives:** It is also stressed by the program designer that the materials should address, as much as possible, the program objectives, the teachers' expectations, and the students' needs and interests.
- **Relevant Content:** As this is an academic writing course, the prime consideration should be the disciplines of the students, and their needs and requirements to be successful writers in a variety of subjects in these disciplines.

The role of in-house materials, prepared by the faculty staff, is emphasized in this respect, since materials of this type seem to be the only solution for the students' variety of academic disciplines. In addition to this, these discipline-specific materials are considered to be an essential part of an EAP writing program, which is a critical issue highlighted by the program designer.

On the other hand, she focuses on the difficulty in terms of resources to plan the syllabus of each material in different departments, and develop contents in parallel with these syllabi.

4.3.1.2. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Program Designers in Case 2

There are five areas considered as prime issues for writing materials in the responses of the program designers:

- **Language Level:** Since writing material needs to be in parallel with the core program, the program designers state that the language level of the writing material should be similar to that of core materials.
- **Needs and Objectives:** It is vital for the material to meet the needs and the objectives. On the other hand, some students do not have "the habit to read, think [in a critical way] and take responsibility for their own learning" (2 pyp: pd1).
- **Relevant Content:** As for the content of the material, the program designers "receive constant feedback" (2 PYP: PD2) from the instructors, but they emphasize that the program is not an EAP one.
- **Integration with Other Skills:** As the material is integrated with the program textbook, "all skills are fostered [in the writing studies] – maybe not through the material" (2 pyp: pd1).
- **Feedback and Assessment:** The material is "graded according to the first draft, second draft and final outcome" (2 pyp: pd2) during which students perform self-evaluation and receive feedback from their peers and teachers.

  The two program designers in the PYP, emphasizing the importance of feedback and formative assessment, state that "feedback is provided via symbols on the paper (final) and students can further examine their results after the portfolio assessment is finalized; they can receive oral feedback during the instructor's office hours or go to the tutors for extra feedback" (2 pyp: pd2). This feedback procedure is one of the most important changes in the new PYP program in Case 2.

In the FYP of Case 2, the two program designers stress the following five considerations below as their core considerations concerning the academic writing materials they use:

- **Learning Context:** The materials have specially been designed for the students. The program designers add that, while developing them, "the authors prioritize the link between the content of the book and the learning context" (FYP: PD2).
- **Relevant Content:** The content of the book is full of "real-life topics that college students like" (2 FYP: PD2). As it is impossible to address all the disciplines, a common ground was considered in the development phases.
- **Feedback and Assessment:** Most of the teachers use "the task-specific rubrics to revise the students' written work" (2 FYP: PD1). They usually give both written and oral feedback to the students, depending on the writing styles and personal sensitivities as well as available time.
- **Integration with Other Skills:** The writing skill is integrated with "listening, reading, and speaking" (2 FYP: PD1) in the material. There are also vocabulary teaching sections, but there is no focus on grammatical patterns.
- **Needs and Objectives:** As the materials have been developed for the students, it is "a valuable source" (2 FYP: PD2) for them, and "a very good source" (2 FYP: PD2) for the teachers in the program, some of whom also contributed to the content.

  The main motivation for preparing these writing materials as a book is the specific needs of the university's local and international students. In order to meet the teachers' goals and their expectations, several instructors from the department participated in the development phases as either authors or editors.

4.3.1.3. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Program Designers in Case 3

The PYP program designer in Case 3 lists the following topics as the main issues concerning the materials:

- **Learning Context:** As there is a common belief in the Middle East that most of the global textbooks are not appropriate to the local contexts, the program designers are quite sensitive to the cultural appropriacy issue of any materials used as this might create possible potential problems inside and outside the class.
- **Needs and Objectives:** As there are specific needs, objectives, and requirements in the PYP, the materials should be carefully selected to comply with these factors.
- **Class Motivation:** Emphasizing the lack of student motivation and interest, the program designer states that "if the topics are of interest, the activities will be easier" (3 pyp: pd1) to use.
- **Activity Types:** Since motivation and interest are key issues in the PYP, the program designer also focuses on the activity types which are also means for maintaining student attention.
- **Adaptability:** As long as the students can personalize the topics and tasks, they are much more motivated to do the activities and tasks according to the program designer.

All in all, the program designer mainly focuses on the cultural appropriacy and its importance for achieving class motivation, and for enabling the teachers to maintain their students' attention and engagement. Moreover, she states that materials containing culturally offensive content cannot be used in their context "owing to the students' and teachers' sensitivities" (3 PYP: PD1).

There are five areas considered as the core considerations in the writing material according to the program designer in the FYP of Case 3:

- **Learning Context:** It is essential that the materials "help students in their academic studies" (3 FYP: PD1) according to the program designer. Therefore, academic content and skills are necessary elements for successful material.
- **Needs and Objectives:** Although it seems that the needs in an EAP class are straightforward, the special needs of the students in their own context should also be taken into consideration thoroughly in the developmental phases of these materials.
- **Class Motivation:** The program designer indicates that this is one of the main issues in their academic writing materials, since the topics and texts, as well as the activities and tasks, are not at all attractive nor engaging for their students.
- **Relevant Content:** The primary concern about the relevance of the materials is that they include topics, such as "What makes you happy?" (3 fyp: pd1); however, "topics should be more relevant to students' majors" (3 fyp: pd1).

  In this case, the majority of the students study in IT and business-related departments. Nevertheless, they encounter activities and tasks in their writing materials that are much more related to their daily lives. Even in the EAP materials, the topics are hardly suitable for all disciplinary fields of the students, which seems to be impossible for global materials unless they address specific study areas such as engineering or educational sciences.

To conclude, In Case 1, the main considerations of the program designer in the PYP are the learning context, the language level, the needs and the objectives, the relevant content, and the usability factors which are among the thirteen criteria established for this research. Furthermore, focusing on the need to combine the process with the product pedagogy, he adds the end-of-the year exam requirements to his list of main considerations. In the FYP of the same case, the first four considerations mentioned above are also valid for this program. This similarity indicates the institution's common core principles in both departments to develop in-house materials.

In the PYP in Case 2, apart from the common considerations stated in Case 1 above, there seems to be separate foci on the integration of language skills and the feedback and the assessment. It is obvious that the feedback and the assessment procedures in EAP writing are highly considered in this department. Similar considerations are also mentioned in the FYP of this case in which the program designers are proud of their in-house materials in the book format.

In the third case, there is an additional focus on class motivation compared to the other two cases, since the program designers do not believe that the global materials are successful in maintaining the motivation and the engagement in the class. Furthermore, cultural appropriacy is one of the main issues in this case, since there are sometimes texts and images that are not acceptable in the context.

4.3.2. The Main Considerations of the Teachers concerning the Academic Writing Materials

In this section, the prime teacher considerations regarding their academic writing materials are summarized within each case to find answers for this sub-question:

- What are the main considerations of the teachers when using their academic writing materials?

4.3.2.1. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Teachers in Case 1

The PYP teachers in Case 1 mention their primary considerations within the four issues below:

- **Learning Context:** One of the teachers' distinct issues is the learning context which includes "students, who will be studying diverse subjects, from a range of socio-cultural backgrounds" (1 PYP: T1-T2.
- **Needs and Objectives:** As a result of this diversity in the students' backgrounds and majors, their learning needs and objectives are also different. It is exceedingly difficult to find common ground from all this diversity.
- **Relevant Content:** As it is unduly difficult to find topics and texts that will maintain the attention of all the students, general English themes, such as transportation, leisure, and education are usually preferred.
- **Computer-Mediated Communication:** This consideration is based on the intention to use more online computer programs in the writing class, and the tendency to use "extensive online teaching materials" (1 PYP: T2).

Additionally, one of the teachers confirms that she "would like to design an online wiki-site where all the materials can be uploaded and used interactively" (1 pyp: t2); however, she also mentions the need for teacher training concerning this new platform. She further explains that it is quite difficult to find engaging and interesting topics in this special program in which there is a wide variety in the socio-cultural and educational backgrounds of the students, thus CMC tools and platforms could be a solution with more attractive features than the print materials.

There are also four core considerations regarding academic writing materials according to the FYP teachers in Case 1:

- **Language Level:** "Student language proficiency can be extremely diverse even within the same group" (1 fyp: t1) according to the teachers. They suggest "editing the material to each particular group's need" (1 fyp: t1).
- **Needs and Objectives:** The teachers are grateful to have the in-house materials developed to meet the program requirements and the needs of the students despite their preference to have all the content in a book format.
- **Relevant Content:** The teachers emphasize that there must be differences between the topics that the students explore in their "high school experience" (1 FYP: T3) and the ones that should be "related to their disciplines" (1 FYP: T3).
- **Guidelines and Input:** All of the teachers believe that it would be very "beneficial to have sample texts" (presented "as examples of the required level") (1 fyp: t2) on the topics which their students are expected to work on.

  Rather than stressing only the need for the sample texts to function as examples of the required level, the majority of the teachers in the study emphasize the essential need for their students to gain new perspectives, since student knowledge on the themes of the material is sometimes too limited to produce any ideas. Materials concerning student disciplines are also very beneficial, because the students already have some basic knowledge base from which to generate these sorts of discipline-specific topics and texts.

4.3.2.2. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Teachers in Case 2

The fourteen PYP teachers share their opinions regarding the prime considerations through their notes on the questionnaires and through the semi-structured interviews.

- **Needs and Objectives:** Several teachers state the inconsistency between the long-term methodological goals of the material (process writing) with the PYP students' prime purpose, which is the Proficiency exam at the end of the academic year.
- **Relevant Content:** The topics are relevant to the students' daily lives; however, some teachers believe that it is impossible to have themes relevant to the students' disciplines.
- **Guidelines and Input:** There is a common argument that the students lack ideas to produce the required tasks. To raise the students' schemata, the teachers "have to provide them with plenty of input" (2 PYP: T4) on the topic.
- **Activity Types:** One of the common arguments concerns free writing: "it isn't appropriate for the Proficiency goals" (2 PYP: T3), but some teachers want to include it, since it encourages "students to do more creative writing" (2 PYP: T3).
- **Integration with Other Skills:** Speaking is fostered during the planning stage, and the majority of input is derived from the reading texts. Yet, the teachers would prefer more input via audio / video resources.
- **Handouts in Book Format:** Some of the teachers would "prefer a classroom book" (2 PYP: T4) not because of the insufficient content of the material, but because a book format is tidier, and provides the teachers and the students with more ownership of the material they use.

  The material would also be more attractive for both the teacher and the students with a better design and layout, according to these teachers.

The five teachers in the FYP of Case 2 mention their prime considerations in the questionnaires and the interviews within the following issues:

- **Learning Context:** As there is a wide variety of disciplines in the faculties, some instructors design and share tasks, which enable the instructors to "ensure unity in content" (2 fyp: t3).
- **Language Level:** While developing the materials, "it is hard to make generalizations as the levels of the students vary – even in the same section" (2 fyp: t2); thus an ESP approach needs to be integrated within the EAP.
- **Learning Context:** Due to the variety of disciplines in the five faculties in the university, some instructors design and share activities and tasks with their colleagues, which enable the instructors to have extra resources.
- **Feedback and Assessment:** Along with the related sections in the material, some teachers look for different techniques to furnish more effective feedback: "I tried giving feedback in Turkish last year – it was an experiment" (2 fyp: t3).
- **Relevant Content:** The content is "well-chosen for an EAP book" (2 fyp: t2), according to the teachers, but there is a debate concerning a greater textual variety which would appeal to more of the students.

  Nonetheless, some teachers believe that the materials are not that appropriate for some students who are in departments like engineering. For example, "argumentation is an academic genre that political science students need more than biology students" (2 fyp: t5). Accordingly, some teachers believe that the students' departmental needs should receive more consideration in the needs analysis:

> … in some departments, some of the writing tasks are not that relevant to the students' future needs. For example, engineering students don't write essays in the departmental courses. In such departments, some other tasks like technical report writing can be added (2 FYP: T1-2).

4.3.2.3. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Teachers in Case 3

The PYP teachers in Case 3 present the following five areas as the primary considerations for the academic writing materials they use:

- **Language Level:** The teachers highlight the variety of student second language proficiency, even in the same classes, and the difficulties they face managing this.
- **Class Motivation:** The teachers, finding their textbooks demotivating for the students, prepare additional up-to-date resources, encouraging the students "by publishing the best work in the college newspaper" (3 pyp: t2).
- **Relevant Content:** The topics in the materials usually concern "describing people, the best moment in life, etc." (3 pyp: t1). On the other hand, the teachers favor themes and tasks which will encourage the students in the writing of academic essays.
- **Activity Types:** According to the teachers, the "students need more guided practice as they are not (on the whole) very imaginative nor curious concerning the wider world" (3 pyp: t1).
- **Learning Context:** Some teachers state that "the material is not suitable" (3 PYP: T1-T2) as they "are trying to prepare students for academic writing" (3 PYP: T1-T2), emphasizing the dilemma between general English and EAP in their context.

  The teachers affirm that the assignments in the materials "focus mainly on practical skills e.g. letter writing" (3 pyp: t2), rather than EAP themes. On the other hand, cultural appropriacy is a major issue in terms of contextual factors, since "many topics are not appropriate to the culture" (3 PYP: T2).

In this section, the main considerations of the FYP teachers in Case 3 are presented within the five issues below:

- **Learning Context:** The different issues of a general English program versus an EAP program can also be observed here, and one of the teachers confirms that "the materials do not relate to their [the students'] major … They're somewhat general" (3 fyp: t2), indicating the need to have more discipline-specific contents.
- **Needs and Objectives:** "The main objective [of the program] is to teach students how to master academic writing" (3 fyp: t1). The material, meeting this aim to some extent, "provides step-by-step process in how to write essays" (3 FYP: T1).
- **Relevant Content:** Almost all of the students in the faculties are in the disciplines of Business and IT; however, the material does not contain enough themes and tasks for these students.
- **Adaptability:** Due to the unique socio-cultural considerations of the region as well as of the students, it is quite difficult to adapt "the material for the students" (3 FYP: T2).
- **Class Motivation:** "Usually students are unlikely to be motivated in the writing class" (3 fyp: t3), and so the teachers would prefer to have more engaging tasks, such as "discussion or group work" (3 FYP: T3).

  The teachers indicate that most of the time they need to bring "authentic materials and current events to [their] classes to maintain the students' interest" (3 fyp: t3) to supplement the global textbook. They strongly believe that it is always much more engaging and interesting for the students to study recent events within their own context and to have content relevant to their current and future studies.

To summarize, In Case 1, the primary considerations of the teachers and the program designers have many similarities such as the learning context, the needs and the objectives, and the relevant content. Additionally, focusing on the need to use CMC tools more extensively specifically outside the class, the teachers confirm the need to use blended learning facilities in academic writing. In the FYP of the same case, the main addition to the list of the program designers in the need to have more sample texts in the materials, since the students need to work on model written products to see the required conventions.

In the PYP in Case 2, apart from the common considerations stated by the program designers, there seems to be dissatisfaction with the format of the materials as there are practical issues for the students to use separate handouts rather than a print book. The teachers, as also mentioned by the program designers, also emphasize the lack of critical and analytical thinking skills in the majority of the students. In the FYP of this case, in which the in-house materials are in the book format, some of the teachers suggest the need to have more-discipline specific materials rather than a common content for all the students.

In the third case, teachers mainly criticize the global materials in the following aspects which are quite similar with the program designer: the lack of attractive and engaging content, the irrelevance of the majority of the topics and texts to the majors of the students, and some of the culturally inappropriate content.

4.3.3. The Main Considerations of the Students concerning the Academic Writing Materials

In this section, the major considerations of the students concerning their writing materials are summarized briefly within the three cases of the study:

- What are the main considerations of the students when studying their academic writing materials?

4.3.3.1. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Students in Case 1

There are four major issues highlighted by the PYP students in Case 1, concerning their main considerations:

- **Learning Context:** The students are aware of the fact that they are in a unique program aiming to meet the needs and requirements for a wide variety of students from different socio-cultural and educational contextual settings.
- **Relevant Content:** Primarily because of the factor stated in the previous issue, the students appreciate their teachers' hard work to endeavor to locate the most appropriate topics, texts, and tasks for their needs and interests.
- **Guidelines and Input:** Several students emphasize the fact that they feel more confident about their organizational skills in the process of writing because of the materials.
- **Needs and Objectives:** The students, also, stress the fact that a comprehensive needs analysis to learn their objectives in the writing program is much more important than any other study in thoroughly meeting their needs.

  The majority of the students strongly believe that their needs and requirements are quite different from those of their peers, so they like the idea of free writing. Nonetheless, some of them are also quite satisfied with the fact that the writing materials have been designed to meet their specific needs and objectives.

In this section, the primary considerations of the FYP students are presented within five categories:

- **Relevant Content:** The most significant feature of their writing materials, according to the students in the FYP, is the content (through tasks such as email writing), which is mostly relevant to their present and future studies.
- **Guidelines and Input:** The students are primarily pleased with the rhetoric guidelines and tips in the material which help them organize their writings more effectively.
- **Integration with Other Skills:** Mentioning the need for more integration with listening, the students think that there is clear integration with reading and speaking as well as to some extent with vocabulary and grammar.
- **Feedback and Assessment:** Most of the students look forward to receiving feedback from their teachers; some believe that "peer feedback is a waste of time" (1 FYP: S8-S9-S10-S11) as they primarily rely on teacher feedback.
- **Computer-Mediated Communication:** According to several students, the writing classes would be much more enjoyable if there was more focus on online supplementary materials and on learning management system use.

  These students believe that it would be more advantageous to implement their academic writing studies through the keyboard rather than through pen and paper, since they will primarily be using the former in their future academic studies, and in real life after they graduate from the university.

4.3.3.2. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Students in Case 2

There are four major issues highlighted by the PYP students in Case 2, concerning their academic writing materials:

- **Needs and Objectives:** The students believe that in order to achieve their foreign language learning objectives, any material should be "communicative and interactive" (2 PYP: S4) as it is in several parts of the material they use.
- **Relevant Content:** The students' views reveal the importance of discipline-specific materials, since most of the students in engineering; for instance, do not think that the topics are relevant to them.
- **Guidelines and Input:** It is remarkable that almost all of the students are completely satisfied with the improvement they have realized in terms of their organizational skills because of the guidelines and input in the material.
- **Integration with Other Skills:** Almost all of the students believe that the material is quite beneficial for them in improving their grammatical knowledge, and they like the integration with reading.

  Nevertheless, the majority of the students want to have more spoken interaction and production even in their writing classes, since the speaking skill is their language learning priority. On the other hand, some students believe that their teachers foster speaking in the writing class both before and after the writing tasks; however, there is no noticeable student response as to whether the materials are beneficial in this respect or not.

In this section, the main considerations of the FYP students in Case 2 are described below within five categories:

- **Language Level:** The variability in language competencies can clearly be noticed here, since some of the students believe that the content of the materials is not linguistically challenging enough, whereas some others think it is.
- **Relevant Content:** The students are generally satisfied with the topics and the texts, specifically with the ones which are up-to-date; still, they would rather have more discipline-specific texts, activities and tasks in their writing class.
- **Activity Types:** Several students indicate that the variety in activity types is satisfactory, and they appreciate the variety of choices that can be made in the tasks in particular.
- **Integration with Other Skills:** One of the issues which is emphasized by almost all of the students is the benefits of having integrated skills materialS, although they would like to see more grammatical patterns included.
- **Guidelines and Input:** The majority of the students are satisfied with the guidelines and input in the material, specifically those on rhetoric issues like organizations and planning; however, they feel that they still need to have linguistic support.

  While mentioning the need for linguistic support, most of the students are aware of the fact they should have gained their grammatical and vocabulary knowledge before this program which is primarily for the purpose of focusing on academic skills.

4.3.3.3. The Findings on the Main Considerations of the Students in Case 3

The four major considerations highlighted by the PYP students in this case are presented below:

- **Learning Context:** Some of the students emphasize the fact that the materials are not appropriate to their learning context, since "it does not include themes relevant to their majors" (3 PYP: S3).
- **Additional Resources:** The students further emphasize that they definitely need more support in their writing process, and several students would prefer having online resources to study outside class, and to practice writing.
- **Feedback and Assessment:** The majority of the students mention the benefits they realize from teacher feedback, but they state that they do not frequently use peer feedback and self-evaluation in the academic writing class.
- **Guidelines and Input:** Most of the students do not feel that they are proficient enough to express their ideas in a meaningful way in the second language.

  According to the students, the global academic writing materials they currently use help them to focus on organizational skills, and they are aware of the improvement in their rhetoric skills in general. However, they still have difficulties transferring their thoughts and feelings on to paper because of their limited structural knowledge and vocabulary range.

In this section, the main considerations of the FYP students in Case 3 are presented within the following four categories:

- **Learning Context:** Although the students like the topics and texts in the book, they feel that they need more focus on their current and future studies in their writing classes.
- **Language Level:** The wide variability in the language proficiency levels of the students can be noticed, since some think that the material is too challenging, while some others believe that the activities are too easy.
- **Needs and Objectives:** The students state that they generally learn about the conventions of essay writing, but they are not sure if they will really need to write essays in their academic studies and future career.
- **Relevant Content:** The majority of the students in this case are in the disciplines of Business and IT. Some of these students "find the materials irrelevant and unnecessary for their requirements".

  The students also highlight that they are much more motivated regarding the themes and the texts, as well as the activities and the tasks, as long as they are relevant to their academic disciplines.

To sum up, in Case 1, the primary considerations of the students do have several similarities with their teachers and the program designer, and they seem to have a good understanding of their unique PYP context. One of the most remarkable findings of the study is seen clearly in the FYP of this case, which is also shared by some of the PYP students, that they consider self-evaluation and peer feedback activities completely unnecessary. There is also a common tendency to use CMC tools in the students, which is also emphasized by some of the teachers, whereas this does not seem to be a priority for the program designers. Lastly, it is important to note that the students in both departments are aware of the improvement in their rhetorical skills and strategies throughout the whole writing process thanks to the materials.

Similar to the students in Case 1, it is very positive to observe that the students in both PYP and FYP of Case 2 can notice the improvement in their organizational skills. PYP students further express their need to get involved in communicative and interactive language learning environment, and they would like to have more integration with the communicative skills and strategies in the materials. One of the main dissatisfaction points come from the students from the more technical departments, such as engineering, primarily due to the topics and the texts which have been developed to create a common appeal to the students. The similar findings can be noticed in the FYP students' responses, and they focus more on the irrelevance of some of the contents in the materials to their disciplinary studies. In addition to these factors, they also explain that they still need structural input in terms of grammatical structures to convey their messages in their writing pieces more thoroughly.

In the third case, the students share the same perspectives with their teachers in the following aspects: the lack of attractive and engaging content, and the irrelevance of the majority of the topics and texts to the majors of the students. They do not focus on the cultural appropriacy as much as their teachers and the program designer. Similar to the first two cases, the students seem to be aware of the improvement in their writing skills and strategies, and they also emphasize their lack of grammatical knowledge to express their ideas and opinions.

The next chapter, Conclusion, includes discussions and conclusions from the data analyses presented in this chapter – Findings.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.0. Introduction

The concluding remarks with regard to the results of this collective case study are presented in this chapter. Furthermore, the chapter aims to provide a brief review of the whole research process as well as to summarise the primary results of the research.

The chapter starts with an overview of the present research study, and then the implications of the findings for the fields of academic writing and the materials evaluation research are presented. These implications include the thirteen criteria, which were used in the checklist prepared for the present study, containing the participants' responses and considerations. These two parts are followed with recommendations for further studies and the limitations of this study. At the end of the chapter, there is a summary of the overall results and conclusion.

5.1. Overview of the Study

The importance of writing, both as a communication tool in this new digital era in which cross-cultural interaction is required more than in any period in history, and as an essential medium for the requirements of the educational period, cannot be neglected today. Therefore, many elements of the effective writing process must be dealt with extensively in current and future academic research so that more and more people can communicate and interact effectively in their academic and business lives.

In this collective case study, the primary aim is to focus on one specific facet of these elements of writing: academic writing materials. To reach global conclusions regarding the evaluation of these writing materials used at the tertiary level, and to carry out extensive research containing a wide range of data, participants from three different contextual settings were involved in the study: Hungary, Turkey, and Oman. In all of these three settings, the perceptions of the program designers, the teachers, and the students concerning their academic writing materials were analyzed through the following research questions, each of which is followed by three sub-questions addressing each participant group mentioned above:

- To what extent are the materials – both commercial and in-house – used in the academic writing programs at the tertiary level appropriate to the contextual needs?
- What are the main considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students concerning the academic writing materials used at the tertiary level?

In order to answer these two research questions thoroughly, the research was initiated with productive meetings and correspondences between the researcher and the program designers in these three different contexts (six settings in total – three PYPs and three FYPs) during which the program requirements and objectives were discussed in detail along with the teachers' and the students'

profiles. This process was followed with a comprehensive analysis of the materials used in these academic writing programs. After this analysis process, which occurred simultaneously with the detailed review of the relevant literature in the EAP writing and the materials evaluation, the common issues in these writing programs were determined in view of the recommendations by the program designers and the supervisor.

As a result of this longitudinal preparation period, the main dimensions of the research were clearly established, shared with the relevant bodies, and discussed with the steering committee members, whose invaluable suggestions have been considered throughout the study. Afterwards, a unique checklist with thirteen criteria (and thirty-nine items) was developed to evaluate the academic writing materials. It is unique in the sense that it is quite different from the similar checklists which have been used in other academic studies in the field, since they have primarily focused on global textbook evaluation. Following the questionnaires (after around a couple of weeks), semi-structured interviews were held with a representative number of voluntary participants in all the participating institutions, from the groups explained above, who had completed the questionnaires.

The findings of this post-use evaluation research, which are presented in the previous chapter in detail, are demonstrated within three groups for each of the three cases: the program designers, the teachers, and the students. All of the research findings of the research are shown separately according to their cases considering the variations in the contextual settings. The implications of these findings are discussed in the next section mainly within the thirteen criteria previously mentioned.

5.2. The Implications of the Findings for the Evaluation of Academic Writing Materials

The implications of the findings in this study are discussed within the checklist prepared specifically for this research: the four criteria in the external evaluation, the seven criteria in the internal evaluation, and the two criteria in the overall evaluation.

Nevertheless, before discussing these findings, it is worth giving some more background about the checklist. Though it is based on McDonough and Shaw's (2003) categorization of the external, the internal, and the overall evaluation as well as Richard's (2001) five factors (the program, the teacher, the learner, the content, the pedagogy), which had been taken into consideration while developing each of the thirty-nine items, the main checklist was designed in view of a range of issues, such as recent EAP writing research, previous literature on writing and materials evaluation, and opinions of the program designers and the supervisor.

As a result of all these considerations, a specific checklist was produced to evaluate the academic writing materials. It is specific, since almost all the previous checklists had been developed either for textbook evaluation (e.g. Sheldon, 1988; Bartlett and Morgan, 1991; Cunningsworth, 2005) or for other language skills, such as reading (e.g. Stieglitz, 1997, Massachusetts Department of Education, 2001), or for global (e.g. Miekley, 2005; Jahangard, 2007) or for in-house materials (e.g. Sevilla-Pavon, Martinez-Saez, and Gimeno-Sanz, 2011).

One of the significant features of this checklist is its flexibility. The checklist has been designed within several versions; considering the participants: the program designers, the teachers, and the students; as well as the context: the English version, the translated version, and the simplified version; and the academic programs: the PYP, and the FYP. The content is also flexible to be used with second language writing settings other than the EAP programs after a few modifications in the criteria and the items.

It is strongly believed that the checklist used in this study can be implemented to evaluate both commercial and in-house materials. However, not all of the thirty-nine items are suitable for all other material evaluation studies, such as the ones used for other language skill evaluations.

5.2.1. The Implications of the Findings in the External Evaluation

In this section, the implications of the findings in the external evaluation are discussed:

A. Learning Context

The findings of the research concerning the learning context reflect the controversies in the two on-going debates in the literature: general English versus EAP (e.g. Pulverness, 2002; Liu, Chang, Yang, and Sun, 2011), and global materials versus the in-house materials (e.g. Skierso, 1991; Swales, 1995; Dat, 2006). In Cases 1 and 2, almost all of the academic writing materials are in-house, and the one used in the FYP in Case 2 is in a printed textbook format; however, the core materials in Case 3 are global textbooks, though they are extensively supported with handouts prepared by the teachers. The main rationale for the extensive use of in-house materials in EAP writing programs is stated by Akin and Guceri (2001), who work in a similar contextual setting to the ones in the study:

> Many course books may neither be of particular interest nor be culturally suitable for a particular group of students. In our situation, it was decided that in-house materials would be developed as they would be more suitable and could target our students' needs (p. 1).

Similar conclusions can be reached through the findings of the present study. In both Case 1 and 2, the program designers and the teachers

strongly believe that the appropriacy of the materials to their learning contexts is primarily due to the fact that these materials were developed by the staff, who are quite knowledgeable about the learning context, and they took the specific contextual requirements and the specific needs into account at the developmental stages. This finding, furthermore, reveals that the in-house materials are motivating for the teachers, since they generate ownership towards the material:

> The materials I use in academic skills class is what my colleague and I compiled. It consists of the tasks we have used and found useful in the past years. Hence, I think it is appropriate to the learning context, although it was not especially written for our particular environment (1 fyp: t2).

Nevertheless, in Case 3, the majority of the program designers, teachers and students do not consider the global materials they use appropriate to the learning context, since there are some culturally inappropriate topics and texts, and irrelevant content to the students' disciplines. In this respect, it should also be noted that the variety of disciplines is an issue in all cases – specifically in the PYPs – except for the FYP materials in Case 1 which has been prepared considering the majors of the students.

Yet, there is a specific criticism (mainly in the PYP – Case 2) against in-house materials that they should be in a book format in terms of practicality. It is claimed that these separate sheets do not allow the students to go back, and make revisions, or to see what is expected from them in the forthcoming weeks. Besides, according to the teachers, it is not that practical to use separate sheets in every class, which devalues the learning atmosphere. Lastly, some teachers claim that a printed book serves as a road map for the students, which is defined with the term "security blankets" by Nahrkhalaji (2012).

B. Language Level

In almost all cases, it is stressed that there is a wide range of English language proficiency among the students even if they are in the same class. This variety is not that remarkable in the PYPs because all such programs adopt some sort of streaming systems through which the students are separated according to their language proficiency levels. For instance, there are two separate PYP groups in Case 1 or there are Pre-Intermediate, Intermediate, and Upper-Intermediate PYP classes in Case 3.

On the other hand, this issue of mixed-level of proficiency – in which there are mainly Intermediate / Upper-Intermediate (B1 – B2) and Advanced (C1) level students – can be considered remarkable in the FYPs in all the three cases. Accordingly, the language level of the material can be a problem for the students, since the content and the texts are not appropriate to some of the students in any case.

There is insufficient research concerning the effects of academic writing materials on mixed ability classes. According to Pulverness (2002), in his article on the teaching of EAP to large mixed group of students, there should be a variety of activities and tasks to address students with different levels of attainment. Sun (2010) also notes that, if not addressed properly, the difference between the language level of the materials and the students might considerably affect class motivation. The comments from the teachers in almost all three cases are quite similar to these remarks.

C. Additional Resources

In general – specifically in Case 1, there has been a tendency among the teachers and the students to use more CMC tools in their language classes. Some of the teachers would rather upload all the writing

materials on a learning management system, and use the system effectively in different phases of the writing process; several students would like to have access to additional writing resources online; however, this consideration of using CMC tools and platforms in the writing program has not been observed as a priority for the majority of the program designers and the teachers except for those in Case 1. As for these additional resources, the general need, according to the program designers and the teachers seems to be model written products so that the students can have more guidance and input. This issue is discussed in the Guidance and Input criterion of the internal evaluation.

Although the use of CMC tools in the writing class is not a priority for any of the program designers, almost all of the students and some teachers indicate that there should be more focus on these tools, such as blogs and wikis. This finding on the interest in using CMC is also supported in the recent literature (e.g. Kern, 2006; Ke, 2010; Chao and Lo, 2011; Cephe and Balcikanli, 2012), some of which is mentioned in the Literature Review chapter. Stapleton and Radia (2009) confirm that a new dimension has been noted in the writing process because of the advances in technology, such as a more efficient way of giving feedback. Moreover, it is indicated that students can develop their argumentation and critical thinking skills through CMC tools (Saye and Brush, 2002; Yeh and She, 2010). Similarly, Fotos and Hinkel (2007) note that CMC-based activities "can provide foreign language writers with abundant opportunities to receiv authentic target language input and produce meaning-focused target language output" (p. 141). Maley (2011) also states how online activities can be used as a resource "for the freeing of teachers and learners alike from the constraints of the coursebook" and for providing "rapid and flexible access to unlimited information resources" (p. 390).

Finally, it is important to stress the possible role of online writing activities as additional resources to provide the students with a more collaborative environment in their writing classes, which seems to be a neglected concept in the academic writing materials used in these three cases: “Writing has more to do with individual work than collaborative effort” (1 FYP: PD1). However, teaching writing as a collaborative process is now one of the core considerations of the writing as a second language research (e.g. Ferris, 2003; Rollinson, 2005; Miyazoe and Anderson, 2010; Elola and Oskoz, 2010; Li, Chu, Ki, Woo, 2012; Kessler, Bikowski, and Boggs, 2012).

D. Needs and Objectives

Almost all of the program designers and the teachers are quite satisfied to have process writing as the core of their academic writing materials; this is also reflected in their choice of materials. It is, furthermore, noticeable that the students are aware of the benefits of this writing process, and of the improvement they have realized primarily in organizational skills due to this process pedagogy, even though some consider this longitudinal process “too complicated and boring”.

On the other hand, as pointed out by Long (2000), “there is an urgent need for courses of all kinds to be relevant and to be seen as relevant to the needs of specific groups of learners and of society at large" (p. 2). For example, mainly in the PYP, it is a fact in all cases that the main purpose of most of the students is to pass the proficiency exam at the end of the academic year so as to continue their studies in their departments. Hence, several program designers and teachers mention the need to combine both process and product pedagogies in their writing materials considering this inevitable need, which is not only valid for students, but also for academic writing program designers.

These views to have a combination of products and process methodologies are in parallel with the previous research done mainly after 2000 (e.g. Marshall and Williams, 2010; Xiao, 2011; Hasan and Akhand 2011). Pulverness (2002), for instance, expresses the possibility of combining these two writing methodologies efficiently in the EAP class:

> In fact, it seems quite possible to me to view the product / process debate as something of a false dichotomy, since it should be possible to adopt a process approach to 'explode' the final stage of the product-based writing cycle. In other words, to have a hybridised 'product via process' approach (p. 8).

Finally, it is not wrong to claim that the participants' responses in terms of the strong view to focus both on the writing process and the quality written product are closely in parallel with recent studies in academic writing.

5.2.2. The Implications of the Findings in the Internal Evaluation

In this section, the findings on the seven criteria in the internal evaluation of the research are discussed:

E. Class Motivation

Haycraft (1998) defines motivation as "the student's desire and need to learn" (p. 6). In the EAP classroom, in which there are a range of issues to be sorted out by the teacher, motivation is a key element. Sun (2010) states that many factors affect a student's motivation towards teaching materials: interest in the subject matter, level of difficulty, relevance to existing knowledge, perception of usefulness.

As for the findings in the present study, it is primarily understood from the program designers' and the teachers' responses in Case 3 that global textbooks are not satisfactory enough to hold the attention of the students, and to motivate and to engage them. They list the prime reasons for the lack of class motivation when using these global textbooks as:

- The irrelevance to the learning context, mainly due to the socio-cultural facts;
- The irrelevance of the topics and the tasks to the students' disciplinary fields; and
- The lack of attractive texts in the material to be used in the pre-writing phase as prompts.

As a result of the second factor mentioned above, the students do focus more on learning their specialist subjects rather than on spending time for the EAP classes (Metsheng, 2009). To attract the attention of the students to their writing classes, teachers should "use authentic, subject-specific materials which are interesting and motivating for students" (Plews, 2010, p. 8). However, in a learning context in which the students come from diverse backgrounds and disciplines, such as PYP, it is almost impossible to find materials of interest to all these students:

> … it is, in principle, not possible to find materials which would interest everyone. It follows that the emphasis should be moved from attempting to provide intrinsically interesting materials, which we have just claimed is generally impossible, to doing interesting things with materials ... these materials should be chosen, not so much on the basis of their own interest, but for what they can be used to do (Brown, 1993, p. 83).

On the other hand, the student participants specifically assert that they are mostly not interested in or not engaged with the content of the materials they use, which is a similar perspective to Tomlinson's (2008), who highlights the lack of engaging content and stimulating activities in EAP

materials. Mol and Bin (2008), in addition to this, claim that cognitive and affective engagement of the students in the materials should be clearly included in the design phase of these activities and materials.

F. Relevant Content

In all cases, this criterion is selected as a core consideration by the program designers, the teachers, and the students regardless of the types of the academic writing materials: global or in-house. Except for the FYP in Case 1; none of these materials include content that is relevant to the majority of the students' academic fields, even though most of the materials are adopted / developed considering the majors of the students, according to the program designers. The main reason for this is the variety of disciplinary fields of the students in these cases; for instance, there are five faculties with more than twenty departments in Case 2. Accordingly, it is almost impossible to address the needs and the interests of all these students in this wide range of disciplines despite the hard work of the teachers to adapt the content. In particular, finding the relevant content to the students is not that feasible in the PYPs as there is an extensive mixture of students from different departments in the same classes in these programs.

In the relevant literature on academic writing, Nesi and Gardner (2006) focus on the different needs of specific disciplines. For instance, laboratory reports should be the core assignments in several sciences, while the essays may be common in the humanities, or case study reports in medical schools, and case notes for law students. Similarly, the majority of the students – e.g. those in the engineering departments in the PYP in Case 2 – in the research argue that the themes and the tasks are not relevant to their disciplines at all. In addition, some of the students also question the relevance of their main task type – the essay – in their writing class to their current (academic) and future (real life) needs.

In a more recent study, Ramoroka (2012) clearly suggests that "students need to be made aware of the disciplinary preferences in their EAP writing course" (p. 40). According to Ramoroka, the writing course should "go beyond teaching generic skills to the teaching of communication skills that are appropriate to understanding writing in disciplinary departments" (p. 40). This view is very similar to the perspectives stated by Hyland (2009):

> The fact that writers in different fields draw on different resources to develop their arguments, establish their credibility and persuade their readers means that EAP teachers need to take the disciplines of their students, and the ways these disciplines create texts, into account in their classroom practices (p. 21).

G. Guidelines and Input

In all three cases, the teachers and the students emphasize this criterion as one of their core considerations; this consideration is also highlighted by several program designers:

> A successful writer should first of all have some knowledge about the topic he is writing about. To raise the students' schemata, we need to provide them with plenty of input on the content of the materials (2 PYP: T7).

In the PYPs, both linguistic and rhetoric guidelines and input are required; however, there is almost no focus on linguistic support for the students in the FYP materials because they are considered to be fairly knowledgeable concerning grammatical structures and vocabulary range.

Nevertheless, the FYP students, primarily in Cases 2 and 3, indicate that they still have difficulty in explaining their opinions and arguments due to the lack of grammatical knowledge in the second language. Hence, they would like to have more linguistic input in their materials.

On the other hand, primarily in the PYP of Case 2 and both programs in 3, the program designers and the teachers indicate the fact that the students do not have the capacity to produce ideas owing to their lack of knowledge and experience in a variety of situations. Partly because of their educational background, they are not at a sufficient level to think critically and analytically in order to realize ideas to focus on in the writing tasks. This notion is also supported by Ramanathan and Kaplan (1996), who maintain that second language writers, "given their respective sociocultural and linguistic socialization practices, are more likely … to encounter difficulty when being inducted into CT [critical thinking] courses in freshman composition classes" (p. 236).

In this respect, Coffin et al. (2003) suggest that teachers need to provide students with as much scaffolding and guidance as possible to develop their understanding of how text types and register are central to the ways in which disciplines are distinguished. Similarly, Asaoka and Usui (2003) clearly state that students face many challenges at the planning stage, before they reach the organization stage. They further note that a possible failure to focus on the right topic "served as a block to constructing an opinion, resulting in an unorganized essay that readers found difficult to understand. This was further complicated when the students had to integrate experts' opinions and data to support their views" (p. 163). They conclude that students may need more intervention by teachers at an early stage of their writing, which is a common perspective shared by the majority of the program designers and the teachers.

H. Activity Types

In this criterion, there is agreement on the first two items – Items 22 and 23 – which concerns controlled and guided writing activities and tasks. Yet, there need to be more guided activities and tasks as well as model

texts for the students to practice adequately before the final product, according to the majority of the teachers and the students.

On the other hand, all the participants disagree that there are free writing activities and tasks in the material that enable students to improve their imagination and creativity (Item 24). This item, in fact, has the highest disagreement rate among all the participants. Most of the program designers and the teachers believe that free writing, as well as the concepts like imagination and creativity, is not a priority for academic writing conventions. Furthermore, it is believed that the students, specifically the ones in the PYPs, are not that ready to focus on free writing activities: "Most of the students need guided practice because their accuracy is not good enough to introduce more free activities (free writing)" (1 pyp: t2).

There are few studies (e.g. Forche and Gerard, 2001; Kobayakawa, 2011) in the literature that focus on these concepts in EAP writing. In one of these studies, Allison (2004) states clearly that, "within EAP, discussions of students' academic writing seem to have had little to say about creativity – certainly far less than about critical dimensions of writing and writing pedagogy" (p. 194). He further explains that greater attention to creativity can help teachers to reduce the negative reactions of the students in EAP classes. This attention is observed only in the PYP in Case 1 contrary to the other cases in which the majority of the program designers and the teachers do not think that free writing is appropriate to the academic settings.

I. Learning Styles

This criterion, primarily Item 25, regarding the learning styles and the intelligence types, also has one of the highest disagreement ratings among all the participants, particularly in Cases 1 and 3. In addition to this, the program designers specifically do not regard the learning styles

and the intelligence types, as well as the interaction types, as their priorities in an EAP program. Moreover, this criterion is not under the category of the main considerations of the teachers and the students in any of the three cases.

On the other hand, there is no significant agreement or disagreement among the participants in the other two items – 26 and 27. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the majority of the materials do not employ pair work and specifically group work activities which are essential elements of the collaborative writing. Pair work is primarily used for peer feedback activities to some extent, primarily in Case 2; however, the overall perceptions concerning these activities are not positive mainly in the students' responses. These classroom practices, focusing on individual work, are also contradictory to the recent literature on the writing as a collaborative process (e.g. Ainley, Hidi, and Berndorf, 2002; Storch, 2005; Kessler and Bikowski, 2010).

J. Integration with Other Skills

In almost all of the materials used in academic writing programs, the tendency is to integrate writing with reading. Reading, as texts in the beginning of the process, is generally used as an input for students to benefit from the structure, the organization, and the ideas. Nonetheless, not only the students but also the teachers emphasize that they would prefer to have a range of audio and video materials used in this planning phase:

> I think doing 'note-taking' first and then moving on to 'writing', somewhat related to the note-taking, works well. Especially 'Steve Jobs' task, involving watching a video, and then doing a reading task and analyzing the related paragraph, and then note-taking from the video and finally doing the writing task worked really well (2 pyp: t4).

Speaking is also fostered during the pre-writing phase primarily through brainstorming and planning activities in which group discussions are fostered. Still, the students, in particular, want to have more speaking in their writing material due to their overall language learning needs and objectives.

Although there is little research on the integration of writing with other language skills, the reading – writing relationship is clearly presented in many contexts. For example, Grabe (2003) mentions three major issues in this relationship: "1) the continuing observation that better readers tend to be better writers across a range of writing tasks; 2) the argument that recognizing and using the organizational framework of a text leads to better writing; and 3) the argument that extensive exposure to print can lead to better writing over time" (p. 246).

Hinkel (2006), on the other hand, stresses the importance of grammar and vocabulary, since achieving proficiency in writing requires explicit pedagogy in grammar and lexis, which is important because one's linguistic repertoire often determines his writing choices. The student participants also indicate their willingness to have more focus on necessary structural patterns and forms for them to compose their written products more effectively, since they feel more comfortable if they have the essential grammatical and lexical knowledge.

K. Feedback and Assessment

According to Myles (2002), "feedback is of utmost importance to the writing process" (p. 18). In this research study, feedback is also a common consideration for almost all the program designers and the teachers. All three feedback and assessment types: self-assessment, peer feedback, and teacher feedback are generally included to a certain extent in the materials of the three cases, and all three types can be noticed clearly in the PYP academic writing materials in Case 2 in which there is

considerable focus on the feedback activities. The extensive use of the materials in this case is quite similar to Urquhart and McIver's (2005) description of the most effective feedback method through "explicit, specific, and thorough explanations linked directly to a written piece" (62).

On the other hand, a striking finding in this criterion is the perception of the students regarding the teacher feedback. The majority of the students believe that teacher feedback is so valuable for them, while they do not want to spend much time with self-assessment and peer feedback sessions. They, furthermore, state that they do not value peer feedback that much, because the instructor, who is regarded as the main source of information, gives feedback at the end of the process.

Some contrary views should be commented on from previous research. For example, Keh (1990) states that "students felt the peer feedback was useful in gaining a conscious awareness that they were writing for more than just the teacher" (p. 296). Moreover, Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, and Huang (1998) find out in their research that 93% of the participants prefer to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback. Lastly, Ferris (2001) reveals that some of the students avoid and neglect teacher feedback, while they consider feedback from their peers as more enjoyable and valuable. Ferris, as well as other researchers like Russell and Spada (2006), also indicate that second language writers must use self-evaluation activities to achieve linguistic gains within the process.

In terms of assessment, the effective use of portfolios has also been observed in Case 2, but it is not a priority for the other cases in the study. In Case 2, the final works of the students are all put in the portfolios in the PYP, while selected works are put in the student portfolios in the FYP.

5.2.3. The Implications of the Findings in the Overall Evaluation

The major implications of the findings on the two criteria in the overall evaluation in this research, usability and adaptability, are discussed in this section.

L. Usability

Only the program designer in the PYP in Case 1 states that the usability of the writing materials is a core consideration for them, and he strongly agrees that the writing materials in the PYP is appropriate in terms of its usability. Similar findings can be observed in the other five settings in the research.

The majority of the participants agree that their academic writing materials are easy to use and well-organized, and it is in parallel with the other second language materials used in their programs. This parallel structure is more obvious in the PYP in Case 2 in which the writing handouts have been designed to supplement the main textbook with similar themes. In this case, there is almost no need to have additional resources, according to the program designers, since the material itself is an additional resource.

However, almost all the teachers and the students in Case 3 note that they use a lot of extra resources prepared by the teachers since the textbooks are not adequate enough to meet the needs and the interests of the students.

M. Adaptability

Adaptability is a main consideration in Case 3, in which the cultural appropriacy of the materials is considered as a priority in adopting a material. The program designers and the teachers in this case strongly believe that culturally inappropriate or offensive topics and texts cause a

lot of problems for them to resolve, since there is a clear sensitivity to these kinds of contents.

Though adaptability is sometimes regarded as the teacher's responsibility, the teacher is not always able to discover procedures to avoid cultural inappropriacy, since the teacher is not as unconstrained as the material writer:

> As a materials writer, within the practical limits imposed by copyright and publishing constraints, this is comparatively easy to achieve: the conscientious materials writer is at liberty to anthologize all kinds of perceptions and thus to create a dialogic interplay of discourses ... The teacher, on the other hand, may have a lot less freedom: s/he may be forced to work with a more monologic coursebook and may not have ready access to supplementary materials that would introduce an element of cultural polyphony (Pulverness, 2004, p. 3).

As mentioned in the literature review, cultural issues in the global textbook have always been an area of discussion (Kramsch, 1988; Risager, 1991; Alptekin, 1993; Gray, 2000, 2010; Basabe, 2004, Altinmakas, 2005). Tomlinson (2012), for instance, confirms that commercial publishers are not able to develop flexible content to help the teachers and the students to make localizations and / or personalization.

In contrast to the global materials, the in-house materials are more adaptable to the local context, according to the participants, since they have been specifically developed in consideration with contextual factors. Accordingly, almost all the participants in Cases 1 and 2 agree that the writing materials they use are appropriate in terms of their usability and adaptability. In Case 3, there is also tendency to use in-house materials in the class because of these contextual considerations:

> In the past, I tried using authentic materials such as magazines, articles, films, etc., but due to the cultural sensitivities in the country, I had to shift back to in-house

> materials … I think it depends where you are teaching and the type of students (3 fyp: t1).

5.3. Recommendations for Further Research

This research focuses solely on the materials evaluation aspect of the academic writing programs, and there have been an increasing number of studies (e.g. Spring, 2010; Godfrey, 2011; Li, 2011; Coxhead, 2011) on EAP writing recently. Nonetheless, it is certain that other aspects of writing, such as the instruction, the duration of the course, the testing and assessment, are also as important in producing quality writing. Thus, it is worth investigating these aspects of the writing process primarily in the academic context, since writing is essential for students to reach the required achievements in the higher education setting. Furthermore, considering the materials in the academic writing programs, other areas such as materials development and materials adaptation might be of interest for future research primarily after the findings in Case 3 on adaptability. Lastly, the role of academic writing materials in the teacher instruction and / or in the testing and assessment can be other areas of interest in future research.

As seen in the recent studies in EAP writing, the roles of computers and online programs have been major considerations for both researchers and practitioners. A variety of issues (e.g. corpus use, writer – reader relationship, peer conferencing, cognitive processes) have been analyzed and / or synthesized in these studies (e.g. Yoon, 2008; Kuteeva, 2011; Lin and Kuo, 2011; Stapleton, 2012). However, there is little empirical study concerning the evaluation of online materials, and their appropriacy in (academic) writing programs in the field.

One of the significant points of this study is the multiple data collected in a variety of settings, which is the nature of collective case studies. Besides, the PYP seems to need more focus since the learning context and the needs and the

objectives in these programs have unique characteristics, some of which are remarkable in the findings of this research, such as the general English or academic English dilemma, the diverse disciplines of the students, and the proficiency exam at the end of the academic year. Accordingly, there needs to be further research to understand these unique elements in these programs, and the academic writing programs in which there is almost no consensus among different institutions concerning the main requirements and objectives. One of the possible research areas for the PYP is the appropriacy of English for General Academic Purposes materials or English for Specific Academic Purposes (Blue, 1993) materials to these program requirements.

As a part of this multiple data collection process, two different departments at the tertiary level are included in the present research: the PYP and the FYP. Moreover, the perceptions of the participants are investigated at the end of their academic year, so the students at the PYPs and the FYPs were totally different. However, it would be very useful to see their perceptions through longitudinal research in which the data can be collected from the same students who start the PYP program, complete it, and then complete the first year in an academic discipline. Accordingly, changes in the students' perceptions concerning academic writing (materials) can also be analyzed throughout such a longitudinal study which should last around two years.

In terms of assessment, the majority of the considerations dealt with in this study are feedback types and proficiency exam requirements. In this respect, one of the most striking findings in the internal evaluation is the fact that the majority of the students do not think that they can truly benefit from peer feedback activities, emphasizing the importance of teacher feedback for them. This finding prompts two sorts of further research: the reasons for this belief and the understanding of the students, and the ways to make peer feedback more meaningful in the (academic) writing class.

Another interesting finding is the importance of language levels in the EAP writing programs. It is observed that there are students with variable language proficiency levels in the same English language classes, and the materials do not address this variability. Therefore, there needs to be additional research on this area, including practical suggestions for the practitioners to cope with this issue.

Finally, even though some opinions about global and in-house materials have been mentioned in this chapter and previously, it is not an aim of the present study to make direct comparisons between the appropriacy of these types of materials concerning EAP writing. There are several academic works – as mentioned above and in the literature review – mainly theoretical, in the literature in which the effectiveness of these two types of materials are compared, but there is a limited amount of empirical research on the major differences of the global and the in-house materials in terms of the appropriacy of them to the needs and requirements of academic writing programs within specific contexts.

5.4. The Limitations of the Study

As with all similar research studies, this study has several limitations. Firstly, this is a collective case study which does not aim to make comparisons. In the research, thirteen main issues in writing were determined, and these factors were primarily focused on for all three cases. Nevertheless, there is no practical suggestion to be used in the program design and / or in the teaching of academic writing concerning the methods to find alternative approaches for the considerations of the program designers, the teachers, and the students in these three contexts.

Secondly, owing to the need to limit the number of cases in the multiple case studies, only one university in each context was selected, and the data from the participants from these universities were collected and analyzed. Indeed, there

could be different points of views in different institutions within a socio-cultural context, so it is important to consider these different views so that researchers would understand the context better.

In addition to these, all the perceptions of the participants in this research were analyzed and categorized into the criteria in the checklist without considering other aspects of writing, such as teacher instruction, the different backgrounds and diverse disciplines of the participants, and students' beliefs. Nonetheless, issues relevant to these variables of the writing classroom, are deliberately avoided throughout the study, since the main purpose was only to focus on the materials.

Lastly, there are various drawbacks in obtaining data from a range of socio-cultural contexts: the major one being the effects of the socio-cultural elements on the responses. In this study, except for the general beliefs and understandings of these elements, these varieties and the variables that could affect the results of the study have not been considered as a priority, primarily due to the nature of collective case studies.

5.5. Conclusion

To conclude, it is important to state that although some perceptions of the participants in this study (e.g. the use of CMC, the need to combine product and process, the importance of having discipline-specific topics) are quite similar to recent findings in the literature, there are a few findings which seem to be in contrast to the perspectives mentioned in the literature, such as the negative attitudes of the students towards peer feedback. Another striking finding is the lack of focus on collaborative activities in most of the academic writing materials, even though writing in the last decade is regarded primarily as a collaborative process.

In addition to the issues above, some of the conclusions (e.g. the learning context and needs, the cultural appropriacy, and the necessary input to write in a second language in an academic context) drawn are believed to contribute to on-going debates, such as general English versus academic content, global materials versus in-house materials, and the need to integrate other language skills within the writing materials. There are also two issues in this study that emerged for further research: the mixed language levels in EAP classes, and the role of free writing in EAP writing.

It is expected that the results of this study, as well as the methodology implemented in terms of the research design, will give some useful and valuable insights for academics, researchers and practitioners in the field of academic writing and materials evaluation.

REFERENCES

Ainley, M., Hidi, S., & Berndorff, D. (2002). Interest, learning, and the psychological processes that mediate their relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(3), 545-561.

Akin, A. R., & Guceri, M. (2001). A macro materials evaluation for better or for worse. Retrieved on July 10, 2012, from http://www.eltnewsletter.com/back/April2001/art562001.htm.

Al-Yousef, H. S. D. (2007). *An Evaluation of the third grade intermediate English coursebook in Saudi Arabia*. Unpublished master's dissertation, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Alamri, A. (2008). *An evaluation of the sixth grade English language textbook for Saudi boys' schools*. Unpublished master's dissertation, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Alexander, O., Argent, S., & Spencer, J. (2008). *EAP essentials: A teacher's guide to principles and practice*. Reading: Garnet.

Ali, M., & Kabir, H. (2012). Critical insights in choosing approaches to feedback in second language (L2) writing: Catering individual needs. *Journal of Education and Practice, 3*(7), 111-119.

Allison, D. (2004). Creativity, students' academic writing, and EAP: Exploring comments on writing in an English language degree programme. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3*(3), 191-209.

Allwrigth, R. L. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal, 36*(1), 5-18.

Alptekin, C. (1993). Target-language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal, 47*(2), 36-52.

Altinmakas, D. (2005). *On Turkish teachers' perceptions of cultural contents of textbooks*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Warwick University, UK.

Anaf, S., Sheppard, L., & Drummond, C. (2007). Combining case study research and systems theory as a heuristic model. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*(10), 1309-1315.

Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (2011). A snapshot of writing instruction in middle schools and high schools. *English Journal, 100*(6), 14-27.

Asaoka, C., & Usui, Y. (2003). Students' perceived problems in an EAP writing course. *JALT Journal, 25*(2), 95-113.

Atai, M. R., & Gheitanchian, M. (2009). Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards teaching methods and materials of high school English textbooks. *Journal of Education, 4*(4), 115-131.

Atkins, A. (2001). *An evaluation of the coursebook used for Oral Communication One at a privately funded senior high school in Japan*. University of Birmingham, UK. Retrieved on August 7, 2012, from http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/atkins3.pdf.

Atkinson, D., & Connor, U. (2008). Multilingual writing development. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Handbook of research of writing* (pp. 515-532). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ayman, B. (1997). *Evaluation of an English for academic purpose textbook: A Case Study*. Unpublished master's dissertation, METU, Ankara, Turkey.

Azizifar, A., Koosha, M., & Lotfi, R. L. (2010). An analytical evaluation of locally produced Iranian high school ELT textbooks from 1970 to the present. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 132-141.

Bahumaid, S. A. (2008). TEFL material evaluation: A teacher's perspective. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics, 44*(4), 423-432.

Barbera, E. (2009). Mutual feedback in e-portfolio assessment: An approach to the netfolio system. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 40*(2), 342-357.

Bartlett, L. E. and Morgan, J. A. (1991). *Choosing the college textbook: A textbook selection checklist for instructor use.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University, Virginia.

Basabe, E. (2004). *Cultures in ELT textbooks: A critical comparative analysis of the representations of the source culture, the local culture and the international culture in global, adapted and local materials*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Warwick University, UK.

Basturkmen, H. (1999). A content analysis of ELT textbook blurbs: Reflections on theory-in use. *RELC Journal, 30*(1), 18-38.

Beal, C. R, Garrod, A. C., & Bonitatibus, G. J. (1990). Fostering children's revision skills through training in comprehension monitoring. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(2), 275-280.

Beardsworth, A., & Keil, T. (1992). The vegetarian option: Varieties, conversions, motives and careers. *Sociological Review, 40*, 253-93.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bhatia, V. K. (2008). Genre analysis, ESP and professional practice. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*, 161-170.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Blue, G. M. (Ed.). (1993). *Language, learning and success: Studying through English*. London: Macmillan.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education.* London: Continuum.

Bourdin B., Fayol M., & Darciaux, S. (1996). The comparison of oral and written modes on adults' and children's narrative recall. In G. Rijlaarsdam, H. van Der Bergh, & M. Couzijn (Eds.), *Theories, models and methodology in writing research* (pp. 159-169). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). *Research in written composition.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Breetvelt, I., van den Bergh, H., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (1994). Relations between writing processes and text quality: When and how? *Cognition and Instruction, 12*, 103-123.

Brescia, W. F. Jr., & Miller, M. T. (2006). What's it worth? The perceived benefits of instructional blogging. *Electronic Journal for the Integration of Technology in Education, 5*. Retrieved on August 7, 2012, from http://ejite.isu.edu/Volume5/Brescia.pdf.

Bridwell-Bowles, L. (1995). Freedom, form, function: Varieties of academic discourse. *College Composition and Communication, 46*(1), 46-61.

British Council (2008). Teaching English: Course books. London.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities*. London: Macmillan.

Brown, V. (1993). Decanonizing discourse: Textual analysis and the history of economic thought. In W. Henderson, T. Dudley-Evans, & R. Backhouse (Eds.), *Economics & language* (pp. 64-84). London: Routledge.

Brown, D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Brown, D. (2001). English language teaching in the post-method era: Toward better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (pp. 9-19), *The Cambridge guide to TESOL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, M. (2010). Cognitive stylistics: History, development, and current applications. *Journal of Foreign Languages, 33*(1), 40-46.

Burns, R. (2000). *Introduction to research methods*. London: Sage.

Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research, 6*, 97-113.

Byrd, P. (2001). Textbooks: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 415-427). US: Heinle & Heinle, Thomson Learning Inc.

Cakit, I. (2006). *Evaluation of the EFL Textbook.* Unpublished master's dissertation, METU, Ankara, Turkey.

Campbell, C. (1998). *Teaching second-language writing: Interacting with text*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinle & Heinle.

Canado, M. L. P., & Esteban, A. (2005). Authenticity in the teaching of ESP: An evaluation proposal. *Scripta Manent 1*(1), 35-43.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Canagarajah, A. S., & Jerskey, M. (2009). Meeting the needs of advanced multilingual writers. In R. Beard, D. Myhill, J. Riley, & M. Nystrand (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of writing development* (pp. 472-488). London: Sage.

Candlin, C., & Hyland, K. (Eds.) (1999). *Writing: Texts, processes and practice*. London: Longman.

Carter, A., Lillis, T., & Parkin, S. (Eds.) (2009). *Why writing matters: Issues of access and identity in writing research and pedagogy*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Cephe, P. T., & Balcikanli, C. (2012). Web 2.0 tools in language learning: What do student teachers think? *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications (IJONTE), 3*(1), 1-12.

Chan, S. C. (2009). Forging a link between research and pedagogy: A holistic framework for evaluating business English materials. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(2), 125-136.

Chao, Y. J., & Lo, H. (2011). Students' perceptions of wiki-based collaborative writing for learners of English as a foreign language. *Interactive Learning Environments, 19*(4), 395-411.

Chitravelu, N., Sithamparam, S., & Choon, T. S. (1995). *ELT methodology: Principles and practice*. Shah Alam: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn Bhd.

Christison, M., & Krahnke, K. (1986). Student perceptions of academic language study. *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 61-81.

Clark, R., & Ivanic, R. (1997). *The politics of writing*. New York: Routledge.

Clarke, D. F. (1989). Materials adaptation: Why leave it all to the teacher? *ELT Journal, 43*(2), 133-141.

Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. (1987). Viewing feedback on compositions from the teacher's and the student' perspective. *ESPecialist, 16,* 13-28.

Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language Writing.* Cambridge: CUP.

Coles, W. E., Jr. (1974). *Composing: Writing as a self-creating process*. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden.

Colleges of Applied Sciences. Retrieved on August 17, 2012, from http://www.cas.edu.om.

Coxhead, A. (2011). *Using vocabulary in writing in a second language: Writing from sources*. Koln: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson / Merrill Education.

Crystal, D. (2009). *The future of language.* London: Routledge.

Cumming, A. (2001). The difficulty of standards, for example in L2 writing. In T. Silva, & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 209-229). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and selecting ELT materials*. London: Heinemann.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann Publishers Ltd.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dat, B. (2006). Breaking stereotypes in coursebooks. In J. Mukundan (Ed.), *Focus on ELT materials* (pp. 70-83). Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.

Daud, D. S. M. B. (2012). *Developing critical thinking skills in tertiary academic writing through the use of an instructional rubric for peer evaluation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Canterbury, UK.

Davies, F. (1988). Designing a writing syllabus in English for academic purposes: Process and product. In P. C. Robinson (Ed.), *Academic writing: Process and product* (pp. 130-142). Hong Kong: Modern English Publications.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *Sociological methods.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dougill, J. (1987). Not so obvious. In L. E. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (pp. 29-35). Oxford: Modern English Publications.

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

Driss, L. (2006). Systematic textbooks supplementation (knowing when to supplement and what to add). US Department of State, Ministry of

Education Morocco, University of Delaware, English Language Institute. Retrieved on August 8, 2012, from http://www.udel.edu/eli/2006P4L/driss.pdf.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehrenreich, S (2012). English as a lingua franca today: Evolving perspectives. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1*(1), 181-184.

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. London: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal, 51*(1), 36-41.

Ellis, R. (1998). The evaluation of communicative tasks. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), Materials development in language teaching (pp. 217-238). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2011). Macro- and micro-evaluations of task-based teaching. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 21-35). Cambridge: Cambridge

Ellis, P., & Ellis, M. (1987). Learning by design criteria for ELF coursebooks. In L. E. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (pp. 90-98). Oxford: Modern English Publications.

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology, 14*(3), 51-71.

Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Eötvös Lorand University. Retrieved on July 7, 2012, from http://www.elte.hu.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). The first term at university: Implications for EAP. *ELT Journal, 65*(4), 387-397.

Ferris, D. (2001). Teaching writing for academic purposes. In J. Flowerdew, & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 298-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Content area strategies at work.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson / Merrill / Prentice Hall.

Flowerdew, L. (2000). Investigating referential and pragmatic errors in a learner corpus. In L. Burnard, & T. McEnery (Eds.), *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective* (pp. 117-124). Frankfurt am main: Peter Lang Publishers.

Forche, C., & Gerard, P. (Eds.) (2001). *Writing creative nonfiction: Instruction and insights from the teachers of the associated writing programs*. Cincinnati, OH: Story Press.

Fotos, S., & Hinkel, E. (2007). The role of output in form-focused writing instruction. In S. Fotos, & H. Nassaji (Eds.), *Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis* (pp. 225-237). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gabrielatos, C. (2004). The coursebook as a flexible tool, materials evaluation and adaptation. *IATEFL Teacher Trainers and Educators SIG Newsletter, 1*, 28-31.

Galbraith, D. (1996). Self-monitoring, discovery through writing, and individual differences in drafting strategy. In G. Rijlaarsdam, H. van den Bergh, & M. Couzijn (Eds.), *Theories, models and methodology in writing research* (pp. 121-141). Amsterdam: University Press.

Gearing, K. (1999). Helping less-experienced teachers of English to evaluate teachers' guides. *ELT Journal 53*(2), 122-127.

Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gimenez, J. (2009). Beyond the academic essay: Discipline-specific writing in nursing and midwifery. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(3), 151-164.

Godfrey, J. (2011). *Writing for university.* London: Palgrave.

Goldberg, A., Russell, M., & Cook, A. (2003). The effect of computers on student writing: A meta-analysis of studies from 1992 to 2002. *The Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment, 2*(1), 1-52.

Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, S. (2008). *Effective writing instruction for all students*. Wisconsin Rapids, WI: Renaissance Learning.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1989). Improving learning disabled students' skills at composing essays: Selfinstructional strategy training. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 201-214.

Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. London: Longman.

Gray, J. (2000). The ELT coursebook as cultural artifact: How teachers censor and adapt. *ELT Journal*, *54*(3), 274-281.

Grote, R. D. (1996). *The complete guide to performance appraisal.* New York: AMACOM Books.

Guilherme, M. (2007). English as a global language and education for cosmopolitan citizenship. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 7*(1), 72-90.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English: An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Longman: Pearson Education Limited.

Harwood, N. (2005). What do we want EAP teaching materials for? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*(2), 149-161.

Hasan, K., & Akhand, M. M. (2010). Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL context: Balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA, 15*, 77-88.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 81-112.

Haycraft, J. (1998). *An Introduction to English language teaching*. London: Longman.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. Gregg and E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Writing* (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1986). Writing research and the writer. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 1106-1113.

Hemsley, M. (1997). The evaluation of teachers' guides – design and application. *ELTED 3*(1), 72-83.

Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching four skills. *TESOL Quarterly 40*(1), 109-125.

Hong Xu, I. (2004). *Investigating criteria for assessing ESL textbooks*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Hu, S. F. (1998). *Research on evaluation criteria of the English textbooks in junior high school.* Dissertation for the MA in Education, National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan.

Huang, S. (2011). *Ideal and Reality of Textbook Selection: An interview- and questionnaire- based investigation in the Taiwanese tertiary context.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick, UK.

Huthchinson, T. (1987). What is underneath? An interactive view of the materials evaluation. In L. E. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (pp. 37-44). Oxford: Modern English Publications.

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

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purpose: A learning centred approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and researching writing* (2nd Ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Hyland, K. (2011). EAP and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee, & M. Handford (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1,* 1-12.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 156-177.

Inal, B. (2006). Coursebook selection process and some of the most important criteria to be taken into consideration in foreign language teaching. *Journal of Arts and Sciences, 5,* 19-29.

Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 307-317.

Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *ELT Journal, 9*(2), 130-150.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johns, A. M. (1981). Necessary English: A faculty survey. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*, 51-57.

Johns, A. M. (1990). L1 composition theories: Implications for developing theories of L2 composition. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (p. 26). Cambridge: CUP.

Johnson, R. K. (1989). A decision-making framework for the coherent language curriculum. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 1-23). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K., Kim, M., Ya-Fang, L., Nava, A., Perkins, D., Smith, A. M., Soler-Canela, O., & Lu, W. (2008). A step forward: Investigating expertise in materials evaluation. *ELT Journal, 62*(2), 157-163.

Jones, D. (2011). Feedback in academic writing: Using feedback to feed-forward. *Language Education in Asia, 2*(1), 120-133.

Jones, F. R. (1993). Beyond the fringe: A framework for assessing teach-yourself materials for ab initio English-speaking learners. *System, 21*, 453-469.

Jones, S. (1985). In-depth interviewing. In R. Walker (Ed.), *Applied qualitative research*. Aldershot: Gower.

Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A.Matsuhahsi (Ed.), *Writing in real time* (pp. 34-57). New York: Longman.

Kajder, S., & Bull, G. (2003). Scaffolding for struggling students reading and writing with blogs. *Learning and Leading with Technology, 31*(2), 32-35.

Kane, M. (2010). Validity and fairness. *Language Testing, 27*(2), 177-182.

Ke, F. (2010). Examining online teaching, cognitive, and social presence for adult students. *Computers & Education, 55*, 808-820.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294-304.

Kent, T. (Ed.) (1999). *Post-process theory: Beyond the writing-process paradigm.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kern, R. (2006). Perspectives on technology in learning and teaching languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 183-210.

Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2010). Developing collaborative autonomous language learning abilities in computer mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 23*, 41-58.

Kessler, G., Bikowski, D., & Boggs, J. (2012). Collaborative writing among second language learners in academic web-based projects. *Language Learning and Technology, 16*(1), 91-109.

Khafaji, A. (2004). *An evaluation of the materials used for teaching English to the secondary level in male public high school in Saudi Arabia.* Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Kilickaya, F. (2004). Guidelines to evaluate cultural content in textbooks. *The Internet TESL Journal, 10*(12). Retrieved on August 1, 2012, from http://iteslj.org.

Kissinger, J. S. (2011). A collective case study of mobile e-book learning experiences. UNF Theses and Dissertations. Retrieved on August 2, 2012, from http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/.

Kobayakawa, M. (2011). Analayzing writing tasks in Japanese high school textbooks: English I, II, and writing. *JALT Journal, 33*(1), 27-48.

Kramsch, C. (1988). The cultural discourse of foreign language textbooks. In A. Singerman (Ed.), *Toward a new integration of language and culture. Northeast Conference Reports 1988* (pp. 63-88). Middlebury, Vermont: Northeast Conference.

Kroll, B. (1990). *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom.* Cambridge: CUP.

Kroll, B. (2003). *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krug, K. (2002). Some points to ponder in textbook evaluation. Retrieved on August 8, 2012, from http://www.kutztown.edu/library/materials/textbookeval.htm.

Kuteeva, M. (2011). Wikis and academic writing: Changing the writer–reader relationship. *English for Specific Purposes*, *30*(1), 44-57.

Lauckner, H., Krupa, T., & Paterson, M. (2007). *Methodological decisions faced when combining collective case study design with constructivist ground theory: Reflections on paradigms, theoretical frameworks and analysis.* A poster presented at the 8th Annual Advances in Qualitative Methods Conference held September 21-24, 2007 in Banff, Alberta.

Law, W. H. (1995). *Teachers' evaluation of English textbooks: An investigation of teachers' idea and current practice, and their implications for developing textbook evaluation criteria.* Unpublished master's dissertation, the University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Lawrence, W. P. W. (2011). *Textbook evaluation: A framework for evaluation the fitness of the Hong Kong new secondary school (NSS) curriculum.* Unpublished master's dissertation, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Lay, N. (1982). Composing processes of adult ESL learners: A case study. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*, 406-411.

Lea, M., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing and staff feedback in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157-172.

Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 143-157.

Lee, I. (2011). Feedback revolution: What gets in the way? *ELT Journal, 65*(1), 1-12.

Lee, S. H., & Muncie, J. (2006). From receptive to productive: Improving ESL learners' use of vocabulary in a postreading composition task. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 295-320.

Leki, I. (2003). Living through college literacy: Nursing in a second language. *Written Communication, 20,* 81-98.

Li, X. W. (2011). *English academic writing.* Beijing: China Machine Press.

Li, X., Chu, S. K. W., Ki, W. W., & Woo, M. M. (2012). Using a wiki-based collaborative process writing pedagogy to facilitate collaborative writing among Chinese primary school students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 28*(1), 159-181.

Lin, J. T., & Kuo, C. H. (2011). Online peer conferencing in academic writing. *JALT, 7*(2), 121-136.

Littlejohn, A. (1998). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 179-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Litz, D. R. A. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. *Asian EFL Journal.* Retrieved on August 7, 2012, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Litz_thesis.pdf.

Liu, D. (2000). Writing cohesion: Using content lexical ties in ESOL. *English Teaching Forum, 38*(1), 28-33.

Liu, J. Y., Chang, Y. J., Yang, F. Y., & Sun, Y. C. (2011). Is what I need what I want? Reconceptualising college students' needs in English courses for general and specific / academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10,* 271-280.

Lockett, A. (1999). From the general to the specific: What the EAP tutor should know about academic discourse. In H. Bool, & P. Luford (Eds.), *Academic standards and expectations: The role of EAP* (pp. 49-58). Nottingham: Nottingham University Press.

Long, M. H. (2000). *Problems in SLA.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewers' own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(1), 30-43.

Maarof, N., Yamat, H., & Li, K. L. (2011). Role of teacher, peer and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 15*, 29-35.

Macrorie, K. (1970). *Uptaught*. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden.

Maley, A. (2011). Squaring the circle – reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 379-402). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manchon, R. M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2009). The temporal dimension and problem-solving nature of foreign language composing: Implications for theory. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Foreign language writing*: *Learning, teaching and research*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Marshall, S., & Williams, S. A. (2010). Combining process, product and genre on a graduate EAP writing course 'outside of the disciplines'. In G. Blue (Ed.), *Developing academic literacy* (pp. 143-154). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Martindale, T., & Wiley, D. A. (2005). Using weblogs in scholarship and teaching. *TechTrends, 49*(2), 55-61.

Massachusetts Department of Education (2001). *Massachusetts English Language Arts curriculum framework*. Malden, MA: Author.

Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Reinventing giants [Epilogue]. In L. L. Blanton, & B. Kroll (with A. Cumming, M. Erickson, A. Johns, I. Leki, J. M. Reid, & T. Silva) (Eds.), *ESL composition tales: Reflections on teaching* (pp. 163-171). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 65-83.

Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & Matsuda, A. (2009). The expansion of second language writing. In R. Beard, D. Myhill, J. Riley, & M. Nystrand (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of writing development* (pp. 457-471). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayring, P. (2000). *Qualitative inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und techniken* (7th Ed.). Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.

McCarter, S., & Jakes, P. (2009). *Uncovering EAP: How to teach academic writing and reading.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. London: Blackwell.

McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McGrath, I. (2006). Teachers' and learners' images for coursebooks. *ELT Journal 60*(2), 171-179.

McKinley, J. (2006). Learning English writing in a Japanese university: Developing critical argument and establishing writer identity. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 3*(2), 1-35.

McKinley, J. (2007). *Diagnostic essay reveals major problems*. Unpublished manuscript, Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan.

Messick, S. (1994). The interplay of evidence and consequences in the validity of peformance assessment. *Educational Researcher, 23*(2), 13-23.

Metsheng, N. (2009). The challenges of teaching EAP in EFL contexts. Retrieved on July 12, 2012, from, http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/blogs/metsheng/challenges-teaching-eap-efl-contexts.

Middle East Technical University. Retrieved on July 17, 2012, from http://www.metu.edu.tr.

Miekley, J. (2005). ESL textbook evaluation checklist. *The Reading Matrix, 5*(2), 162-185.

Mitchell, V. (1996). Rethinking foreign language writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miyazoe, T., & Anderson, T. (2010). Learning outcomes and students' perceptions of online writing: Simultaneous implementation of a forum, blog, and wiki in an EFL blended learning setting. *System, 38*(2), 185-199.

Mol, H., & Bin, T. B. (2008). EAP materials in Australia and New Zealand. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language teaching materials*. London: Continuum.

Moreno, A. I. (2003). Matching theoretical descriptions of discourse and practical applications to teaching: The case of causal metatext. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*, 265-295.

Mukundan, J. (2009). *ESL textbook evaluation*. Koln: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Mukundan, J., & Ahour, T. (2010). A review of textbook evaluation checklists across four decades (1970-2008). In B. Tomlinson, & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp.336-352). London: Continuum.

Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 4*(6), 21-27.

Murdoch, Y. (2000). *Evaluation of the coursebooks used in the Chungbuk Provincial Board of Education secondary school teachers' training sessions*. University of Birmingham, UK. Retrieved on August 7, 2012, from http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/yvette3.pdf.

Murray, D. M. (1968). *A writer teaches writing: A practical method of teaching composition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Murray, D. M. (1972). Teach writing as a process not product. *The Leaflet, 71*, 11-14.

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ, 6*, 1-19.

Nahrkhalaji, S. (2012). An avaluation of a global ELT textbook in Iran: A two-phase approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2*(3), 184-191.

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003). The neglected 'R': The need for a writing revolution. New York: College Board. Retrieved on August 6, 2012, from http:/www.collegeboard.org/prod_downloads/writingcom/neglectedr.pdf.

National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges (2004). Writing: A ticket to work … or a ticket out (a survey of business leaders). New York: College Board. Retrieved on August 5, 2012, from http://www.collegeboard.org/prod_downloads/writingcom/writing-ticket-towork.pdf.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). Common core standards for English language arts and literacy in history / social studies, science, and technical subjects. Washington, DC. Retrieved on August 5, 2012, from http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf.

Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2006). Variation in disciplinary culture: University tutors' views on assessed writing tasks. In R. Kiely, P. Rea-Dickins, H. Woodfield, & G. Clibbon (Eds.), *Language, culture and identity in applied linguistics (British Studies in Applied Linguistics, Volume 21)* (pp. 99-117). London: Equinox Publishing.

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Hudson, P. (2010). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about teaching writing and learning to teach writing before their practicum: A case study in Vietnam. *Asian EFL Journal*, *12*(2), 43-67.

Nunan, D. (1988). Principles for designing language teaching materials. *Guidelines*, *10*, 1-24.

Nunan, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers. London: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Peacock, M. (1997). Choosing the right book for your class. Retrieved on August 4, 2012, from http://www.sx.ac.uk/linguistics/pgr/egspll/volume1/PDFs/PEACOCK1.pdf.

Plews, M. (2010). A review of current best-practice in EAP and how its effectiveness can be measured. Retrieved on July 21, 2012, from http://www.sprachenzentrum.hu-berlin.de/downloads/a-review-of-current-best-practice-in-eap-and-how-its-effectiveness-can-be-measured.

Poverjuc, O. (2011). The experiences of feedback practices on academic writing undergone by students with English as an additional language in a master's programme: A multiple case study. *Journal of Academic Writing*, *1*(1), 143-152.

Pulverness, A. (2002). Squaring the circle: Teaching EAP to large mixed groups. Retrieved on July 7, 2012, from http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2002/wp01.htm.

Pulverness, A. (2004). Here and there: Issues in materials development for intercultural learning. Retrieved on July 6, 2012, from http://elt.britcoun.org.pl/forum/handt.htm.

Rahimy, R. (2007). A coursebook evaluation. *ESP World*, *6*(2). Retrieved on August 8, 2012, from http://www.esp-world.info/contents.htm.

Rahman, M. M. (2012). An evaluation of English writing text at the preparatory year, Najran University, Saudi Arabia. *Academic Research International, 2*(2), 706-714.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 229-258.

Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. (1996). Some problematic "channels" in the teaching of critical thinking in current L1 composition textbooks: Implications for L2 student-writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 7,* 225-249.

Ramoroka, B. T. (2012). Teaching academic writing for the disciplines: How far can we be specific in an EAP writing course? *English Linguistics Research, 1*(2), 33-43.

Reid, J. (2001). Writing. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to TESOL* (pp. 28-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reinders, H., & Lewis, M. (2006). An evaluative checklist for self-access materials. *ELT Journal, 60*(3), 272-278.

Renner, C. (1997). Women are busy, tall, and beautiful: Looking at sexism in EFL Materials. *Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Orlando, March 11-15.

Riazi, A. (1997). Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A social-cognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of education. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*(2), 105-137.

Riazi, A. M. (2003). What textbook evaluation schemes tell us? A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In W. A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 52-68). Singapore: SEAMEO regional center.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2002). 30 Years of TEFL / TESL: A personal reflection. *RELC Journal, 33*(2), 1-35.

Richards, J. C. (2007). Materials development and research: towards a form-focussed perspective. In S. Fotos, & H. Nassaji (Ed.), *Form focussed instruction and teacher education: Studies in honor of Rod Ellis* (pp. 147–160), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language Teaching* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rijlaarsdam, G., & van den Bergh, H. (1996). The dynamics of composing – An agenda for research into an interactive compensatory model of writing: Many questions, some answers. In C. M. Levy, & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences and applications* (pp. 107-125). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Risager, K. (1991). Cultural references in European textbooks: An evaluation of recent tendencies. In D. Buttjes, & M. Byram (Eds.), *Mediating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of English language teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal 59*(1), 23-30.

Rose, J. (2009). *Independent review of the primary curriculum: Final report*. Nottingham: DCSF.

Rubdy, R. (2003). Selection of materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.

Russell and Spada (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Salamonson, Y., Koch, J., Weaver, R., Everett, B., & Jackson, D. (2010). Embedded academic writing support for nursing students with English as a second language. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 9*, 413-421.

Sasaki, M. (2009). Changes in English as a foreign language students' writing over 3.5 years: A sociocognitive account. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 49-76). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Saye, J., & Brush, T. (2002). Scaffolding critical reasoning about history and social issues in multimedia-supported learning environments. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 50*(3), 77-96.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., & Steinbach, R. (1984). Teachability of reflective processes in written composition. *Cognitive Science, 8*(2), 173-190.

Schafer, G. (2001). The process of change in a community college writing program. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 29*, 7-15.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sert, N. (2008). The language of instruction dilemma in the Turkish context. *System, 36*(2), 156-171.

Sevilla-Pavón, A., Martínez-Sáez, A., & Gimeno-Sanz, A. (2011). Designing and evaluating online language learning materials for higher education. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 1*(4), 269-273.

Shafie, L. A., Maesin, A., Osman, N., Nayan, S., & Mansor, M. (2010). Understanding collaborative academic writing among beginner university writers in Malaysia. *Studies in Literature and Language, 1*, 58-69.

Sheerin, S. (1989). *Resource books for teachers: Self-access*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal 42*(4), 237-246.

Skibniewski, L. (1990). The writing processes of advanced foreign language learners: Evidence from thinking aloud and behavior protocols. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics* (pp. 193-202). Poznan: Adam Mikiewicz University.

Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. C. Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 432-453). Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, *22*(1), 29-51.

Spring, J. (2010). How to take university EAP support beyond the Freshman year with CBI: The case of a paired EAP-Philosophy course. In J. Nordmeyer, & S. Barduhn (Eds.), *Integrating language and content.* Alexandria, USA: TESOL.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stapleton, P. (2005). Using the Web as a research source: Implications for L2 academic writing. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 177-189.

Stapleton, P. (2012). Shifting cognitive processes while composing in an electronic environment: A study of L2 graduate writing. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *3*(1), 151–171.

Stapleton, P., & Radia, P. (2010). Tech-era L2 writing: Towards a new kind of process. *ELT Journal*, *64*(2), 175-183.

Stapleton, P., Helms-Park, R., & Radia, P. (2006). The web as a source of unconventional research materials in second language academic writing. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *9*(1), 63-74.

Stieglitz, E. L. (1997). *The Stieglitz informal reading inventory: Assessing reading behaviors from emergent to advanced levels* (2nd Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Stoecker, R. (1991). Evaluating and rethinking the case study. *Sociological Review*, *39*(1), 88-112.

Stoller, F. L., Horn, B., Grabe, W., & Robinson, M. S. (2005). Creating and validating assessment instruments for a discipline-specific writing course: An interdisciplinary approach. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 7-101.

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, *52*, 119-158.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*, 153-173.

Storch, N. (2009). The impact of studying in a second language (L2) medium university on the development of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*, 103-118.

Sun, Z. (2010). Language teaching materials and learner motivation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(6), 889-892.

Sun, Y., & Chang, Y. (2012). Blogging to learn: Becoming EFL academic writers through collaborative dialogues. *Language Learning and Technology*, *16*(1), 43-61.

Suzuki, R. (2004). Diaries as introspective research tools: From Ashton-Warner to blogs. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, *8*(1). Retrieved on August 6, 2012, from http://www.writing.berkeley.edu/tesl-ej/ej29/int.html.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (1995). The role of the textbook in EAP writing research. *English for specific Purposes, 14,* 3-18.

Thein, N. (2006) *Evaluating the suitability and effectiveness of three English coursebooks at Myanmar Institute of Technology*. Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Thailand, Thailand.

Tierney, R., Carter, M., & Desai, L. (1991). *Portfolio assessment in the reading-writing classroom.* Norwook, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Tobin, L. (2001). Process pedagogy. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper, & K. Schick (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagog*ies (pp. 1-18). New York: Oxford University Press.

Todd, J. (1979). Mixing qalitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(4), 602-611.

Tomlinson, B (1998). Glossary of basic terms for materials development in language teaching and introduction. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to TESOL* (pp. 66-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2003). Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (2008). *English language learning materials. A critical review*. London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching (State-of-the-Art Article). *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 143-179.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2004). *Developing language course materials*. Singapore: RELC.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2010). Published research on materials development for language learning. In B. Tomlinson, & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice*. London: Continuum.

Torrance, M., Thomas, G. V., & Robinson, E. J. (1994). The writing strategies of graduate research students in the social sciences. *Higher Education, 27,* 379-392.

Tribble, C. (2009). Writing academic English – a survey review of current published resources. *English Language Teaching Journal, 63,* 400-417.

Trimbur, J. (1994). Taking the social turn: Teaching writing post-process. *College Composition and Communication, 45,* 108-118.

Troudi, S., & Alwan, F. (2010). Teachers' feelings during curriculum change in the United Arabic Emirates: opening Pandora's box. *Teacher Development, 14*(1), 107-121.

Tucker, C. A. (1975). Evaluating beginning textbooks. *English Teaching Forum 13,* 335-361.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching – practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Urquhart, V., & McIver, M. (2005). *Teaching writing in the content areas.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

van Waes, L. (2004). Collaborative writing in a digital environmental. *Information design journal and document design, 12*(1), 73-80.

van Waes, L., & Schellens, P. J. (2003). Writing profiles: The effect of the writing mode on pausing and revision patterns of experienced writers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35,* 829-853.

Vellenga, H. (2004). *Learning pragmatics from EFL and ESL textbooks*. Michigan: Michigan University center.

Vincent, S. (1990). Motivating the advanced learner in developing writing skill; a project. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 272-278.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2004). Imagination and creativity in childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology, 42*(1), 7-97.

White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. Harlow: Longman.

Wild, C. (1991). Syllabus design and coursebooks in the TESOL classroom. *EA Journal, 9,* 1.

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

Wingate, U., & Tribble, C. (2012). The best of both worlds? Towards an EAP / academic literacies writing pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education* (in press).

Xiao, Z. (2011). Word clusters and reformulation markers in Chinese and English: Implications for translation universal hypotheses. *Languages in Contrast, 11*(2), 145-171.

Xie, Y., & Sammons-Lohse, D. (2012). Students' use of a blogging-mapping tool in a graduate class: A collective case study. In T. Amiel, & B. Wilson (Eds.), *Proceedings of world conference on educational multimedia, hypermedia and telecommunications 2012* (pp. 507-511). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Yakhontova, T. (2001). Textbooks, contexts and learners. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*(3), 397-415.

Yeh, K. H., & She, H. C. (2010). Online synchronous scientific argumentation learning: Nurturing students' argumentation ability and conceptual change in science context. *Computers & Education, 55*(2), 586–602.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yoon, H. (2008). More than a linguistic reference: The influence of corpus technology on L2 academic writing. *Language Learning and Technology, 12*(2), 31-48.

Zabawa, J. (2001). Criteria for FCE textbook evaluation: An attempt at questionnaire formulation. Retrieved on July 8, 2012, from http://www.univ.rzeszow.pl/fil_ang/wsar2/sar_v2_17.pdf.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from the research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*(1), 67-76.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(2), 195-209.

Zimmermann, R., & Schneider, K. D. (1987). The collective learner tested: Retrospective evidence for a model of lexical search. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 177-195). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – The Informed Consent Form

Gönülü Katılım Formu (Örnek)

Bu çalışma, Prof Dr Hüsnü Enginarlar danışmanlığında Kenan Barut tarafından yürütülen, yazma derslerinde kullanılan araç-gereçlerin değerlendirilmesi konulu doktora çalışmasının bir bölümüdür. Çalışmanın amacı, katılımcıların kullandıkları İngilizce yazma dersi araç-gereçleri ile ilgili bilgi toplamaktır. Çalışmaya katılım tamamiyle gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Ankette, sizden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamimiyle gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Anket, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek soruları içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda anketi uygulayan kişiye, anketi tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır. Anket sonunda, bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Kenan Barut (kenanbarut@hotmail.com) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad Tarih İmza Alınan Ders

APPENDIX B – Sample Questionnaire for Program Designers

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROGRAM DESIGNERS

Dear Colleague,

I am a doctoral student at Middle East Technical University, Ankara. This questionnaire is designed to investigate your perceptions concerning the appropriacy of your writing materials to your own context. Your cooperation will be much appreciated. All your answers will be kept confidential and used only for research purposes.

I look forward to receiving your replies. Thank you for your participation.

Kenan Barut

kenanbarut@hotmail.com

Your institution

- ……

Your program

a. Preparatory year – Foundation year b. Freshman year – Grade 1

Your gender

a. Female b. Male

Your age

a. 20 – 30
b. 41 – 50
c. 31 – 40
d. 51+

Your program design experience

a. 1 – 5 years
b. 6 – 10 years
c. 11 – 15 years
d. 16+ years

In your writing classes, you use

a. Only Commercial / Global materials
b. Only In-house materials
c. Mostly Commercial / Global materials
d. Mostly In-house materials

Please select your main considerations while adopting / developing your writing material. Choose 1 for the least important one(s), and 4 for the most important one(s) for you.

a. Learning context	1	2	3	4
b. Language level	1	2	3	4
c. Additional resources	1	2	3	4
d. Needs and objectives	1	2	3	4
e. Class motivation	1	2	3	4
f. Relevant content	1	2	3	4
g. Guidelines and input	1	2	3	4
h. Activity types	1	2	3	4
i. Learning styles	1	2	3	4
j. Integration with other skills	1	2	3	4
k. Feedback and assessment	1	2	3	4
l. Usability	1	2	3	4
m. Adaptability	1	2	3	4
n. Other (……)	1	2	3	4
o. Other (……)	1	2	3	4

Please write briefly regarding your main approach / philosophy to the teaching of writing. Have you made any shifts / changes in your approaches to the teaching of writing? Please also write your comments on these shifts / changes.

- ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

What have been the main factors in these shifts / changes (i.e. teachers' feedback, students' feedback, seminars, books and articles)? To what extent, do these factors affect your material adoption process in terms of the writing program?

- ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

**material : all the materials (i.e. handouts / books) you use in your English language writing classes and / or writing sections of English classes*

**1 – 4 : please select 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree, 1 for strongly disagree*

Part 1

A. Learning Context

1	The content of the material is relevant to the students' current and future studies.	1	2	3	4
2	The design and layout of the material is appropriate to the students' age group.	1	2	3	4
3	The material doesn't contain culturally offensive or inappropriate topics / themes or texts.	1	2	3	4

To what extent is the material appropriate to the learning context / environment?

- ……

  ……

  ……

B. Language Level

4	The material is appropriate to the English language level of the students.	1	2	3	4
5	The content of the material is challenging enough to help the students improve their English language level.	1	2	3	4
6	The activities and tasks in the material are not too challenging for the students' English language level.	1	2	3	4

Is there any part of the material which is too low or too high for the English language level of the students?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

C. Additional Resources

7	The material has beneficial additional resources (i.e. extra resources, guidelines) which are suitable for the program.	1	2	3	4
8	There are adequate additional resources to help teachers and learners extend the teaching and learning processes beyond the classroom.	1	2	3	4
9	The additional resources for the course can be found easily on-site or online.	1	2	3	4

Do you think there is need for any additional resources? If yes, what kind of additional resources would you like to have?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

D. Needs and Objectives

10	The material serves the program objectives and requirements of our writing classes.	1	2	3	4
11	The material has been developed to foster process writing (i.e. plan, draft, edit, revise).	1	2	3	4
12	The material helps the students produce quality written work.	1	2	3	4

To what extent does the material meet the teachers' and students' needs and objectives? Would you propose any changes in this context?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

Strongly Disagree (1) **Disagree (2)** **Agree (3)** **Strongly Agree (4)**

Part 2

E. Class Motivation

13	The material includes attractive and up-to-date topics / themes and texts that maintain the attention of the students.	1	2	3	4
14	The activities and tasks in the material motivate and engage the students.	1	2	3	4
15	The content of the material generates interest and curiosity among the students.	1	2	3	4

How does the material help the teachers sustain interest and motivation in their writing class?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

F. Relevant Content

16	The material has topics / themes, texts and tasks that are relevant to the students' current and future studies.	1	2	3	4
17	The material provides the students with the necessary writing skills and strategies (i.e. brainstorming, planning, editing, and revising) to help them with their current and future studies.	1	2	3	4
18	The material includes topics / themes and texts which are related to the students' daily lives.	1	2	3	4

Which topics / themes are generally focused on in the material? What topics / themes should be added? What changes are you planning to make concerning the content of the material?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

G. Guidelines and Input

19	There are clear linguistic (i.e. grammar) tips and guidelines for the students to help them in their writing process.	1	2	3	4
20	There are clear rhetoric (i.e. organizational) tips and guidelines for the students to help them in their writing process.	1	2	3	4
21	There is a sufficient amount of input (i.e. information, ideas) for the students to help them compose the writing tasks in the material.	1	2	3	4

To what extent does the methodology of the material assist the students in developing their writing skills and strategies? What would you like to change / develop in the material in terms of methodology?

- ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

H. Activity Types

22	There are controlled writing activities and tasks (containing a variety of forms and patterns) in the material.	1	2	3	4
23	There are guided writing activities and tasks (containing model paragraphs / essays) in the material.	1	2	3	4
24	There are free writing activities and tasks that improves students' imagination and creativity in the material.	1	2	3	4

Does the material focus more on controlled, guided or free activities? Are you planning to change anything concerning the activity types in the material?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

I. Learning Styles

25	The activities and tasks in the material address various learning styles and intelligence types (i.e. linguistic, visual, and logical) of importance to the program.	1	2	3	4
26	The activities and tasks in the material employ different interaction types – individual, pair, and group work.	1	2	3	4
27	The material assists the students in developing their writing skills and strategies (i.e. brainstorming, planning, editing, and revising) through a variety of activities and tasks.	1	2	3	4

To what extent are you satisfied with the variety of activities and tasks in the material? What kind of activities and tasks do the teachers focus on in their writing classes?

- ……

  ……

  ……

  ……

J. Integration with Other Skills

28	The material helps the students improve their reading and listening along with their writing skills.	1	2	3	4
29	The material helps the students improve their grammar and vocabulary knowledge.	1	2	3	4
30	The material creates opportunities for both written and spoken interaction among the students.	1	2	3	4

Which other skills are fostered in the writing material? Which skill would you focus on more in addition to the writing in the material?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

K. *Feedback and Assessment*

31	The material assists the students in receiving feedback from their peers and teachers.	1	2	3	4
32	The material provides the students with self-evaluation opportunities.	1	2	3	4
33	The material prepares the students for the writing sections of their exams in the program, such as the mid-term and the final / the proficiency.	1	2	3	4

How do you assess the writing tasks of the students? In what way, do you prefer to give feedback to the students?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

Strongly Disagree (1) **Disagree (2)** **Agree (3)** **Strongly Agree (4)**

Part 3

L. Usability

34	The material structure is in parallel with other materials in the English language program.	1	2	3	4
35	The material is easy to use and well-organized for both teaching and learning purposes.	1	2	3	4
36	There are other extra writing materials used in class along with the material.	1	2	3	4

How easily do you believe the material is integrated into the English language program at your institution?

○ ……

……

……

……

M. Adaptability

37	The content of the material can be adapted easily to the program design.	1	2	3	4
38	The content of the material can be related to the students' culture and environment.	1	2	3	4
39	The activities and tasks in the material are flexible enough to be personalized by the students.	1	2	3	4

What difficulties do you find in adapting the material to the program's context?

- ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

- *Please write any additional comments you have concerning the writing materials you use.*

……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……

☺ THANK YOU ☺

APPENDIX C – Sample Translated Questionnaire for Students

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS / ANKET ÇALIŞMASI

Dear Students,

I am a doctoral student at Middle East Technical University, Ankara. This questionnaire is designed to investigate your perceptions concerning appropriacy of your writing materials to your own context. Your cooperation will be much appreciated. All your answers will be kept confidential and used only for research purposes.

I look forward to receiving your replies. Thank you for your participation.

Kenan Barut

kenanbarut@hotmail.com

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Bu anket, İngilizce derslerinizdeki yazma çalışmalarında kullandığınız materyallerin sizlere uygunluğu hakkındaki görüşlerinizi almak üzere hazırlanmıştır. Lütfen aşağıdaki tüm soruları dikkatle okuyarak cevaplayınız. Sorulara vereceğiniz yanıtlar, çalışmaya değer katacaktır. Tüm cevaplarınız gizli tutulacaktır ve sadece akademik araştırmalarda kullanılacaktır.

Katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Kenan Barut

kenanbarut@hotmail.com

Doktora Öğrencisi, ODTÜ

Your class / Sınıfınız

a. Preparatory year – Foundation year / Hazırlık – Temel İngilizce Programı

b. Freshman year – Grade 1 / 1. Sınıf

Your gender / Cinsiyetiniz

a. Female

b. Male

Your age / Yaşınız

a. 16 – 18

b. 19 – 21

c. 22 – 24

d. 25+

Your English language learning experience / Kaç yıldır İngilizce öğrenmektesiniz?

a. 1 – 4 years

b. 5 – 8 years

c. 9 – 12 years

d. 13+ years

Your current English language level / İngilizce dil seviyeniz

a. A1 – A2 / Elementary

b. A2 – B1 / Pre-Intermediate

c. B1 – B2 / Intermediate

d. B2 – C1 / Upper-Intermediate

e. C1 / Advanced

**material : all the materials (i.e. handouts / books) you use in your English language writing classes and / or writing sections of English classes*

**1 – 4 : please select 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree, 1 for strongly disagree*

**materyal : İngilizce derslerinde yazma bölümlerinde kullanmakta olduğunuz kaynaklar (örneğin portfolyo materyalleri)*

**1 – 4 : Eğer aşağıdaki yargılara kesinlikle katılmıyorsanız 1'i, katılmıyorsanız 2'yi, katılıyorsanız 3'ü, kesinlikle katılıyorsanız 4'ü işaretleyiniz.*

Strongly Disagree (1) Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)	Disagree (2) Katılmıyorum (2)	Agree (3) Katılıyorum (3)	Strongly Agree (4) Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)

1. The content of the material is relevant to my current and future studies. / Materyalin içeriği, şu anki ve gelecekteki çalışmalarım ile ilişkilidir.	1	2	3	4
2. The content of the material is appropriate to my age. / Materyalin içeriği, yaşıma göre uygundur.	1	2	3	4
3. There is no culturally offensive or inappropriate topic / theme or text in the material. / Materyal, kültürel olarak uygun olmayan herhangi bir konu ya da metin içermemektedir.	1	2	3	4
4. The language use in the material is not too much below or above my English language level. / Materyal, İngilizce dil seviyeme uygundur.	1	2	3	4
5. I can improve my English language level with the activities and tasks in the material. / Materyaldeki etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmalarıyla, İngilizce dil seviyemi geliştirebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
6. I am able to do the activities and tasks in the material with my current English language level. / Şu anki İngilizce dil seviyem, materyaldeki etkinlikleri ve yazma çalışmalarını yapmam için yeterlidir.	1	2	3	4

Strongly Disagree (1) **Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)**	**Disagree (2)** **Katılmıyorum (2)**	**Agree (3)** **Katılıyorum (3)**	**Strongly Agree (4)** **Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)**

7. I can benefit from additional resources (i.e. extra resources, workbook) for the writing class. / Yazma dersi için, değişik kaynaklardan yararlanabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
8. I can practice writing outside the class with the help of additional resources. / Değişik kaynaklar sayesinde, sınıf dışında da yazma çalışmaları yapabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
9. I can find additional resources for the writing course easily on-site or online. / Yazma dersi için gerekli olan fazladan kaynakları kolaylıkla bulabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
10. The material helps me to prepare for the writing tasks in my current and future studies. / Materyal, şu anki ve gelecekteki yazma çalışmalarıma hazırlanmamı sağlıyor.	1	2	3	4
11. The material helps me to focus on the writing process (i.e. plan, draft, edit, revise) as well as the end product. / Materyal, hem yazma sürecinde (örneğin planlama, taslak, düzeltme, gözden geçirme) hem de yazılarımı (örneğin paragraf, deneme) yazmamda bana yardımcı oluyor.	1	2	3	4
12. I can produce quality written work with the help of the material. / Materyal sayesinde, kaliteli yazılar yazabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4

Strongly Disagree (1) **Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)**	**Disagree (2)** **Katılmıyorum (2)**	**Agree (3)** **Katılıyorum (3)**	**Strongly Agree (4)** **Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)**

13. There are attractive and up-to-date topics / themes and texts in the material that hold my attention. / Materyalde, ilgi çekici ve güncel konular ile metinler bulunmaktadır.	1	2	3	4
14. There are motivating and engaging activities and tasks in the material. / Materyalde, motive edici etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmaları vardır.	1	2	3	4
15. The content of the material raises my interest and curiosity in the writing class. / Materyalin içeriği, derse olan ilgimi ve merakımı artırıyor.	1	2	3	4
16. The topics / themes, texts and tasks in the material are relevant to my current and future studies. / Materyaldeki bazı konular, metinler ve yazma çalışmaları benim şu anki ya da gelecekteki çalışmalarımla doğrudan ilgilidir.	1	2	3	4
17. The activities and tasks in the material help me to get prepared for my current and future studies. / Materyaldeki etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmaları, şu anki ve gelecekteki çalışmalarıma hazırlık anlamında bana yardımcı oluyor.	1	2	3	4
18. There are topics / themes and texts in the material which I can relate to in my daily life. / Materyalde, günlük hayatımla ilişkilendirebileceğim konular ve metinler var.	1	2	3	4

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)	**Katılmıyorum (2)**	**Katılıyorum (3)**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)**

19. There are clear grammar tips and guidelines in the material to help me in my writing process. / Materyalde, yazma sürecim boyunca bana yardımcı olan dilbilgisi / gramer ile ilgili fikirler ve destekleyici noktalar bulunmaktadır.	1	2	3	4
20. There are clear organizational tips and guidelines in the material to help me in my writing process. / Materyalde, yazma sürecim boyunca bana yardımcı olan yazı yapısı (örneğin paragraf organizasyonu) ile ilgili fikirler ve destekleyici noktalar bulunmaktadır.	1	2	3	4
21. There is a sufficient amount of input (i.e. information, ideas) to help me compose the writing tasks in the material. / Yazma çalışmalarını gerçekleştirmem için, materyalde yeterince bilgi / fikir vardır.	1	2	3	4
22. I can minimize my errors focusing on forms and patterns within the material. / Materyaldeki şekiller ve örneklere odaklanarak, hatalarımı azaltabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
23. I can benefit from the model paragraphs / essays in composing my written work. / Yazma çalışmamı yaparken, materyaldeki örnek paragraflardan / denemelerden faydalanıyorum.	1	2	3	4
24. I can improve my imagination and creativity through the activities and tasks within the material. / Materyaldeki etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmaları sayesinde, hayal gücüm ile yaratıcılığımı geliştirebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4

Strongly Disagree (1)	**Disagree (2)**	**Agree (3)**	**Strongly Agree (4)**
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)	**Katılmıyorum (2)**	**Katılıyorum (3)**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)**

25. There are activities and tasks in the material which are relevant with my learning style (i.e. through visual aids, linguistic or mathematical formulas). /
Materyalde kendi öğrenme stillerime (örneğin görsel, işitsel, formüllere dayalı) uygun etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmaları vardır. 1 2 3 4

26. There are a variety of activities and tasks in the material that lead us do individual, pair and group work in the writing class. /
Materyalde, sınıf içerisinde, tek başına yapılabilecek, iki kişiyle yapılabilecek ve grup halinde yapılabilecek çeşitli etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmaları mevcuttur. 1 2 3 4

27. I can develop my writing skills and strategies (i.e. brainstorming, planning, editing, and revising) through a variety of activities and tasks in the material. /
Materyaldeki değişik etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmalarıyla, yazma becerilerimi ve stratejilerimi (örneğin planlama, düzeltme, gözden geçirme) geliştirebiliyorum. 1 2 3 4

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)	**Katılmıyorum (2)**	**Katılıyorum (3)**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)**

28. I can improve my reading and listening skills along with writing skills with the help of the material. / Materyal sayesinde, yazma becerilerimin yanı sıra, okuma va dinleme becerilerimi de geliştirebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
29. I can improve my grammar and vocabulary knowledge within the material. / Materyal sayesinde, dilbilgisi ve kelime becerilerimi geliştirebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4
30. I can interact with my classmates written and orally within the material. / Materyaldeki etkinlikler ve yazma çalışmaları, sınıf arkadaşlarımla derslerde hem yazılı hem de sözlü iletişim içerisinde olmamı sağlıyor.	1	2	3	4
31. I can get feedback from my classmates and teachers within the material. / Materyal, hem sınıf arkadaşlarımdan hem de öğretmenimden geribildirimler almamı sağlıyor.	1	2	3	4
32. I can notice and correct my own mistakes within the material. / Materyal bana, yazılarımdaki hatalarımı görme ve düzeltme fırsat veriyor.	1	2	3	4
33. I can get prepared for the writing parts of my exams in the program like mid-term and final thanks to the material. / Materyal sayesinde, vize ve finallerimin yazma bölümlerine hazırlıklı olabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1)	**Katılmıyorum (2)**	**Katılıyorum (3)**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4)**

34. The material structure is in parallel with other materials (i.e. Reading, Grammar) I use in the English language program. / Materyalin yapısı, diğer İngilizce materyallerimizle (örneğin Okuma, Dilbilgisi) aynı doğrultudadır.	1	2	3	4
35. The material is easy to use and well-organized for my learning purposes. / Materyalin kullanımı kolaydır ve materyal iyi bir şekilde düzenlenmiştir.	1	2	3	4
36. We sometimes use other materials (i.e. handouts, worksheets) in our writing class. / Yazma derslerimizde, bazen başka materyaller (örneğin çalışma kağıtları) de kullanmaktayız.	1	2	3	4
37. We sometimes adapt the content of the material in our writing class. / Zaman zaman, yazma derslerimizde, materyalin içeriğinde uyarlamalar / değişiklikler yapıyoruz.	1	2	3	4
38. Some topics and texts in the material are related to my own culture and environment. / Materyalde kendi kültürüm ve çevremle ilgili bazı konular ve metinler vardır.	1	2	3	4
39. I can personalize the activities and tasks in the material. / Materyaldeki etkinlikleri ve yazma çalışmalarını, kendimle ilişkilendirerek kişiselleştirebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4

- *Please write any additional comments you have concerning the writing materials you use. / Kullandığınız yazma materyaliyle ilgili paylaşmak isteğiniz görüşleriniz varsa lütfen belirtiniz.*

……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……

☺ TEŞEKKÜRLER ☺

APPENDIX D – Sample Simplified Questionnaire for Students

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Dear Students,

I am a doctoral student at Middle East Technical University, Ankara. With this questionnaire, I would like to learn your opinions about the materials which are used in your writing classes (*Speech and Writing* and *Study Skills*). I would kindly appreciate your cooperation. All your answers will be kept confidential and used only for research purposes.

I look forward to receiving your replies. Thank you for your participation.

Kenan Barut / kenanbarut@hotmail.com

Your gender

a. Female b. Male

Your age

a. 16 – 18 b. 19 – 21 c. 22 – 24 d. 25+

Your English language learning experience

a. 1 – 5 years b. 6 – 10 years c. 11 – 15 years d.15+ years

Your current English language level

a. A2 – B1 / Pre-Intermediate b. B1 – B2 / Intermediate c. B2 – C1 / Upper-Intermediate d. C1 / Advanced

Please select 1 – 4, *1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.* All sentences below are about <u>the writing materials</u> which you use in your *Speech and Writing* and *Study Skills* classes.

1. The topics and texts in the materials are relevant to my future studies.	1	2	3	4
2. The topics and texts in the material are appropriate to (suitable for) my age group (university students).	1	2	3	4
3. There is <u>no</u> culturally offensive or inappropriate (problematic) topic or text in the materials.	1	2	3	4
4. I can understand the topics and texts in the materials.	1	2	3	4
5. I can improve (develop) my English language level with the activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4
6. I can do the activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4
7. I can find extra resources and activities / information for writing.	1	2	3	4
8. I can practice writing outside the class with the help of these resources.	1	2	3	4
9. I can find these resources easily in print or online.	1	2	3	4
10. I can prepare for the writing tasks in my future studies with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
11. I can focus on the writing process (i.e. planning, draft, editing, and revising) with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
12. I can write quality paragraphs / essays with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4

13. There are attractive topics and texts in the materials.	1	2	3	4
14. There are motivating activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4
15. The topics and texts in the materials raise my interest.	1	2	3	4
16. The topics, texts and tasks in the materials are relevant to my future studies.	1	2	3	4
17. I can prepare for my future studies with the help of the activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4
18. There are topics and texts in the materials which I can relate to in my daily life.	1	2	3	4
19. There are clear grammar tips and guidelines in the materials.	1	2	3	4
20. There are clear organizational (i.e. how to organize a paragraph) tips and guidelines in the materials.	1	2	3	4
21. There is enough input (i.e. information, ideas) to help me in the materials.	1	2	3	4
22. I minimize my errors (mistakes) with the help of the forms and patterns (i.e. sample sentences, formulas) in the materials.	1	2	3	4
23. I can benefit from the model (sample) paragraphs / essays in the materials.	1	2	3	4
24. I can improve my creativity with the help of the activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4

25. There are activities and tasks in the materials which are relevant to my learning style (i.e. through images, linguistic or mathematical formulas).	1	2	3	4
26. There are individual, pair and group work activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4
27. I can develop my writing skills and strategies (i.e. brainstorming, planning, editing, and revising) with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
28. I can improve my reading and listening skills with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
29. I can improve my grammar and vocabulary knowledge with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
30. I can interact (communicate) with my classmates written and orally with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
31. I can get (receive) feedback from my classmates and teachers with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
32. I can see and correct my own mistakes with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
33. I can prepare for the writing parts of my exams with the help of the materials.	1	2	3	4
34. The materials' language level is very similar to the other materials which we use in our preparatory year program.	1	2	3	4
35. The materials are easy to use.	1	2	3	4
36. We sometimes use other materials which are prepared / brought by our teachers in our writing classes.	1	2	3	4

37. We sometimes adapt (make small changes) the topics and texts of the materials in our writing classes.	1	2	3	4
38. Some topics and texts in the materials are related to my own culture and environment.	1	2	3	4
39. I can personalize (relate to myself) the activities and tasks in the materials.	1	2	3	4

- *Please write any additional comments you have concerning the writing materials you use.*

……

……

……

……

……

……

☺ THANK YOU ☺

APPENDIX E – The Interview Guide

Sample Guide for the Teachers' Interview

- **Before the Interview**
  - Introduction and the procedure – timing and confidentiality.
  - The reason for the interview.
  - Permission to use audio-recording.

- **The First Few Questions**
  - How long have you been teaching academic writing?
  - How long have you been using your current writing materials?
    - Specify the material type and the main considerations concerning the material.

- **The Content Questions**
  - To what extent, do you think, does the material help your students with their current and future studies?
    - Specify with the disciplines of the students.
  - Do you have any difficulty to adapt the material to the language levels of your students?
    - Confirm if there is any issue about the mixed-level classes.
  - What kind of additional resources do you use to supplement the core material?
    - Specify the online resources.
  - To what extent does the material meet your needs as a teacher of academic writing?
    - Check the exact needs and expectations.

- How helpful does the material to maintain the motivation of your students in the writing class?
  - Specify the relevance of the themes and texts.
- Do your students have any difficulty in finding ideas to write on the tasks you assign?
  - Make links to the guidelines and tips in the material.
- To what extent do you consider the intelligence types of your students in the writing class?
  - Refer to the activities and the tasks in the material with specific examples.
- Do you generally prefer to use controlled, guided or free writing activities in your writing class?
  - Refer to the activity types in the material.
- What kind of feedback techniques do you use in your academic writing class?
  - Check the reactions of the students to different feedback types.
- Does the content of the material need specific adaptations for your writing class?
  - Specify the areas of these adaptations.

- **Probes**
  - Some probes from the responses in the questionnaires.
  - Some probes from the responses in the interview.

- **The Final Closing Question**
  - Is there anything else you would like to add concerning the academic writing materials you use?

APPENDIX F – Descriptive Statistics of the Questionnaires

- **Questionnaire for the Program Designers (Case 1 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 1***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.67	0.58
Item 1	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
B. Language Level									3.67	0.58
Item 4	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
C. Additional Resources									3.67	0.58
Item 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 8	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 9	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
D. Needs and Objectives									3.33	0.58
Item 10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 12	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
E. Class Motivation									4	0
Item 13	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 14	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 15	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
F. Relevant Content									4	0
Item 16	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	

G. Guidelines and Input								4	0
Item 19 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 20 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 21 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
H. Activity Types								3	1
Item 22 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 23 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 24 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
I. Learning Styles								2.33	0.58
Item 25 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 26 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 27 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.67	1.15
Item 28 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 29 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 30 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.67	0.58
Item 31 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 32 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 33 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
L. Usability								3.67	0.58
Item 34 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 35 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 36 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
M. Adaptability								3	1
Item 37 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 38 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 39 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	

- **Questionnaire for the Program Designers (Case 1 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 1***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									4	1
Item 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
B. Language Level									3.33	0.58
Item 4	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 6	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
C. Additional Resources									3.33	0.58
Item 7	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 8	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 9	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
D. Needs and Objectives									3.67	0.58
Item 10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
E. Class Motivation									2.67	0.58
Item 13	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 14	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 15	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
F. Relevant Content									3.67	0.58
Item 16	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 18	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	

G. Guidelines and Input								3	1
Item 19 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 20 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 21 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
H. Activity Types								3	1
Item 22 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 23 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 24 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
I. Learning Styles								3	1
Item 25 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 26 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 27 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.67	1.15
Item 28 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 29 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 30 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.67	0.58
Item 31 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 32 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 33 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
L. Usability								3.67	0.58
Item 34 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 35 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 36 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
M. Adaptability								3.67	0.58
Item 37 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 38 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 39 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	

- **Questionnaire for the Teachers (Case 1 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 2***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.33	1.03
Item 1	-	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
B. Language Level									2.67	1.37
Item 4	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 5	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 6	2	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
C. Additional Resources									3.17	1.33
Item 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 9	1	50	1	50	-	-	-	-	1.50	
D. Needs and Objectives									3	0.89
Item 10	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 12	-	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
E. Class Motivation									3.33	0.52
Item 13	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 14	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 15	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
F. Relevant Content									3	0.89
Item 16	-	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	

G. Guidelines and Input								3.50	0.84
Item 19 -	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50	
Item 20 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 21 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
H. Activity Types								3	0.89
Item 22 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 23 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 24 -	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
I. Learning Styles								3.33	0.52
Item 25 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 26 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 27 -	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
J. Integration with Other Skills								3.17	0.98
Item 28 -	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 29 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 30 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.67	0.52
Item 31 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 32 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 33 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
L. Usability								2	0.63
Item 34 1	50	1	50	-	-	-	-	1.50	
Item 35 -	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 36 -	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50	
M. Adaptability								3.33	0.52
Item 37 -	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 38 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 39 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	

- **Questionnaire for the Teachers (Case 1 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 3***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.67	0.71
Item 1	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	100	4	0
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	100	4	0
B. Language Level									3.33	0.87
Item 4	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 5	-	-	-	-	1	67	2	33	3.67	0.58
Item 6	-	-	1	33	-	-	2	67	3.33	1.15
C. Additional Resources									2.56	1.13
Item 7	1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
Item 8	1	33	-	-	1	34	1	33	2.67	1.53
Item 9	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
D. Needs and Objectives									3.56	0.73
Item 10	-	-	1	33	-	-	2	67	3.33	1.15
Item 11	-	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 12	-	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
E. Class Motivation									3	0.50
Item 13	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 14	-	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
Item 15	-	-	-	-	3	100	-	-	3	0
F. Relevant Content									3.22	0.83
Item 16	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 17	-	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 18	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1

G. Guidelines and Input								3	0.87
Item 19 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 20 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 21 -	-	1	33	-	-	2	67	3.33	1.15
H. Activity Types								3	0.87
Item 22 -	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 23 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 24 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
I. Learning Styles								2.78	0.97
Item 25 1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
Item 26 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 27 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.78	0.97
Item 28 1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
Item 29 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 30 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.67	0.50
Item 31 -	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 32 -	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 33 -	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
L. Usability								2.78	1.20
Item 34 1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
Item 35 -	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 36 1	33	-	-	1	34	1	33	2.67	1.53
M. Adaptability								3.22	0.44
Item 37 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
Item 38 -	-	-	-	3	100	-	-	3	0
Item 39 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58

- **Questionnaire for the Students (Case 1 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 25***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.03	0.84
Item 1	-	-	11	44	6	24	8	32	2.88	0.88
Item 2	-	-	6	24	6	24	13	52	3.28	0.84
Item 3	1	4	5	20	14	56	5	20	2.92	0.76
B. Language Level									3.41	0.90
Item 4	-	-	-	-	8	32	17	68	3.68	0.48
Item 5	3	12	1	4	5	20	16	64	3.36	1.04
Item 6	2	8	5	20	4	16	14	56	3.20	1.04
C. Additional Resources									3.32	0.82
Item 7	-	-	-	-	9	36	16	64	3.64	0.49
Item 8	3	12	3	12	14	56	5	20	2.84	0.90
Item 9	1	4	2	8	6	24	16	64	3.48	0.82
D. Needs and Objectives									3.17	0.83
Item 10	-	-	6	24	6	24	13	52	3.28	0.84
Item 11	2	8	3	12	7	28	13	52	3.24	0.97
Item 12	-	-	5	20	15	60	5	20	3	0.65
E. Class Motivation									3	0.90
Item 13	-	-	6	24	11	44	8	32	3.08	0.76
Item 14	1	4	3	12	13	52	8	32	3.12	0.78
Item 15	5	20	3	12	9	36	8	32	2.80	1.12
F. Relevant Content									3.21	0.79
Item 16	-	-	3	12	4	16	18	72	3.60	0.71
Item 17	-	-	2	8	14	56	9	36	3.28	0.61
Item 18	3	12	3	12	16	64	3	12	2.76	0.83

G. Guidelines and Input								3	0.66
Item 19 -	-	6	24	13	52	6	24	3	0.71
Item 20 -	-	2	8	18	72	5	20	3.12	0.53
Item 21 2	8	2	8	18	72	3	12	2.88	0.73
H. Activity Types								2.67	1.03
Item 22 2	8	3	12	16	64	4	16	2.88	0.78
Item 23 8	32	4	16	7	28	6	24	2.44	1.19
Item 24 4	16	7	28	7	28	7	28	2.68	1.07
I. Learning Styles								2.93	0.78
Item 25 -	-	6	24	15	60	4	16	2.92	0.64
Item 26 -	-	1	4	17	68	7	28	3.24	0.52
Item 27 3	12	9	36	7	28	6	24	2.64	0.99
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.88	0.87
Item 28 3	12	7	28	11	44	4	16	2.64	0.91
Item 29 -	-	3	12	17	68	5	20	3.08	0.57
Item 30 4	16	2	8	11	44	8	32	2.92	1.04
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.01	0.71
Item 31 2	8	2	8	11	44	10	40	3.16	0.90
Item 32 1	4	1	4	18	72	5	20	3.08	0.64
Item 33 -	-	6	24	18	72	1	4	2.80	0.50
L. Usability								2.93	0.79
Item 34 3	12	8	32	10	40	4	16	2.60	0.91
Item 35 -	-	1	4	20	80	4	16	3.12	0.44
Item 36 -	-	8	32	7	28	10	40	3.08	0.86
M. Adaptability								3.09	0.78
Item 37 1	4	11	44	6	24	7	28	2.76	0.93
Item 38 -	-	6	24	11	44	8	32	3.08	0.76
Item 39 -	-	-	-	14	56	11	44	3.44	0.51

- **Questionnaire for the Students (Case 1 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 82***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.47	2.01
Item 1	3	4	6	7	43	52	30	37	3.22	0.74
Item 2	-	-	9	11	33	40	40	49	3.74	3.34
Item 3	-	-	6	7	33	40	43	53	3.45	0.63
B. Language Level									3.41	0.80
Item 4	6	7	10	12	27	33	39	48	3.21	0.93
Item 5	5	6	5	6	33	40	39	48	3.29	0.84
Item 6	-	-	-	-	23	28	59	72	3.72	0.46
C. Additional Resources									2.87	0.87
Item 7	8	10	11	13	40	49	23	28	2.95	0.90
Item 8	3	4	19	23	34	41	26	32	3.01	0.84
Item 9	10	12	18	22	45	55	9	11	2.65	0.84
D. Needs and Objectives									3.07	0.88
Item 10	5	6	7	9	32	39	38	46	3.26	0.86
Item 11	6	7	6	7	38	46	32	40	3.17	0.86
Item 12	12	15	5	6	54	66	11	13	2.78	0.86
E. Class Motivation									2.61	0.81
Item 13	6	7	22	27	35	43	19	23	2.82	0.88
Item 14	6	7	35	43	33	40	8	10	2.52	0.77
Item 15	5	6	38	46	32	39	7	9	2.50	0.74
F. Relevant Content									2.93	0.76
Item 16	2	2	21	26	40	49	19	23	2.93	0.77
Item 17	4	5	11	13	40	49	27	33	3.10	0.81
Item 18	2	2	24	29	46	57	10	12	2.78	0.69

G. Guidelines and Input									3.10	0.79
Item 19	4	5	15	18	39	48	24	29	3.01	0.82
Item 20	1	1	14	17	30	37	37	45	3.26	0.78
Item 21	-	-	21	26	37	45	24	29	3.04	0.74
H. Activity Types									2.89	0.88
Item 22	-	-	20	24	36	44	26	32	3.07	0.75
Item 23	6	7	8	10	46	56	22	27	3.02	0.82
Item 24	10	12	34	42	20	24	18	22	2.56	0.97
I. Learning Styles									2.99	0.81
Item 25	3	4	38	46	37	45	4	5	2.51	0.65
Item 26	2	2	15	18	30	37	35	43	3.20	0.82
Item 27	-	-	14	17	32	39	36	44	3.27	0.74
J. Integration with Other Skills									2.87	0.89
Item 28	4	5	30	37	30	37	18	21	2.76	0.84
Item 29	7	9	19	23	37	45	19	23	2.83	0.89
Item 30	7	9	12	15	36	43	27	33	3.01	0.91
K. Feedback and Assessment									3.20	0.77
Item 31	-	-	6	7	34	42	42	51	3.44	0.63
Item 32	6	7	9	11	47	58	20	24	2.99	0.81
Item 33	5	6	6	7	42	51	29	36	3.16	0.81
L. Usability									3.04	0.78
Item 34	3	4	12	15	43	52	24	29	3.07	0.77
Item 35	3	4	10	12	55	67	14	17	2.98	0.67
Item 36	5	6	16	19	30	37	31	38	3.06	0.91
M. Adaptability									2.83	0.71
Item 37	1	1	18	22	57	70	6	7	2.83	0.56
Item 38	6	7	15	18	42	52	19	23	2.90	0.84
Item 39	4	5	21	26	48	58	9	11	2.76	0.71

- **Questionnaire for the Program Designers (Case 2 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 2***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.67	0.52
Item 1	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
B. Language Level									4	0
Item 4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
C. Additional Resources									3.50	0.84
Item 7	-	-	1	50	-	-	1	50	3	
Item 8	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 9	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
D. Needs and Objectives									3.83	0.41
Item 10	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 12	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
E. Class Motivation									3	0
Item 13	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 14	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 15	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
F. Relevant Content									3.67	0.52
Item 16	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 18	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	

G. Guidelines and Input								4	0
Item 19 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 20 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 21 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
H. Activity Types								3	0.63
Item 22 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 23 -	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 24 -	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50	
I. Learning Styles								3.33	0.82
Item 25 -	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50	
Item 26 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 27 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
J. Integration with Other Skills								3.33	0.82
Item 28 -	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50	
Item 29 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 30 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
K. Feedback and Assessment								4	0
Item 31 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 32 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 33 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
L. Usability								3.67	0.82
Item 34 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 35 -	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 36 -	-	1	50	-	-	1	50	3	
M. Adaptability								3.17	0.41
Item 37 -	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 38 -	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 39 -	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	

- **Questionnaire for the Program Designers (Case 2 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 2***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.33	0.52
Item 1	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
B. Language Level									3.33	0.52
Item 4	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 5	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 6	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
C. Additional Resources									2.50	0.84
Item 7	-	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50	
Item 8	-	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 9	-	-	1	50	-	-	1	50	3	
D. Needs and Objectives									4	0
Item 10	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
Item 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4	
E. Class Motivation									3	0
Item 13	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 14	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 15	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
F. Relevant Content									3.33	0.52
Item 16	-	-	-	-	2	100	-	-	3	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	
Item 18	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50	

G. Guidelines and Input								3.33	1.21
Item 19	1	50	-	-	1	50	-	-	2
Item 20	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
Item 21	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
H. Activity Types								3.50	0.84
Item 22	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50
Item 23	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
Item 24	-	-	1	50	-	-	1	50	3
I. Learning Styles								3.17	0.98
Item 25	-	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 26	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50
Item 27	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
J. Integration with Other Skills								3.33	0.82
Item 28	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
Item 29	-	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50
Item 30	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50
K. Feedback and Assessment								2.83	0.75
Item 31	-	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50
Item 32	-	-	1	50	1	50	-	-	2.50
Item 33	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50
L. Usability								3.17	0.98
Item 34	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50
Item 35	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
Item 36	-	-	2	100	-	-	-	-	2
M. Adaptability								3.83	0.41
Item 37	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
Item 38	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100	4
Item 39	-	-	-	-	1	50	1	50	3.50

- **Questionnaire for the Teachers (Case 2 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 14***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.31	0.81
Item 1	1	7	2	14	7	50	4	29	3	0.88
Item 2	-	-	2	14	5	36	7	50	3.36	0.74
Item 3	-	-	2	14	2	14	10	72	3.57	0.76
B. Language Level									2.95	0.79
Item 4	-	-	2	14	7	50	5	36	3.21	0.70
Item 5	1	7	2	14	8	58	3	21	2.93	0.83
Item 6	1	7	4	29	7	50	2	14	2.71	0.83
C. Additional Resources									2.31	0.95
Item 7	3	21	7	50	2	14	2	14	2.21	0.97
Item 8	3	21	4	29	5	36	2	14	2.43	1.02
Item 9	3	21	5	36	5	36	1	7	2.29	0.91
D. Needs and Objectives									3.07	0.71
Item 10	-	-	4	29	6	43	4	29	3	0.78
Item 11	-	-	2	14	6	43	6	43	3.29	0.73
Item 12	-	-	3	21	9	65	2	14	2.93	0.62
E. Class Motivation									2.31	0.78
Item 13	1	7	8	57	4	29	1	7	2.36	0.74
Item 14	1	7	8	57	4	29	1	7	2.36	0.74
Item 15	3	21	6	43	4	29	1	7	2.21	0.89
F. Relevant Content									2.57	0.83
Item 16	5	36	3	21	5	36	1	7	2.14	1.03
Item 17	-	-	4	28	9	65	1	7	2.79	0.58
Item 18	-	-	5	36	7	50	2	14	2.79	0.70

G. Guidelines and Input								2.86	0.95
Item 19	1	7	3	21	6	43	4	29	2.93	0.92
Item 20	1	7	3	21	6	43	4	29	2.93	0.92
Item 21	2	14	4	29	4	29	4	28	2.71	1.07
H. Activity Types									2.93	0.81
Item 22	1	7	4	29	6	43	3	21	2.79	0.89
Item 23	-	-	3	21	7	50	4	29	3.07	0.73
Item 24	1	7	2	14	8	58	3	21	2.93	0.83
I. Learning Styles									2.43	0.80
Item 25	3	21	5	36	5	36	1	7	2.29	0.91
Item 26	2	14	7	50	4	29	1	7	2.29	0.83
Item 27	-	-	5	36	8	57	1	7	2.71	0.61
J. Integration with Other Skills									2.62	0.85
Item 28	1	7	5	36	7	50	1	7	2.57	0.76
Item 29	1	7	2	14	8	58	3	21	2.93	0.83
Item 30	3	21	4	29	6	43	1	7	2.36	0.93
K. Feedback and Assessment									3.48	0.63
Item 31	-	-	1	7	6	43	7	50	3.43	0.65
Item 32	-	-	1	7	5	36	8	57	3.50	0.65
Item 33	-	-	1	7	5	36	8	57	3.50	0.65
L. Usability									2.81	0.86
Item 34	-	-	2	14	9	65	3	21	3.07	0.62
Item 35	1	7	1	7	7	50	5	36	3.14	0.86
Item 36	3	21	5	36	6	43	-	-	2.21	0.80
M. Adaptability									2.98	0.78
Item 37	-	-	-	-	9	65	5	35	3.36	0.50
Item 38	1	7	1	7	8	57	4	29	3.07	0.83
Item 39	1	7	6	43	6	43	1	7	2.50	0.76

- **Questionnaire for the Teachers (Case 2 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 5***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3.20	1.01
Item 1	1	20	3	60	1	20	-	-	2	0.71
Item 2	-	-	-	-	2	40	3	60	3.60	0.55
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	100	4	0
B. Language Level									3.20	0.68
Item 4	-	-	1	20	2	40	2	40	3.20	0.84
Item 5	-	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55
Item 6	-	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
C. Additional Resources									3.20	0.77
Item 7	-	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55
Item 8	-	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55
Item 9	1	20	-	-	3	60	1	20	2.80	1.10
D. Needs and Objectives									3.53	0.52
Item 10	-	-	-	-	2	40	3	60	3.60	0.55
Item 11	-	-	-	-	2	40	3	60	3.60	0.55
Item 12	-	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55
E. Class Motivation									3.07	0.70
Item 13	-	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
Item 14	-	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
Item 15	-	-	1	20	2	40	2	40	3.20	0.84
F. Relevant Content									2.73	0.88
Item 16	1	20	4	80	-	-	-	-	1.80	0.45
Item 17	-	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
Item 18	-	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55

G. Guidelines and Input								3.40	0.74
Item 19 -	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
Item 20 -	-	-	-	2	40	3	60	3.40	0.55
Item 21 -	-	1	20	-	-	4	80	3.60	0.89
H. Activity Types								3.27	0.96
Item 22 -	-	1	20	-	-	4	80	3.60	0.89
Item 23 -	-	1	20	-	-	4	80	3.60	0.89
Item 24 -	-	3	60	1	20	1	20	2.60	0.89
I. Learning Styles								3.07	0.88
Item 25 -	-	4	80	1	20	-	-	2.20	0.45
Item 26 -	-	1	20	1	20	3	60	3.40	0.89
Item 27 -	-	-	-	2	40	3	60	3.60	0.55
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.93	0.70
Item 28 -	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55
Item 29 -	-	2	40	3	60	-	-	2.60	0.55
Item 30 -	-	2	40	2	40	1	20	2.80	0.84
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.07	0.80
Item 31 -	-	2	40	2	40	1	20	2.80	0.84
Item 32 -	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
Item 33 -	-	1	20	1	20	3	60	3.40	0.89
L. Usability								3.47	0.64
Item 34 -	-	-	-	1	20	4	80	3.80	0.45
Item 35 -	-	-	-	2	40	3	60	3.60	0.55
Item 36 -	-	1	20	3	60	1	20	3	0.71
M. Adaptability								3.27	0.59
Item 37 -	-	-	-	3	60	2	40	3.40	0.55
Item 38 -	-	-	-	4	80	1	20	3.20	0.45
Item 39 -	-	1	20	2	40	2	40	3.20	0.84

- **Questionnaire for the Students (Case 2 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 221***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3	0.69
Item 1	9	4	52	24	134	60	26	12	2.80	0.69
Item 2	7	3	36	16	150	68	28	13	2.90	0.64
Item 3	1	-	20	9	114	52	86	39	3.29	0.64
B. Language Level									3.07	0.63
Item 4	-	-	15	7	162	73	44	20	3.13	0.50
Item 5	6	3	38	17	122	55	55	25	3.02	0.73
Item 6	3	1	29	13	141	64	48	22	3.06	0.63
C. Additional Resources									2.29	0.81
Item 7	39	18	88	40	78	35	16	7	2.32	0.85
Item 8	43	20	93	42	74	33	11	5	2.24	0.82
Item 9	33	15	97	44	83	38	8	3	2.30	0.76
D. Needs and Objectives									2.77	0.71
Item 10	9	4	43	19	142	64	27	13	2.85	0.68
Item 11	5	2	54	25	138	62	24	11	2.82	0.64
Item 12	22	10	56	26	124	55	19	9	2.63	0.78
E. Class Motivation									2.36	0.79
Item 13	22	10	71	32	102	46	26	12	2.60	0.82
Item 14	27	12	110	50	70	32	14	6	2.32	0.77
Item 15	34	16	126	56	54	25	7	3	2.15	0.71
F. Relevant Content									2.58	0.79
Item 16	32	15	96	43	81	37	12	5	2.33	0.79
Item 17	18	9	58	26	129	58	16	7	2.65	0.73
Item 18	15	7	53	24	122	54	31	15	2.76	0.77

G. Guidelines and Input									2.78	0.71
Item 19	1	-	32	15	145	66	43	19	3.04	0.60
Item 20	7	3	30	14	158	71	26	12	2.92	0.61
Item 21	18	8	119	54	68	31	16	7	2.37	0.74
H. Activity Types									2.60	0.83
Item 22	19	9	60	28	123	54	19	9	2.64	0.76
Item 23	12	5	32	15	144	65	33	15	2.90	0.71
Item 24	44	20	101	45	53	24	23	11	2.25	0.89
I. Learning Styles									2.52	0.81
Item 25	23	11	115	52	71	32	12	5	2.33	0.73
Item 26	32	15	79	35	82	37	28	13	2.48	0.89
Item 27	11	5	60	28	121	54	29	13	2.76	0.74
J. Integration with Other Skills									2.65	0.73
Item 28	22	10	96	43	87	40	16	7	2.44	0.77
Item 29	5	2	15	7	182	82	19	9	2.97	0.49
Item 30	18	8	88	40	92	41	23	11	2.54	0.79
K. Feedback and Assessment									2.86	0.74
Item 31	9	4	60	28	122	54	30	14	2.78	0.72
Item 32	6	3	32	15	120	54	63	28	3.09	0.73
Item 33	13	6	61	29	127	56	20	9	2.70	0.72
L. Usability									2.70	0.75
Item 34	6	3	54	25	141	63	20	9	2.79	0.63
Item 35	23	11	44	20	138	62	16	7	2.67	0.70
Item 36	23	11	62	29	107	47	29	13	2.64	0.84
M. Adaptability									2.52	0.72
Item 37	15	7	75	34	121	54	10	5	2.57	0.69
Item 38	16	7	83	38	102	46	20	9	2.57	0.76
Item 39	22	10	90	41	102	46	7	3	2.43	0.71

- **Questionnaire for the Students (Case 2 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 112***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									2.93	0.77
Item 1	11	10	38	34	58	52	5	4	2.51	0.74
Item 2	5	4	17	15	67	60	23	11	2.96	0.73
Item 3	1	1	6	5	60	54	45	40	3.33	0.62
B. Language Level									3.10	0.76
Item 4	3	3	12	11	64	57	33	29	3.13	0.70
Item 5	5	4	29	26	58	52	20	18	2.83	0.77
Item 6	4	4	3	3	55	49	50	44	3.35	0.71
C. Additional Resources									2.76	0.81
Item 7	8	7	16	15	68	60	20	18	2.89	0.78
Item 8	20	18	22	20	59	52	11	10	2.54	0.90
Item 9	5	4	23	21	67	60	17	15	2.86	0.72
D. Needs and Objectives									2.89	0.83
Item 10	4	4	22	20	69	61	17	15	2.88	0.69
Item 11	11	10	10	9	51	46	40	35	3.07	0.92
Item 12	10	9	29	26	57	51	16	14	2.71	0.82
E. Class Motivation									2.47	0.85
Item 13	5	4	35	31	46	41	26	24	2.83	0.84
Item 14	18	16	42	38	45	40	7	6	2.37	0.83
Item 15	17	15	59	52	31	28	5	4	2.21	0.75
F. Relevant Content									2.40	0.77
Item 16	16	14	54	48	39	35	3	3	2.26	0.73
Item 17	11	10	54	48	44	39	3	3	2.35	0.69
Item 18	16	14	23	21	63	56	10	9	2.60	0.84

G. Guidelines and Input									2.71	0.73
Item 19	8	7	31	28	60	54	13	11	2.77	0.77
Item 20	8	7	22	20	70	62	12	11	2.77	0.74
Item 21	7	6	31	28	68	61	6	5	2.65	0.68
H. Activity Types									2.62	0.78
Item 22	5	4	37	32	58	53	12	11	2.69	0.72
Item 23	8	7	9	8	65	58	30	27	3.04	0.80
Item 24	26	23	53	48	26	23	7	6	2.13	0.84
I. Learning Styles									2.71	0.82
Item 25	21	19	55	49	30	27	6	5	2.19	0.80
Item 26	1	1	20	18	54	48	37	33	3.13	0.73
Item 27	3	3	25	22	73	65	11	10	2.82	0.63
J. Integration with Other Skills									2.66	0.75
Item 28	7	6	32	29	66	59	7	6	2.65	0.69
Item 29	5	4	32	29	59	53	16	14	2.77	0.75
Item 30	14	12	29	26	61	55	8	7	2.56	0.80
K. Feedback and Assessment									2.61	0.81
Item 31	9	8	31	28	60	53	12	11	2.67	0.78
Item 32	10	9	36	32	56	50	10	9	2.59	0.78
Item 33	16	14	30	27	53	48	13	11	2.56	0.88
L. Usability									2.78	0.74
Item 34	8	7	20	18	77	69	7	6	2.74	0.68
Item 35	8	7	27	24	69	62	8	7	2.69	0.71
Item 36	2	2	35	31	45	40	30	27	2.92	0.81
M. Adaptability									2.43	0.84
Item 37	10	9	46	41	48	43	8	7	2.48	0.76
Item 38	10	9	34	30	55	50	13	11	2.63	0.81
Item 39	28	25	44	39	31	28	9	8	2.19	0.91

- **Questionnaire for the Program Designers (Case 3 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 1***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3	0
Item 1	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
B. Language Level									3	1
Item 4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 5	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 6	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
C. Additional Resources									3	1
Item 7	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 8	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 9	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
D. Needs and Objectives									2.67	0.58
Item 10	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 12	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
E. Class Motivation									2.67	0.58
Item 13	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 14	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 15	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
F. Relevant Content									3	0
Item 16	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 18	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	

G. Guidelines and Input								3.33	0.58
Item 19 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 20 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 21 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
H. Activity Types								2.67	0.58
Item 22 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 23 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 24 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
I. Learning Styles								2.67	0.58
Item 25 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 26 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 27 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.67	0.58
Item 28 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 29 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 30 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
K. Feedback and Assessment								2.33	0.58
Item 31 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 32 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 33 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
L. Usability								3.33	0.58
Item 34 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 35 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 36 -	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
M. Adaptability								2.67	0.58
Item 37 -	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 38 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 39 -	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	

- **Questionnaire for the Program Designers (Case 3 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 1***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									3	1
Item 1	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 2	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
B. Language Level									2	1
Item 4	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 5	1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Item 6	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
C. Additional Resources									2	0
Item 7	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 8	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 9	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
D. Needs and Objectives									3.67	0.58
Item 10	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 11	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
Item 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4	
E. Class Motivation									1	0
Item 13	1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Item 14	1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Item 15	1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
F. Relevant Content									2.33	0.58
Item 16	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	
Item 17	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3	
Item 18	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2	

G. Guidelines and Input								3	1
Item 19	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 20	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4
Item 21	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
H. Activity Types								3.33	0.58
Item 22	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
Item 23	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4
Item 24	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
I. Learning Styles								2.67	1.15
Item 25	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 26	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 27	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4
J. Integration with Other Skills								1.67	0.58
Item 28	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 29	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 30	1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.33	0.58
Item 31	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
Item 32	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
Item 33	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	4
L. Usability								2.67	0.58
Item 34	-	-	1	100	-	-	-	-	2
Item 35	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
Item 36	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
M. Adaptability								3	0
Item 37	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
Item 38	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3
Item 39	-	-	-	-	1	100	-	-	3

- **Questionnaire for the Teachers (Case 3 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 3***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									2.67	0.50
Item 1	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 2	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 3	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
B. Language Level									2.56	0.53
Item 4	-	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 5	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 6	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
C. Additional Resources									2.11	0.33
Item 7	-	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0
Item 8	-	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0
Item 9	-	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
D. Needs and Objectives									2.67	0.50
Item 10	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 11	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 12	-	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
E. Class Motivation									2	0.50
Item 13	1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
Item 14	-	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0
Item 15	-	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0
F. Relevant Content									2.11	0.33
Item 16	-	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0
Item 17	-	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 18	-	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0

G. Guidelines and Input								2.56	0.53
Item 19 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 20 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 21 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
H. Activity Types								2.33	0.50
Item 22 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 23 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 24 -	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0
I. Learning Styles								2.44	0.53
Item 25 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 26 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 27 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.44	0.53
Item 28 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 29 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 30 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
K. Feedback and Assessment								2.78	0.97
Item 31 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 32 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 33 1	33	-	-	2	67	-	-	2.33	1.15
L. Usability								2.44	0.53
Item 34 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 35 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 36 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
M. Adaptability								2.22	0.44
Item 37 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 38 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 39 -	-	3	100	-	-	-	-	2	0

- **Questionnaire for the Teachers (Case 3 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 3***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									2.22	1.09
Item 1	2	67	-	-	1	33	-	-	1.67	1.15
Item 2	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 3	1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
B. Language Level									2.78	1.09
Item 4	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 5	1	33	1	34	-	-	1	33	2.33	1.53
Item 6	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
C. Additional Resources									2.11	1.05
Item 7	1	33	-	-	2	67	-	-	2.33	1.15
Item 8	-	-	2	67	-	-	1	33	2.67	1.15
Item 9	1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
D. Needs and Objectives									2.89	1.05
Item 10	1	33	1	34	1	33	-	-	2	1
Item 11	-	-	-	-	1	33	2	67	3.67	0.58
Item 12	-	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
E. Class Motivation									2.67	1
Item 13	-	-	2	67	-	-	1	33	2.67	1.15
Item 14	-	-	2	67	-	-	1	33	2.67	1.15
Item 15	-	-	2	67	-	-	1	33	2.67	1.15
F. Relevant Content									2.89	1.17
Item 16	-	-	2	67	-	-	1	33	2.67	1.15
Item 17	-	-	1	33	-	-	2	67	3.33	1.15
Item 18	1	33	-	-	1	34	1	33	2.67	1.53

G. Guidelines and Input								2.56	0.73
Item 19 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 20 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 21 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
H. Activity Types								3.11	0.60
Item 22 -	-	-	-	3	100	-	-	3	0
Item 23 -	-	-	-	3	100	-	-	3	0
Item 24 -	-	1	33	-	-	2	67	3.33	1.15
I. Learning Styles								3	0.50
Item 25 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 26 -	-	-	-	3	100	-	-	3	0
Item 27 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
J. Integration with Other Skills								2.89	0.78
Item 28 -	-	2	67	1	33	-	-	2.33	0.58
Item 29 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 30 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
K. Feedback and Assessment								3.33	0.50
Item 31 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
Item 32 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
Item 33 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
L. Usability								2.78	0.97
Item 34 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58
Item 35 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
Item 36 1	33	1	34	-	-	1	33	2.33	1.53
M. Adaptability								3	0.71
Item 37 -	-	-	-	2	67	1	33	3.33	0.58
Item 38 -	-	1	33	1	34	1	33	3	1
Item 39 -	-	1	33	2	67	-	-	2.67	0.58

- **Questionnaire for the Students (Case 3 PYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 72***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									2.56	0.82
Item 1	9	13	33	46	21	28	9	13	2.42	0.87
Item 2	8	11	7	10	51	42	6	9	2.76	0.76
Item 3	1	1	45	63	14	19	12	17	2.51	0.79
B. Language Level									2.55	0.90
Item 4	10	14	18	25	35	48	9	13	2.60	0.88
Item 5	14	19	22	31	20	28	16	22	2.53	1.05
Item 6	8	11	22	31	40	55	2	3	2.40	0.75
C. Additional Resources									2.76	0.76
Item 7	1	1	21	29	38	53	12	17	2.85	0.71
Item 8	3	5	28	39	28	39	13	17	2.71	0.81
Item 9	6	8	15	21	44	61	7	10	2.72	0.75
D. Needs and Objectives									2.63	0.96
Item 10	9	13	23	31	20	28	20	28	2.71	1.01
Item 11	20	28	20	28	26	36	6	8	2.25	0.96
Item 12	1	1	21	28	32	44	18	27	2.93	0.78
E. Class Motivation									2.53	0.84
Item 13	12	17	24	33	32	44	4	6	2.39	0.84
Item 14	6	8	15	21	42	57	9	14	2.75	0.78
Item 15	10	14	28	39	26	36	8	11	2.44	0.87
F. Relevant Content									2.81	0.85
Item 16	3	5	17	24	27	38	25	33	3.03	0.87
Item 17	9	13	27	37	24	33	12	17	2.54	0.92
Item 18	2	3	16	22	43	60	11	15	2.88	0.69

G. Guidelines and Input									2.50	0.93
Item 19	8	11	28	39	20	28	16	22	2.61	0.96
Item 20	12	17	27	37	28	39	5	7	2.36	0.84
Item 21	11	15	25	35	23	32	13	18	2.53	0.96
H. Activity Types									2.47	0.83
Item 22	21	29	20	28	26	36	5	7	2.21	0.95
Item 23	3	5	29	40	35	48	5	7	2.58	0.69
Item 24	6	9	24	33	34	47	8	11	2.61	0.80
I. Learning Styles									2.85	0.77
Item 25	2	3	28	39	31	43	11	15	2.71	0.76
Item 26	6	9	19	26	30	42	17	23	2.81	0.90
Item 27	1	1	9	14	49	67	13	18	3.03	0.60
J. Integration with Other Skills									2.74	0.89
Item 28	6	9	18	25	31	43	17	23	2.82	0.89
Item 29	8	11	20	28	30	42	14	19	2.69	0.91
Item 30	6	9	24	33	28	39	14	19	2.69	0.88
K. Feedback and Assessment									2.62	0.83
Item 31	9	13	14	19	36	50	13	18	2.74	0.90
Item 32	5	7	28	39	34	47	5	7	2.54	0.73
Item 33	12	17	10	14	46	63	4	6	2.58	0.83
L. Usability									2.55	0.77
Item 34	3	5	28	39	35	47	6	9	2.61	0.70
Item 35	11	15	16	22	42	58	3	5	2.51	0.80
Item 36	9	13	22	30	36	50	5	7	2.51	0.80
M. Adaptability									2.44	0.90
Item 37	10	14	25	35	35	48	2	3	2.40	0.76
Item 38	9	13	28	39	30	42	5	7	2.43	0.80
Item 39	18	25	18	25	20	28	16	22	2.47	1.10

- **Questionnaire for the Students (Case 3 FYP)**

  - ***Total Number of Participants: 66***

	Strongly Disagree		*Disagree*		*Agree*		*Strongly Agree*		*M*	*SD*
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
A. Learning Context									2.59	0.73
Item 1	4	6	30	45	25	38	7	11	2.53	0.77
Item 2	7	11	10	15	48	73	1	1	2.65	0.69
Item 3	3	5	27	41	30	45	6	9	2.59	0.72
B. Language Level									2.65	0.79
Item 4	8	12	38	58	14	24	6	9	2.27	0.80
Item 5	4	6	10	15	40	60	12	19	2.91	0.76
Item 6	4	6	12	19	45	68	5	7	2.77	0.67
C. Additional Resources									2.98	0.79
Item 7	2	3	18	27	28	43	18	27	2.94	0.82
Item 8	1	1	12	19	33	50	20	30	3.09	0.74
Item 9	6	9	7	11	40	60	13	20	2.91	0.82
D. Needs and Objectives									2.55	0.74
Item 10	4	6	22	33	34	52	6	9	2.64	0.74
Item 11	3	5	32	47	28	43	3	5	2.47	0.66
Item 12	10	15	13	20	40	60	3	5	2.55	0.81
E. Class Motivation									2.52	0.77
Item 13	4	6	16	24	39	59	7	11	2.74	0.73
Item 14	10	15	21	33	30	45	5	7	2.45	0.84
Item 15	4	6	39	59	19	29	4	6	2.35	0.69
F. Relevant Content									2.60	0.79
Item 16	7	11	31	47	25	37	3	5	2.36	0.74
Item 17	4	6	28	43	27	40	7	11	2.56	0.77
Item 18	1	1	22	33	28	43	15	23	2.86	0.78

G. Guidelines and Input									2.71	0.80
Item 19	6	9	19	29	25	37	16	25	2.77	0.92
Item 20	4	6	20	30	37	57	5	7	2.65	0.71
Item 21	2	3	26	39	28	43	10	15	2.70	0.76
H. Activity Types									2.68	0.67
Item 22	3	5	24	36	34	52	5	7	2.62	0.70
Item 23	4	6	16	24	37	56	9	14	2.77	0.76
Item 24	1	1	22	33	42	65	1	1	2.65	0.54
I. Learning Styles									2.74	0.79
Item 25	6	9	19	29	28	43	13	19	2.73	0.89
Item 26	3	5	22	33	31	47	10	15	2.73	0.89
Item 27	1	1	18	27	43	66	4	6	2.76	0.58
J. Integration with Other Skills									2.59	0.74
Item 28	7	11	28	43	25	37	6	9	2.45	0.81
Item 29	3	5	13	19	46	70	4	6	2.77	0.63
Item 30	7	11	19	28	37	56	3	5	2.55	0.75
K. Feedback and Assessment									2.65	0.66
Item 31	4	6	13	19	46	70	3	5	2.73	0.65
Item 32	1	1	22	33	40	61	3	5	2.68	0.59
Item 33	-	-	40	61	16	24	10	15	2.55	0.75
L. Usability									2.61	0.80
Item 34	7	11	22	33	34	51	3	5	2.50	0.75
Item 35	13	19	14	21	35	54	4	6	2.45	0.88
Item 36	1	1	19	30	34	51	12	18	2.86	0.72
M. Adaptability									2.59	0.71
Item 37	4	6	18	27	40	61	4	6	2.67	0.69
Item 38	11	17	13	19	38	58	4	6	2.53	0.85
Item 39	1	1	28	43	35	53	2	3	2.58	0.58

APPENDIX G – Curriculum Vitae

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name	: Barut, Kenan
Nationality	: Turkish (TC)
Year and Place of Birth	: 1981, Dortmund / Germany
Marital Status	: Married
Phone	: +90 216 418 4658 – 128
Fax	: +90 216 449 2141
Email	: kenanbarut@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

Ph.D.	Middle East Technical University, English Language Teaching (ELT)	2012
M.A.	Abant Izzet Baysal University, English Language Teaching (ELT)	2007
B.A.	Istanbul University English Language and Literature	2002
High School	Izzet Baysal Anatolian High School	1998

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	**Place**	**Enrollment**
2009-2012	Oxford University Place, Central Asia and Middle East	Regional Manager
2007-2009	Erciyes University, English Language Teaching	English Language Instructor
2005-2007	Ankara University Development Foundation Schools	Head of Department
2004-2005	Ministry of Education, Primary School	English Language Teacher
2003-2004	Private Kultur Schools	English Language Teacher

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

English (Advanced), German (Upper-Intermediate), Arabic (Intermediate)

SELECTED PRESENTATIONS

Year	Topic	Conference
2007	Writing and Technology	TESOL Greece, Athens
2007	Technology CALLs You	Bilkent, Ankara
2007	Common European Framework; Good, Bad and Ugly	Youth Project, Lviv
2007	Improving Writing through Technology	Cag University, Mersin
2007	Extra-Curricular Activities	Bilkent, Ankara
2007	Current Trends in C.A.L.L.	Cevre College, Istanbul
2007	Improving Language Skills with ELP	Get-In Network, Hannover

SELECTED PROJECTS

Year	Topic	Institution
2007	Youth-In-Action	Comenius, Council of Europe
2006	Get-In-Network	Comenius 3, Council of Europe
2005	European Language Portfolio	Board of Education, Turkey
2003	Time Management for Students	Comenius 1, Council of Europe
2000	The Interaction of Firtina Valley with the Environment	UNDP-GEF

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Barut, K. (2007). "Key-Stroke Logging Programmes in EFL Writing Classroom". Proceeding. Gazi University, Congress of Foreign Language Education in Turkey.

Barut, K. (2007). "Improving Higher-Level Cognitive Skills of EFL Students". Proceeding. Gazi University, Congress of Foreign Language Education in Turkey.

Barut, K. (2007). *Developing Higher-Order Cognitive Skills of Students through Stimulated Recall Methodology in EFL Classroom*. Unpublished master's dissertation, Abant Izzet Baysal University Institute of Social Sciences English Language Teaching Program, Bolu, Turkey.

APPENDIX H – Turkish Summary

YÜKSEK ÖĞRETİMDE KULLANILAN
AKADEMİK YAZMA ARAÇ-GEREÇLERİN DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ:
ÜÇ ÜNİVERSİTEDE YAPILAN DURUM ÇALIŞMASI

Özellikle son yıllarda, tüm dünyada, kaliteli İngilizce öğretim programları için ortaya çıkan talepte büyük bir artış görülmektedir. Bunun en büyük nedeni ise, İngilizce'nin modern dünyadaki toplumlar arasında ortak dil olarak kullanılmaya başlanması sonucu (bakınız Jenkins, 2007; Crystal, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2011) beliren, İngilizce'nin küresel iletişim dili haline gelmesidir. Bu bağlamda, Ehrenreich (2012), İngiliz dilinin artık, sadece ana dil olarak İngilizce konuşulan Amerika, İngiltere ya da Yeni Zelanda gibi ülkelerde değil, tüm dünyada günlük yaşamın doğal bir parçası olduğunu belirtmektedir. Buna bağlı olarak, iş hayatında, eğitim-öğretimde ya da sosyal hayatta, başkalarıyla iletişim kurma veya başarılı sonuçlar almada, bu küresel iletişim dilini etkili ve etkin bir biçimde kullanmak en belirgin etkenlerden birisi haline gelmiştir.

Özellikle konuşma ve yazma alanlarında bu iletişim dilinin öğrenimi ve etkin kullanımına olan yoğun talep sonucunda İngilizce öğretimi, tüm seviyelerde, okullardaki genel eğitim-öğretim sisteminin temel parçalarından birisi haline gelmiştir. Özellikle yabancı dildeki yazma becerisi, okul ortamında gerçekleştirilen bir dersten fazlası halini alarak, gerçek yaşamdaki başarı için gerekli bir öğe şeklinde algılanmaktadır. Canagarajah ve Jerskey (2009), etkili yazma becerisinin, küresel dünyada hem öğrenciler hem de akademisyenler için elzem bir nitelik haline geldiğini savunmuşlardır. Ayrıca, yazma, üniversite öğrencilerinin hem yüksek öğrenim hayatları boyunca, hem de daha sonrasındaki yaşam başarılarında gerekli bir dil becerisidir. Çünkü üniversitelerde, akademisyenler tarafından, öğrencilerin düşüncelerini yazılı olarak ortaya koymaları ve fikirlerini bu yolla savunmaları istenilmektedir. Yine yazma becerileri ve stratejileri, mezun olduktan sonraki iş hayatlarındaki birçok noktada da, söz konusu öğrencilere fazlasıyla yardımcı olmaktadır.

Akademik amaçlı yazma alanında yapılan çalışmalarda (örneğin Harwood, 2005; Alexander, Argent ve Spencer, 2008; McCarter ve Jakes, 2009; Tribble, 2009; Hyland, 2009), bu gibi konulara açıkça değinilmektedir. Bu tarz hususlara ilaveten, işbirlikçi yazma etkinliklerinin yazma sürecindeki rolü, geribildirim olarak öğretmen değerlendirmesi ve akran değerlendirmesi, öğrenme stilleri ve stratejileri, serbest yazma etkinlikleri, planlama ve düzenleme gibi yüksek seviyede bilişsel beceriler gerektiren sınıf içi / dışı etkinlikler, özellikle son yıllarda yazılan bu eserlerde sık sık araştırma konusu olarak göze çarpmaktadır. Bu gibi konuların, günümüz akademik yazma araç-gereçlerindeki varlığı ve etkin kullanımı ise, araştırma gündemindeki akademik alanlardan birisi haline gelmiştir ve git gide daha da fazla ilgi çekmektedir.

Bu anlamdaki, en belirgin çalışmalardan ikisi Harwood (2005) ve Tribble (2009) tarafından gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu iki araştırmacı da, hiçbir genel ders kitabının, üniversitelerdeki program geliştirme uzmanlarının, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin akademik yazma anlamındaki ihtiyaçlarını karşılayamamakta olduğunu açık bir şekilde savunmuşlardır. Harwood, bunun sebebi olarak, bu araç-gereçleri geliştiren uzmanların uygulamalı dilbilim alanında gerekli çalışmaları yapmamaları olarak göstermiştir. Benzer şekilde, Tribble, bu araç-gereçlerin, akademik yazma alanında çalışmalar yapan kişilerin yazması gereken uzun ve karmaşık metinler düşünüldüğünde, ne kadar yetersiz olduklarını belirtmiştir. Akademik amaçlı yazma alanındaki araç-gereçleri ineleyen araştırmasında, Tribble aşağıdaki şekilde bir sonuca varmıştır:

> Sonuç olarak, ortaya çıkan belirgin kaygılardan birisi, bu araştırma için önerilen genel ders kitaplarının çoğunun deneme anlamındaki eserler yazmaya ve bu eserleri yazması beklenen öğrencilerin bu anlamdaki gelişimlerini sağlamaya yönelik olmalarıdır. Daha kapsamlı, gerçeklere ve tespitlere dayalı, belirli akademik disiplinlerdeki yazma çalışmalarına yönelik eserler ise, göreceli olarak çok daha kısıtlıdır. Beni endişelendiren bir başka nokta da, akademik amaçlı İngilizce alanındaki farklılıkların, bu araştırmada incelenmek için kullanılan bu kitaplarda, kapaklarında ya da pazarlama / promosyon araç-gereçlerinde yeterli şekilde yer bulmamasıdır (s. 416).

Özellikle yüksek öğrenimdeki özel program gereksinimleri, öğretmenlerin değişik öğretim teknikleri ve beklentileri ile öğrencilerin ihtiyaçları ve ilgilerindeki farklılıklar sonucunda, akademik yazma araç-gereçlerinde gözle görülür bir memnuniyetsizlik söz konusudur. Bu gibi etkenlere bağlı olarak, akademik yazma öğretimi yapılan sınıflarda, öğretmenlerin kendi ürettikleri / geliştirdikleri araç-gereçlerin kullanımı ciddi oranda artmaktadır. Buna rağmen, araç-gereç değerlendirmesi alanındaki çoğu akademik çalışma (örneğin Murdoch, 2000; Atkins, 2001; Litz, 2005; Cakit, 2006; Al-Yousef, 2007; Jahangard, 2007; Alamri, 2008; Atai ve Gheitanchian, 2009; Tribble, 2009; Huang, 2011; Nahrkhalaji, 2012; Rahman, 2012), bu araç-gereçlerden daha çok, genel ders kitaplarının değerlendirilmesi üzerine yoğunlaşmıştır.

Bazı araştırmacılar (örneğin Alptekin, 1993; Renner, 1997), içerikteki kültürel öğeler gibi belirgin sosyo-kültürel sorunlardan dolayı, genel ders kitaplarını eleştirmişlerdir. Diğer taraftan, Gray (2000), tamamiyle farklı bir görüş belirterek, bu tarz kitapların kültürel elçi olarak kullanıcılarına hizmet ettiklerini vurgulamıştır. Cunningsworth (1984) ise, hiçbir araç-gerecin, ortamlarına özel öğrenim şartlarının ihtiyaçlarını, tam ve kesin olarak karşılayamayacağını belirtmiştir. Öğretmenler, bu araç-gereçleri en etkili şekilde kullanmak için kendi öğretim yollarını bulmalılar ve gerekli uyarlamaları yapmalıdırlar. Buna bağlı olarak, tüm bu gereksinimleri karşılayabilecek ideal bir araç-gereç, gerçek dışı bir beklentidir ve gerçekçi olan, kurumların, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin ihtiyaçları ile araç-gereçlerin sundukları arasındaki ortak noktayı bulabilmektir.

Genel ders kitaplarının ya da kurumların kendi içerisinde geliştirilen araç-gereçlerin değerlendirilmelerindeki en önemli hususlardan birisi ise amaca uygun bir kontrol listesidir. 1970'lerden beri, bütün dünyada genel olarak kullanılan çeşitli kontrol listeleri mevcuttur. Bu bilindik listelerden bazıları, kronolojik olarak, şunlardır: Tucker, 1975; Williams, 1983; Sheldon, 1988; Skierso, 1991; Cunningsworth, 1995; Ur, 1996; McGrath, 2002; McDonough ve Shaw, 2003; Miekley, 2005. Aşağıdaki tabloda (Mukundan ve Ahour, 2010) ise, 2000'li yıllarda ortaya çıkan kontrol listelerini bulabilirsiniz:

Table 1: Kitap Değerlendirme Kontrol Listeleri (2000'ler)

Kontrol Listesi	Bölüm	Nicel	Nitel	Kelime Sayısı
Byrd et al. (2001)	4	Evet	-	163
Richards (2001)	3	-	Evet	222
Zabawa (2001)	10	Evet	Evet	585
Garinger (2001)	2	-	Evet	196
Garinger (2002)	4	-	Evet	218
Ansari et al. (2002)	4 (Taslak)	-	-	160
Krug (2002)	3+1TG	-	Evet	498
Los Angeles Uni. Okul Birimi Kitap Değerlendirmesi (2002)	2	Evet	-	338
McGrath (2002)	4	-	Evet	81
McDonough et al. (2003)	2	-	Evet	333
Rubdy (2003)	3	-	Evet	1692
Canado et al. (2005)	4	Evet	-	626
Litz (2005)	7	Evet	-	2534
Miekley (2005)	2+1TG	Evet	-	1357
Nuttall (2005)	Genel	-	Evet	266
Diss (2006)	5	-	Evet	99
Rahimy (2007)	3	-	Evet	207
ACTFL Standartları Doğrultusundaki Kitap Değerlendirmesi (2008)	2	Evet	Evet	911
Kitap Değerlendirme Formu – Crystal Springs Books (2008)	17	Evet	-	677

Bu kontrol listeleri, ya eğitim-öğretim araç-gereçlerinin kullanımı öncesindeki, ya kullanımı sırasındaki, ya da kullanımı sonrasındaki değerlendirmelerde uygulanmaktadırlar. McGrath'a (2006) göre, öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin tecrübelerine dayandırıldığı sürece, kullanım sonrası değerlendirme, bu üç değerlendirme şekli arasındaki en güvenir olanıdır. Ellis (1998) ve Tomlinson (2003) gibi bu alandaki önemli akademisyenler de, McGrath ile doğru orantılı olarak, kullanım sonrası araç-gereç değerlendirmenin faydalarına değinmişlerdir. Tüm bu açıklamalara rağmen, bu değerlendirme şeklindeki akademik çalışmaların azlığı da, bu uzmanlar tarafından özellikle vurgulanmaktadır.

Akademik yazma ve araç-gereç değerlendirme alanlarındaki tüm bu unsurlar ve farklı etkenler dikkate alınarak gerçekleştirilen bu kullanım sonrası araç-gereç değerlendirme çalışması, üniversitelerdeki program geliştirme uzmanlarının, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin, akademik yazma derslerinde kullandıkları araç-gereçlerle ilgili düşüncelerini detaylı şekilde çözümlemek için gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu şekilde, bu araç-gereçlerin bulunulan öğrenme ortamının gereksinimlerine ve ihtiyaçlarına uygunlukları değerlendirilmiştir.

Genelleme yapılabilmesi ve daha güvenir sonuçlara ulaşılabilmesi için Macaristan, Türkiye ve Umman gibi üç değişik coğrafyadaki farklı yüksek öğretim kurumlarında gerçekleştirilen bu araç-gereç değerlendirme çalışmasında, nitel (anket) ve nicel (mülakat) araştırma yöntemleri ile, aşağıdaki iki ana araştırma sorusunun cevaplanmasına çalışılmıştır:

1. Akademik yazma derslerinde kullanılan araç-gereçler – hem genel ders kitapları hem de kurumlarda hazırlanan kaynaklar – bağlamsal ihtiyaçlara ne oranda uygundur?

    a. Bu araç-gereçler, program hedeflerine ne oranda uygundur?
    b. Bu araç-gereçler, öğretmenlerin öğretim tekniklerine ve beklentilerine ne oranda uygundur?
    c. Bu araç-gereçler, öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarına ve ilgilerine ne oranda uygundur?

2. Üniversitelerde kullanılan akademik yazma araç-gereçleri ile ilgili, program geliştime uzmanlarının, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin temel düşünceleri nelerdir?
    a. Program geliştime uzmanlarının, bu araç-gereçlerin seçilmesindeki / geliştirilmesindeki temel unsurları nelerdir?
    b. Öğretmenlerin, bu araç-gereçleri kullanırken karşılaştıkları temel unsurlar nelerdir?
    c. Öğrencilerin, bu araç-gereçleri kullanırken karşılaştıkları temel unsurlar nelerdir?

İlgili alanlarda yapılan çalışmalardan birisinde, daha önceden de belirtildiği gibi, Tribble (2009) akademik amaçlı İngilizce yazma araç-gereçlerini üç ana kategoriye ayırmıştır: süreçli yazma içerisinde yazara odaklanan entellektüel / bağlamsal araç-gereçler, Vygotsky yöntemleri ile yazar – okuyucu ilişkisine odaklanan sosyal / üslup temelli araç-gereçler ve akademik okur-yazarlık prensiplerini temel alan araç-gereçler. Lea ve Street (1998), bu prensipleri, kurumsal uygulamalar içerisinde geliştirilen ve diğer tüm modelleri kapsayan, öğrencilerin yazma süreçlerinin doğal bir anlayışı olarak tanımlarlar.

Tüm bu farklı türdeki akademik yazma kaynaklarını kullanırken, yapılması gereken en temel hamle ise öğrencilerin mevcut ve gelevekteki ihtiyaçların hep göz önünde bulundurmaktır. Vincent'e (1990) göre, başarılı yazma dersi araç-gereçleri, öğrencilerin ihtiyaçları ile ilgilerine uygun stilleri ve onların yazma becerileri ve stratejilerinin olumlu anlamda gelişimi içerisinde yer alan kendi hatalarını fark edebilme ile düzeltebilme yetilerini geliştiren çalışmaları içerir. Bu akademik amaçlara ve hedeflere ulaşabilmek için, Flowerdew (2000), en uygun tür olarak üslup temelli akademik yazma araç-gereçlerini önermektedir. Kendisi, ikisinin de aynı anda ortaya çıktığı için, genel hareket yapısı ile problem çözme yapılarının göz önüne alınmasının gerekliliğini ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca, bu farklı yazım türleri ile ilgili temel bilginin yeterli olmasından ziyade, ancak öğrencilerin gerekli yetileri algılayabilmede bir başlangıç olarak algılanması gerektiği de Flowerdew tarafından açık bir şekilde vurgulanmıştır.

Bu alandaki önemli tavsiyelerden birisi de, akademik yazma çalışmalarında bilgisayar destekli dil öğrenim araç-gereçlerinin önemine değinen Stapleton'dan (2005) gelmiştir. Orta düzeyin üstünde İngilizce dil becerisine sahip Japon, Rus ve Bulgar üniversite öğrencileriyle yapılan bu çalışmada, internet tabanlı kaynakların akademik yazma derslerine uygunluğu ve katkıları sorgulanmıştır. Özellikle yazar – okuyucu ilişkisi bakımından, internet öncesi dönemde, yazarın okuyucuya ulaşabilmek için ilgili yayımcı bulabilmek anlamında verdiği mücadeleye dikkat çekilmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, aşağıdaki dört gelişme sayesinde, bu sürecin çok daha olumlu bir hal aldığı belirtilmiştir:

- Kullanımı kolay tarayıcılar
- Gelişmiş arama motorları
- Web sayfası yaratabilmek için kullanılabilen basit yazılımlar
- Git gide ucuzlaşan bilgisayarlar ve ağ bağlantıları

Bununla beraber, tüm bu farklı perspektifteki ortak sorunsallardan önemli bir tanesi, genel ders kitaplarının mı yoksa kurumlarda geliştirilen kaynakların mı akademik yazma derslerine daha uygun olduğudur. Benzer çalışmalara bakıldığında, bu alanda ortak bir görüş birliği olmadığı görülmektedir. Tribble (2009) gibi akademisyenler, yüksek öğrenimde kullanılan genel ders kitaplarının, özellikle sanat bölümlerindeki öğrencilerin kompozisyon çalışmalarına katkısına değinirken, bu tür yazma araç-gereçlerinin gerçek kanıtları ve savunmaları içermesi gereken yazım çalışmaları ile ilgilenen öğrenciler için çok fazla yardımcı olmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Aynı doğrultuda, Lockett (1999), aşağıdaki açıklamayı yapmıştır:

> Gerçek dışı, içgüdüsel ve izlenimci unsurlara doğru giden eğilimi – ki akademik yazmanın özünde de bunların olduğuna değinilerek, günümüz ana ders kitaplarında veya yazma kitapçıklarında görebiliriz; bu kaynakların öğrencilere, yararlı bilgiler vererek rehberlik ettikleri iddia edilmektedir. Bu ikincil kaynakların göreceli olarak yetersizliği, betimleyici birincil kaynaklara olan ihtiyaçların daha fazla gözden geçirilmesi gerekliliğini ortaya koymaktadır (p. 50).

Lockett ve Tribble ile benzer görüşlere sahip olan Bridwell-Bowles (1995), kurumlar tarafından geliştirilen araç-gereçlerin, sadece farklı akademik yazma kuralları ile ilgili gerekli bilgilerin öğretilebilmesi için değil, aynı zamanda öğrencilerin iletişimin gücünü gerçek anlamda kullanabilecekleri unsurlar üretmesinde de etkili olabileceğini savunmaktadır. Akademik amaçlı İngilizce yazma ile ilgili makalesinde, Harwood (2005) da, genel ders kitaplarının sınırlılıklarına dikkat çekmiştir: "En azından, akademik amaçlı İngilizce araç-gereçleri göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, genel ana ders kitaplarının uyumsuzlukları, yararlarına göre çok daha fazladır" (s. 158). Harwood'un bu makaledeki en güçlü savlarından birisi ise, günümüzde yayımcıların çoğunun eğitimsel değerlerden çok pazarlamayı göz önüne aldığını ve bu doğrultuda gelecekteki akademik amaçlı İngilizce genel ana ders kitabı yazarlarının "yazacakları araç-gereçlerin çoğunun pedagojik olarak başarısız, fakat ticari olarak oldukça başarılı olabileceğidir" (s. 152). Harwood, aynı zamanda, hızla değişen pedagojiler yüzünden, son araştırmaları göz önüne alarak başarılı bir genel ders kitabı geliştirmenin imkansızlığına değinmiştir. Tüm bunlara ilaveten, Stoller, Horn, Grabe ve Robinson (2006), yüksek öğretimde kullanılan genel ders kitaplarının belirgin yabancı dil öğrenim ihtiyaçlarını karşılayamadığından dolayı, akademik amaçlı İngilizce ile uğraşan birçok insanın araç-gereç geliştirme etkinlikleri ile uğraşmak zorunda olduklarını dile getirmişlerdir. Bu araştırmacılar, kurumlar tarafından geliştirilen araç-gereçlerin, zaman geçtikçe, idari yapı, hükümet ya da yayımcılar tarafından belirlenen dış kurallara, öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarına, akademik araştırma sonuçlarına ve alandaki eğilimlere daha fazla uygun hale geldiklerini belirtmişlerdir.

Diğer taraftan, Bahumaid (2008) gibi bazı akademisyenler, genel ders kitaplarının temel olarak kültürel uyumsuzluğundan ve içerdikleri bazı görevler ile etkinliklerin yabancı dil öğrenen öğrenciler ve öğretmenleri için aşırı zorluğundan kaynaklanan sınırlılıklarını kabul etmekle beraber, bu araç-gereçlerin faydalarının, kurumlarda geliştirilenlere göre çok daha fazla olduğunu iddia etmektedirler. Bu görüşte olan araştırmacılar, genel ders kitaplarının arkasında yatan uzun çalışmaları ve pilot uygulamaları ortaya koymaktadırlar.

Açıkça görüldüğü gibi, dil öğretiminde / öğreniminde, genel ders kitaplarının öğretmenlere ve öğrencilere olan yararları ya da zararları birçok akademik araştırmaya (örneğin Bridwell-Bowles, 1995; Lockett, 1999; Harmer, 2001; Stoller, Horna, Grabe ve Robinson, 2006; Tribble, 2009; Mukundan, 2009) konu olmuştur. Tomlinson'a (2012) göre, genel ders kitaplarına, zaman ile para tasarrufu açısından ve öğretmenlerin tüm herşeyi tek bir kaynakta görmek istemelerinden dolayı ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Bununla beraber, "belirgin bir yaş grubundaki ve dil seviyesindeki bütün öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarını ve isteklerini karşılamada, bu genel ders kitapları çok da başarılı olmamaktadır (s. 158). Tomlinson, ayrıca, genel ders kitaplarına karşı yapılan bunca eleştiriye rağmen, British Council'ın (2008) yaptığı bir ankete göre, öğretmenlerin %65'inin her zaman ve sık sık bir genel ders kitabı kullandıklarını belirtmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, yapılan tüm bu çalışmalarda, akademik yazma programları ile ilgili olarak, genel ders kitaplarının ya da kurumlarda geliştirilen araç-gereçlerin hangisinin daha faydalı olduğu ile ilgili genel bir uzlaşma söz konusu değildir. Bununla beraber, öğrencilerin, kurumların ve diğer bağlamsal unsurların ihtiyaçları ile gereksinimleri düşünülerek, yüksek öğretimde, genel ders kitaplarının yanına veya yerine, kurumlarda geliştirilen araç-gereçlerin artık çok daha fazla kullanılmakta olduğunu gözlemlemekteyiz.

Bu araştırmada, Macaristan, Umman ve Türkiye'deki birer üniversitenin ikişer biriminden (İngilizce hazırlık sınıfı ve birinci sınıf) katılımcılar yer almıştır; sonuçta da hem nicel (anketler yoluyla) hem de nitel (mülakatlar yoluyla) veriler elde edilmiştir. Tüm bu katılımcılar, Budapeşte'deki Eötvös Lorand Üniversitesi, Ankara'daki Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi ve Rustak'taki Uygulamalı Bilimler Kolejleri'ne mensupturlar. İngilizce hazırlık sınıflarındaki öğrenciler, Mühendislik ve Mimarlık'tan Eğitim ve Uluslararası İlişkiler'e kadar farklı bölümlerdeki öğrencilerden – farklı bölümlerdeki öğrenciler aynı sınıfta – oluşmaktadırlar. Birinci sınıftaki öğrenciler ise, akademik yazma dersleri de dahil olmak üzere tüm İngilizce derslerine Matematik ve Diş Hekimliği gibi kendi bölümlerinde, aynı bölümlerdeki akranları ile, dahil olmaktadırlar.

Bu üç büyük üniversitenin ve söz konusu iki biriminin seçilmesinde dört ana unsur rol oyanıştır:

- Bu tür çoklu durum çalışmalarında seçilen durumların sayısı kısıtlanmalıdır (Harling, 2002): "Çok az olursa genelleme yapmak imkansızdır; çok fazla olursa da, derin bir çözümlemeye ulaşmak çok zordur" (s. 2). Buna bağlı olarak, bu çalışmada, üç üniversitedeki iki birimden temsili sayıda katılımcı belirlenmiştir.
- Son zamanlardaki çoğu araç-gereç değerlendirme çalışması, ya başta Uzak Doğu olmak üzere Asya ülkelerinde (örneğin Murdoch, 2000; Atkins, 2001; Ranalli, 2002; Otlowski, 2003; Litz, 2005; Davies, 2006; Brunton, 2009; Lawrence, 2011) ya da Avustralya ve Kanada gibi ana dil olarak İngilizce konuşulan ülkelerde (örneğin Basturkmen, 1999; Hong Xu, 2004; Vellenga, 2004) yapılmıştır. Fakat, İngiliz dili kullanıcılarının sadece %25'i (Crystal 2003) ana dili İngilizce olanlar olduğu için, akademik dünya da dahil olmak üzere çoğu İngilizce etkileşim süreci ana dil olarak İngilizce konuşulmayan coğrafyalarda meydana gelmektedir. Bu yüzden, bu çalışmada Orta Doğu, Türkiye ve Orta Avrupa gibi, ana dil olarak İngilizce konuşulmayan bölgeler seçilmiştir.
- Haftada yirmi ya da daha fazla İngilizce derslerinin olduğu, bir yıllık yoğun hazırlık programları Orta Doğu, Türkiye ve belirgin oranlarda Hollanda ve Macaristan'daki bazı üniversitelere özgüdür. Birinci sınıf öncesi düzenlenen bu yoğun dil programları, diğer İngilizce programlarına göre daha yenilikçidir ve incelenmeye değerdir.
- Bu üç üniversitenin her biri, ülkelerindeki en önemli ve en iyi bilinen, yabancı dil programlarıyla da tanınmış kurumlardır. Bunun yanında, hepsi de akademik amaçlı İngilizce derslerini kesin bir şekilde desteklemektedirler ve genel dil müfredatlarında akademik yazma dersleri önemli role sahiptir. Bu nedenlerden dolayı, söz konusu üç ülkede de, hemen hemen tüm lise mezunları, bu üniversitelere kayıt olabilmek için büyük bir yarış içindedirler.

Katılımcılarla ilgili vurgulanması gereken bir diğer önemli nokta da, sadece öğretmenlerin (örneğin Law, 1995; Vellenga, 2004; Frederickson ve Olsson, 2006; Johnson et al., 2008), ya da öğrencilerin (örneğin Peacock, 1998; Yakhontova, 2001) veya nadiren her ikisinin (Güntek, 2005) yer aldığı araç-gereç araştırmalarının aksine, araç-gereç kullanımı ve değerlendirmesi süreçleri ile ilgili etkin yer alan tüm katılımcıların – program geliştirme uzmanları, öğretmenler ve öğrenciler – bu araştırmada bulunmasıdır. Bu değişik katılımcıların görüşlerinden oluşacak farklılığın, bu araştırmaya zenginlik ve bütüncüllük katması beklenmektedir. Yine, yukarıda da belirtilen araştırma sorularının, her bir alt sorusu da, bu farklı katılımcıların görüşlerini ve düşüncelerini çözümleyebilmek için geliştirilmiştir.

Birinci durumda – Eötvös Lorand Üniversitesi, hazırlık sınıflarından toplam 28 katılımcı, araştırmada yer almıştır ki özellikle hemen hemen bütün mevcut öğrenciler gönüllü olarak katılım sağlamışlardır. Bu katılımcıların 25'i öğrenci, 2'si öğretmen ve 1'i ise program geliştirme uzmanıdır. Birinci sınıflardan ise, toplamda 86 katılımcı araştırmaya katılmıştır. Bu katılımcıların 82'si öğrenci, 3'ü öğretmen ve 1'i program geliştirme uzmanıdır. İkinci durumda ise – Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, hazırlık sınıflarından toplam 221 öğrenci, 14 öğretmen ve 2 program geliştirme uzmanı bu çalışmada yer almıştır. Birinci sınıflardan ise, beş farklı fakülteden toplam 112 öğrenci, 5 öğretmen ve 2 program geliştirme uzmanı ile anketler ve görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Üçüncü durumda – Uygulamalı Bilimler Kolejleri, toplam 72 hazırlık sınıfı ve 66 birinci sınıf öğrencisi, 3 hazırlık sınıfı ve 3 birinci sınıf öğretmeni, 1'er hazırlık sınıfı ve birinci sınıf program geliştirme uzmanı araştırmaya katılmıştır. Tüm bu gönüllü katılımcılar belirlenirken, herhangi bir bölüm ya da yaş grubu gibi kısıtlama veya seçim yapılmamıştır ve katılımcılar rastgele belirlenmişlerdir.

Bu 3 kurumdaki 6 birimde kullanılan bütün akademik yazma araç-gereçleri, araştırmacı tarafından detaylı şekilde incelendikten sonra, 2011 – 2012 akademik yılının güz dönemi sonuna doğru, kontrol listeleri ve anket soruları geliştirilmeye başlanılmıştır. Çalışmanın genel çerçevesinin belirlenmesi için ise, daha önceki

yıllara ait tüm ilgili akademik araştırmalar ve özellikle bu çalışmalarda kullanılan araç-gereç değerlendirme modelleri ayrıntılı şekilde incelenmiştir. Sonuç olarak ise, McDonough ve Shaw (2003) tarafından geliştirilen model, bu araştırmanın çerçevesi için odak noktası olarak belirlenmiştir. Bu belirlemede rol oynayan temel unsurlar ise:

- Araştırma kapsamında, araç-gereçlerdeki dış, iç ve genel etkenlerin incelenmesi ihtiyacı
- Modelin, hem genel ders kitapları hem de kurumlarda hazırlanan kaynakları incelemede kullanılabilir olması (Murdoch, 2000)
- Modelin, hem kullanım öncesi hem de kullanım sonrası değerlendirme yapılmasına uygunluğu
- Modelin, daha önce yapılan benzer çalışmalarda (örneğin Atkins, 2001; Lawrence, 2011) başarı ile kullanılmış olması

Kontrol listesindeki tüm sorular belirlenirken, McDonough ve Shaw'daki (2003) içerikten uyarlamalar yapılmıştır ve bu soruların Richards'ın (2001) beş etkeni ile de uyumluluğu göz önüne alınmıştır. Bu süreçte, akademik amaçlı İngilizce ile ilgili güncel sorunlar da dikkate alınarak, her biri 3 farklı madde içeren, aşağıdaki 13 ölçüt belirlenmiştir:

- **Dış Etkenler**
    A. Öğrenme Ortamı
    B. Dil Seviyesi
    C. Yardımcı Kaynaklar
    D. İhtiyaçlar ve Hedefler
- **İç Etkenler**
    E. Sınıf Güdülenmesi
    F. İlgili İçerik
    G. Öğrenim Girdileri
    H. Etkinlik Çeşitleri
    I. Öğrenme Stilleri

J. Diğer Dil Becerileriyle Bağlantı
K. Geribildirim ve Değerlendirme

- **Genel Etkenler**
  L. Kullanılabilirlik
  M. Uyarlanabilirlik

Kontrol listesindeki, toplam 3 ana etkende, 13 ölçüt içerisindeki 39 madde bulunmaktadır. Bu kabul edilebilir bir sayıdır, çünkü çoğu bilinen ve yaygın olarak kullanılan ankette 12 ile 53 arası soru bulunmaktadır (Huang, 2011). Bu durum, Cunningsworth'ün (1995) belirttiği gibi pratiklik anlamında önemlidir: "Ölçütlerin ve sorulan soruların sayısını uygulanabilir oranda kısıtlamak önemlidir, aksi halde detaylar denizinde boğulma tehlikesi yaşanır" (s. 5). Bu 39 madde dışında, her bir anketin başında, yaş, cinsiyet ve katılımcıların tecrübesi gibi genel bilgileri sorgulayan sorular ile program geliştirme uzmanlarının ve öğretmenlerin anketlerinde açık uçlu sorular mevcuttur.

Anketlerdeki maddelerin her biri için, katılımcıların işaretleyebilecekleri 4 farklı seçenek bulunmaktadır: Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum (1), Katılmıyorum (2), Katılıyorum (3) ve Kesinlikle Katılıyorum (4). 4 seçenekli sistemdeki temel amaç ise, katılımcıların söz konusu ölçütler ile ilgili kesin görüşlerini ve eğilimlerini tespit etmektir ve merkezi yanıtlardan kaçınmaktır; çünkü 5 seçenekten oluşan maddelerdeki genel eğilim, ortada yer alan 3. seçeneği işaretlemektir (Mukundan et al., 2011).

Katılımcıların, kullandıkları araç-gereçlerle ilgili fikirlerinin ve görüşlerinin daha kapsamlı bir şekilde çözümlenebilmesi için, anketi dolduran katılımcıların arasından rastgele seçilen kişiler ile yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlar yapılmıştır. Anketlerdeki açık uçlu sorulara verilen cevaplar ile beraber mülakatların ses kayıtlarının metinleri, araştırmadaki nitel veriyi oluşturmuşlardır. Mülakatlara katılan kişiler de, anketlerde olduğu gibi, gönüllü katılımcılar arasından seçilmiştir. Mülükatların yapılış şekilleri ise – bireysel, ikili gruplar ya da daha kalabalık küçük gruplar ile – tamamiyle katılımcıların istekleri doğrultusunda

kararlaştırılmıştır. Görüşme yerleri de katılımcılar tarafından belirlenen mülakatlardaki ana hedeflerden birisi, katılımcıların rahatlıkla fikirlerini ve düşüncelerini paylaşabilecekleri rahat bir ortam yaratmaktı.

Söz konusu 3 üniversitedeki 6 birimde bulunan program geliştirme uzmanların, öğretmenler ve öğrenciler ile gerçekleştirilen tüm bu mülakatlar öncesinde, aşağıdaki etkenler göz önüne alınarak hazırlanan ve açık uçlu sorulardan oluşan birer mülakat kılavuzu hazırlandı her bir katılımcı grubu için:

- Araştırma soruları
- Anket cevapları
- Akademik yazma araç-gereçleri ile ilgili temel unsurlar

Mülakatlar yapılırken de, Robson (2002) tarafından ortaya konulan aşağıdaki konulara itina ile dikkat edilmiştir:

- Konuştuğundan daha fazla dinle
- Soruları doğrudan, açık ve net şekilde sor
- Yönlendirici sorulardan uzak dur
- Eğlen ya da en azından eğleniyormuş gibi görün

Hem anketler hem de mülakatlar yapılmadan önce ise, pilot uygulamalar yapılarak içeriğin katılımcılar ve araştırma ile ilintili ve kolay anlaşılabilir olması yönünde adımlar atıldı. Temsili sayıda katılımcıların katıldığı pilot çalışmalarda elde edilen veriler doğrultusunda, bazı sorular tekrar yazıldı ya da değiştirildi.

Yukarıda da belirtildiği üzere, bu çalışma sonucunda hem nicel hem de nitel verilere ulaşıldı. Her bir madde için, betimsel istatistikler hesaplandı ve bu doğrultuda yüzdeler ile standart sapmalar belirlendi. Tüm bu istatistiki veriler, SPSS 16.0 kullanılarak elde edildi. Bununla beraber, açık uçlu sorular ve mülakat kayıtları, içerik çözümlemesi yapılarak 13 kategori içerisinde gruplandı. Bu gruplama yapılırken, kesinliğine emin olunmayan hususlarda, meslektaşların ve program geliştirme uzmanlarının fikirlerine başvuruldu.

Tüm bu uzun süreli, kullanım sonrası araç-gereç değerlendirme çalışmasının sonuçları, söz konusu 13 ölçüt içerisinde değerlendirildi:

A. Öğrenme Ortamı

Öğrenme ortamı ile ilgili ortaya çıkan bulgular, bu alanda süregelen genel İngilizce – akademik amaçlı İngilizce (örneğin Pulverness, 2002; Liu, Chang, Yang ve Sun, 2011) ve genel araç-gereçler – kurumlarda hazırlanan kaynaklar (e.g. Skierso, 1991; Swales, 1995; Dat, 2006) tartışmaları ile aynı doğrultudadır.

Birinci ve ikinci durumdaki tüm kaynaklar, kurumlardaki akademik kadro tarafından derlenmiştir; üçüncü durumda ise, genel araç-gereçlere yer verilmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, ilk iki durumdaki araç-gereçlerin öğrenme ortamına uygunluğunun sebebi, program geliştirme uzmanları ve öğretmenler tarafından, kaynakların kurumu ve ihtiyaçları iyi tanıyan kişiler tarafından derlenmesidir / hazırlanmasıdır. Bu araç-gereçler, aynı zamanda, kurumda çalışan akademik kadro tarafından da daha fazla sahiplenilmektedirler ve bu şekilde güdülenme de artış gösterir.

Bununla beraber, üçüncü durumda, kullanılan genel araç-gereçlerdeki memnuniyetsizliğin sebebi, kitapların kültürel olarak uygunsuzluğu ve içerik olarak öğrencilerin bölümleri ile çok fazla ilgili olmayan konu ve metinler içermeleri olarak gösterilmiştir.

B. Dil Seviyesi

Hemen hemen tüm katılımcılar, özellikle program geliştirme uzmanları ile öğretmenler, aynı sınıfta bulunan öğrencilerde bile çok farklı dil yeterlik seviyeleri görüldüğünden bahsetmektedirler. Hazırlık sınıflarında, öğrenciler dil yeterlik seviyelerine göre belirlenen sınıflarda derslerine devam ettiklerinden dolayı, bu sorun çok daha nadir gözlemlenmektedir birinci sınıflar ile karşılaştırıldığında.

Bu konuda yapılan araştırma sayısı ise çok sınırlıdır. Pulverness (2002), farklı dil seviyesindeki öğrenciler ile yapılan akademik amaçlı İngilizce dersleri ile ilgili makalesinde, bu tür sınıflarda, çok farklı alıştırmaların ve görevlerin kullanılması gerekliliğini vurgulamıştır. Sun (2010) ise, dil seviyelerindeki bu farklılığın düzgün bir şekilde ele alınmamasının, özellikle sınıf güdülenmesi anlamında ciddi sorunlar yaratabileceğini belirtmiştir. Araştırmadaki üç durumda da yer alan öğretmenlerin fikirleri, bu araştırmacıların yorumlamaları ile doğru orantılıdır.

C. Yardımcı Kaynaklar

Genel olarak, özellikle de birinci durumda, öğretmenler ile öğrencilerin sınıflarında bilgisayar destekli iletişim araçlarını daha fazla kullanmak istedikleri ortaya konulmuştur. Bu öğretmenlerin bazıları, tüm yazma dersi araç-gereçlerini, kapsamlı bir öğrenim yönetim sistemine yüklemek istediklerini; bazı öğrenciler ise, çevrimiçi olarak fazladan yazma dersi araç-gereçlerine erişmek istediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bununla birlikte, hemen hemen hiçbir program geliştirme uzmanı, bu konuyu akademik yazma programlarındaki öncelikleri olarak vurgulamamışlardır. Tüm katılımcıların, yardımcı kaynak anlamında, öğrencilerin örnek olarak yararlanabilecekleri yazma çalışmalarına ihtiyaç duyduğunu belirtmesi ise, üç durumda da görülmüştür.

Öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin bloglar ve wikiler gibi daha fazla bilgisayar destekli iletişim araç-gereçlerinden yararlanma isteği, son zamanlarda yapılan araştırmalarda da ortaya çıkmıştır (örneğin Kern, 2006; Ke, 2010; Chao ve Lo, 2011, Cephe ve Balcikanli, 2012). Stapleton ve Radia (2009), bu tür gelişmiş araç-gereçler sayesinde daha etkin geribildirim verilebileceğini; Saye ve Brush (2002) ile Yeh ve She (2010) ise, bu araç-gereçlerin İngilizce öğretimi içerisinde yer alması ile öğrencilerin eleştirel düşünme becerilerini geliştirebileceklerini belirtmişlerdir.

Son olarak, bu tür araç gereçler, özellikle son yıllarda yapılan araştırmalarda (örneğin Ferris, 2003; Rollinson, 2005; Miyazoe ve Anderson, 2010; Elola ve Oskoz, 2010; Li, Chu, Ki, Woo, 2012; Kessler, Bikowski ve Boggs, 2012) vurgulanan işbirlikçi yazma çalışmalarını geliştirmede de etkin şekilde kullanılabilirler.

D. İhtiyaçlar ve Hedefler

Çalışmada yer alan hemen hemen bütün program geliştirme uzmanları ile öğretmenler, akademik yazma araç-gereçlerindeki süreçli yazma çalışmalarından memnundurlar. Aynı zamanda, birçok katılımcı öğrenci de, süreçli yazma çalışmaları sayesinde, özellikle organizasyon becerilerindeki gelişmelerden bahsetmektedirler.

Çalışmaya katılan tüm katılımcıların bir başka ortak görüşü de, özellikle hazırlık sınıflarında, sene sonu yeterlik sınavlarına çalışmanın gerekliliği ve önemidir. Bu yüzden, akademik yazma alanında son yıllarda yapılan çalışmalarda (örneğin Marshall ve Williams, 2010; Xiao, 2011; Hasan ve Akhand 2011) belirtildiği gibi, süreç odaklı ve sonuç odaklı çalışmalar sınıflarda belirli oranlarda yer almalıdır. Pulverness (2002), bu iki tür yazma çalışmasının da akademik yazma sınıflarında aynı anda ve ortamda etkin şekilde kullanılabileceklerinden bahsetmiştir.

E. Sınıf Güdülenmesi

Haycraft (1998), güdülenmeyi, "öğrencilerin öğrenme isteği ve ihtiyacı" (s. 6) olarak tanımlar. Öğretmenlerin birçok değişik sorunla karşılaştıkları akademik amaçlı İngilizce sınıflarında, güdülenme anahtar bir etmendir. Sun'a (2010) göre, öğrencilerin araç-gereçlere karşı olan tutumlarında belirgin unsurlar rol oynar: konuya olan ilgi, araç-gereçlerin zorluk oranı, var olan bilgi ile bağlantı ve yararlılık.

Özellikle üçüncü durumdaki program geliştirme uzmanları ve öğretmenlerin görüşlerine göre, genel ders kitapları, öğrencilerin ilgilerini çekmekte ve onları güdülemekte yeterli değildir. Bu durumun belirli sebepleri ise, bu tür araç-gereçlerin:

- Özellikle sosyo-kültürel gerçeklere bağlı olarak, öğrenme ortamına çok uygun olmamaları,
- Konularının ve alıştırmalarının öğrencilerin akademik disiplinleri ile ilgili olmamaları ve
- Yazma öncesinde öğrencilere yardımcı olacak ilgi çekici metinlere ve alıştırmalara sahip olmamalarıdır.

Araştırmaya katılan öğrenciler ise, genel anlamda, kullandıkları akademik yazma araç-gereçlerini güdüleyici ve ilgi çekici bulmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Tomlinson (2008), bunun sebebi olarak, akademik amaçlı İngilizce araç-gereçlerinde öğrencileri meşgul edebilecek ilgi çekici konuların ve görevlerin yer almamalarını göstermektedir. Mol ve Bin (2008) ise, bu etkinliklerin ve araç-gereçlerin hazırlanması safhasında, öğrencilerin bilişsel ve duyuşsal algılarının önemli rol oynaması gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir.

F. İlgili İçerik

Araç-gereçlerin genel ders kitapları ya da kurumlarda geliştirilen kaynaklar olduğuna bakılmaksızın, tüm katılımcıların, her üç durumda da bu maddeyi temel sorunları içerisinde gördükleri gözlemlenmiştir. Birinci durumdaki birinci sınıflardaki katılımcılar dışındaki hemen hemen çoğu öğretmen ve öğrencilerin, kullandıkları yazma araç-gereçlerindeki içeriğin, öğrencilerin bölümleri ile çok fazla bağlantılı olmadıklarını kesin şekilde savunmaktadırlar.

Bu durumun ana sebeplerinden birisi ise, öğrencilerin çok farklı bölümlerden olmalarıdır; mesela, ikinci durumda 5 farklı fakülteden

20'den fazla bölüm bulunmaktadır. Buna bağlı olarak da, ortak olarak kullanılan araç-gereçlerde, bu kadar farklı bölümden gelen öğrencilerin hepsinin ilgi alanına ulaşmak oldukça zordur. Özellikle de aynı sınıfta birçok farklı bölümden öğrencinin bulunduğu hazırlık sınıflarında, bu durumla başa çıkmak oldukça güçtür.

Nesi ve Gardner (2006), farklı alanlardaki öğrencilerin yazma derslerindeki ihtiyaçlarının da farklılıklarını vurgulamıştır: Fen bilimleri bölümlerinde laboratuvar raporları temel gereksinimdir, sosyal bilimlerde ise denemeler önemlidir. Tıp fakültelerinde durum çalışması raporları, hukuk fakültelerinde ise dava notlarının düzenli şekilde yazılması ihtiyacı ön plana çıkmaktadır. Mesela özellikle ikinci durumdaki hazırlık sınıfındaki mühendislik öğrencileri, bu durumu vurgulamaktadırlar. Aynı durumdaki birinci sınıf öğrencileri ise, denemenin kendi alanları ile ya da gelecekteki çalışma alnları ile ilgisini kuramadıklarını ortaya koymuşlardır.

G. Öğrenim Girdileri

Üç durumda da, hem öğretmenler hem de öğrenciler, bu maddeyi temel sorunlarından birisi olarak göstemişlerdir; bazı program geliştirme uzmanları da benzer kanaatte bulunmuşlardır. Hazırlık sınıflarında, hem yapısal hem de organizasyonsal girdilere olan ihtiyaç vurgulanırken; birinci sınıflardaki öğrencilerin dilbilgisi ve kelime haznesi olarak oldukça bilgili oldukları farzedildiğinden, bu araç-gereçlerde bu tür konulara odaklanılmamıştır.

Bununla beraber, özellikle ikinci ve üçüncü durumlardaki öğrenciler, ikinci dildeki dilbilgisi bilgilerindeki eksiklikler sebebiyle, halen fikirlerini ve iddialarını ortaya koymakta güçlül çektiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bunun sonucunda, kullandıkları araç-gereçlerde, yapısal konularda daha fazla desteğe ihtiyaçları oldukları belirgindir.

Diğer taraftan, ikinci durumdaki özellikle hazırlık sınıfında ve üçüncü durumdaki her iki birimde de, program geliştirme uzmanları ile öğretmenler, öğrencilerin entellektüel bilgilerindeki eksiklikler yüzünden, yeni fikirler üretemediklerini iddia etmektedirler. Kısmen daha önceki eğitim-öğretim hayatlarından dolayı, bu öğrencilerin yazma ödevlerine odaklanmak için gerekli olan fikirleri üretmede ihtiyaçları olan eleştirel ve analitik düşünme yetilerindeki eksiklik ortaya konmuştur.

Bu bağlamda, Asaoka ve Usui (2003), öğrencilerin yazma sürecinde organizasyon safhasına gelmeden önceki planlama döneminde, birçok sorunla karşılaştıklarını açıkça savunmuşlardır. Bu sebepten dolayı, çoğu program geliştirme uzmanı ile öğretmenin belirttiği gibi, bu iki araştırmacı da, yazmanın erken safhalarında öğretmenlerin öğrencilere daha fazla destek olması sonucuna varmışlardır.

H. Etkinlik Çeşitleri

Etkinlik çeşitleri ile ilgili olarak, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin genel görüşü, öğrencilerin örnek yazma çalışmalarına duydukları ihtiyaçtır. Fakat tüm katılımcılar, araç-gereçlerde öğrencilerin hayal güçlerini ve yaratıcılıklarını geliştirtirmeye yardımcı olacak serbest yazma etkinliklerinin yer almadıklarını da bildirmişlerdir (Madde 24). Bununla birlikte, çoğu program geliştirme uzmanı ile öğretmen, hayal gücü ve yaratıcılık ile beraber, serbest yazma gibi kavramların akademik yazmada öncelikli gereksinimlerden olmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir.

Akademik amaçlı İngilizce programlarında bu tür kavramların yeri ile ilgili çok az sayıda araştırma (örneğin Forche ve Gerard, 2001; Kobayakawa, 2011) vardır. Bu araştırmalardan birisinde, Allison (2004) şöyle bir açıklama yapmıştır: “Akademik amaçlı İngilizce programlarında, öğrencilerin akademik yazma süreçlerindeki yaratıcılıkları ile ilgili tartışma, yazmanın ve yazma pedagojisinin eleştirel boyutlarındaki tartışmalara göre kesinlikle çok daha azdır” (s.

194). Ayrıca, bu çalışmada, öğretmenlerin yazmadaki yaratıcılığa odaklanması ile, öğrencilerin akademik amaçlı İngilizce derslerine olan olumsuz tutumlarında azalma olacağı belirtilmiştir. Bu düşünce, sadece birinci durumdaki hazırlık sınıfında gözlemlenmiştir.

I. Öğrenme Stilleri

Bu ölçüt, özellikle Madde 25, birinci ve üçüncü durumlar başta olmak üzere katılımcıların en çok olumsuz düşünce belirttikleri konulardan birisidir. Buna ilaveten, program geliştirme uzmanları, akademik amaçlı yazma programlarında, öğrenme stilleri ve zeka türleri gibi konuların öncelikli olmadığını savunmaktadırlar. Bu ölçüt, hiçbir durumdaki öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin temel sorunları arasında yer almamıştır.

Diğer taraftan, Madde 26 ve 27 ile ilgili, belirgin hiçbir olumlu ya da olumsuz görüş bulunmamaktadır. Bununla beraber, işbirlikçi yazmanın temelinde yer alan ikili çalışmalar ile grup çalışmalarının, araç-gereçlerde fazla yer almadığı gözlemlenmiştir. İkili çalışmalar, belirli oranda, ikinci durumdaki geribildirim etkinliklerinde bulunmaktadır; fakat, özellikle öğrencilerin bu çalışmaların yararlılığına olan inancı kısıtlıdır. Bireysel çalışmalara verilen bu önem, son yıllardaki işbirlikçi yazma çalışmaları ile ilgili eserlerdeki (örneğin Ainley, Hidi ve Berndorf, 2002; Storch, 2005; Kessler ve Bikowski, 2010) görüşler ile tamamiyle zıttır.

J. Diğer Dil Becerileriyle Bağlantı

Hemen hemen tüm araç-gereçlerde, yazma çalışmaları ile okumanın bağlantılı şekilde sunulduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Okuma, yazma sürecinin hemen başında, öğrencilerin yapısal, organizasyonsal ve fikirsel olarak yararlanabilecekleri metinler aracılığı ile bu araç-gereçlerde yer almaktadır. Bununla birlikte, hem öğretmenler hem de öğrenciler, bu metinlerin ses ve görüntü şekillerinde de sunulmasının faydalarını ortaya koymuşlardır.

Özellikle yazma öncesindeki süreçteki, beyin fırtınası ve planlama etkinliklerinde, konuşma becerisinin de ön plana çıktığı görülmektedir. Fakat özellikle öğrenciler, genel yabancı dil öğrenme hedeflerini de vurgulayarak, daha fazla konuşma etkinliğine olan ihtiyacı belirtmektedirler.

Bu konudaki çalışma sayısının azlığına rağmen, özellikle okuma – yazma bağlantısı ile ilgili bazı araştırmalar mevcuttur. Örneğin Grabe (2003), bu konudaki üç önemli hususu dile getirmiştir:

- İyi okuyucular, yazma çalışmalarında genellikle başarılıdırlar.
- Bir metni iyi bir şekilde algılayarak ve organizasyonsal yapısını kullanarak daha iyi eserler yazılabilir.
- Metinlerle uzun süreli aşinalık, zamanla, daha kaliteli yazılar üretilmesine sebep olur.

Diğer taraftan, Hinkel (2006) de, kaliteli yazma çalışmaları ortaya koymak için gerekli olan seçimleri yapmakta dilbilgisi ve kelime haznesinin önemini ortaya koymuştur. Benzer şekilde, çalışmaya katılan öğrenciler de, temel dilbilgisi ve kelime yapılarının kendilerine verdikleri özgüveni vurgulayarak, akademik yazma araç-gereçlerinde daha fazla yapısal biçimlerin olması gerekliliğini belirtmişlerdir.

K. Geribildirim ve Değerlendirme

Myles'a (2002) göre, "geribildirim, yazma sürecinde belirgin öneme sahiptir" (s. 18). Bu çalışmada da, geribildirim, hem program geliştirme uzmanlarının hem de öğretmenlerin temel sorunları arasında yer almıştır. Özellikle, ikinci durumdaki yazma çalışmalarında, öz değerlendirme, akran değerlendirmesi ve öğretmenlerin yaptıkları geribildirim, yazma çalışmalarının temelinde yer almaktadır ve bu durumda, program geliştirme uzmanları, bu hususu yaptıkları temel ve yenilikçi program değişiklikleri arasında göstermektedirler.

Diğer taraftan, çoğu öğrenci, öz değerlendirme ve akran değerlendirmesini gereksiz bularak, öğretmenlerinden aldıkları dönütün önemini vurgulamışlardır. Buradaki temel etken, öğretmenlerini, tüm süreç içerisinde, bilginin ana kaynağı olarak görmeleridir. Bu görüşler, bu alandaki önemli çalışmalarla (örneğin Keh, 1990; Jacobs, Curtis, Braine ve Huang, 1998; Ferris, 2001) çelişmektedir.

Portfolyo kullanımı konusunda ise, sadece ikinci durumda etkili bir çalışma gözlemlenmektedir. Diğer iki durumda, dil öğretiminde git gide önem kazanan bu unsura çok fazla ilgi duyulmadığı görülmektedir.

L. Kullanılabilirlik

Kullanılabilirlik konusunu, sadece birinci durumdaki program geliştirme uzmanı, temel sorunları içerisine almıştır. Çoğu katılımcı, araç-gereçlerini, uygulanabilirlik konusunda gayet başarılı bulmaktadır.

Katılımcıların büyük bir oranı, akademik yazma araç-gereçlerinin kullanımının kolaylığını ve iyi bir şekilde düzenlenmiş olduklarını vurgulamaktadırlık. Ayrıca, bu araç-gereçlerin, diğer yabancı dil araç-gereçlerinin yapısına olan paralellikleri de ortaya konulmuştur. Örneğin, ikinci durumdaki hazırlık programındaki akademik yazma araç-gereçleri, ana ders kitabındaki konular ile aynı içerikleri taşımaktadır ve temel İngilizce dersinin önemli bir uzantısı olarak kullanılmaktadırlar.

M. Uyarlanabilirlik

Bu hususta, kültürel uygunluğun ön planda olduğu üçüncü durumdaki sıkıntılar dikkat çekmektedir. Bu durumdaki, program geliştirme uzmanları ile öğretmenler, kültürel olarak uygun olmayan içeriklerin, kendileri için, yabancı dil sınıflarında çözülmesi çok zor olan sorunlara yol açtıklarını vurgulamışlardır.

Literatür taramasında da değinildiği gibi, genel ders kitaplarındaki kültürel unsurlar, hep tartışma konusu olmuştur (Kramsch, 1988; Risager, 1991; Alptekin, 1993; Gray, 2000, 2010; Basabe, 2004, Altinmakas, 2005). Tomlinson (2012) ise, yayın evlerinin, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin ihtiyaçları ile ilgileri doğrultusunda uyarlamalar yapılabilecek araç-gereçler geliştirmedeki kısıtlılıklarını ortaya koymuştur.

Katılımcılara göre, özellikle yerel unsurlar göz önüne alınarak geliştirildiklerinden dolayı, kurumlarda hazırlanan araç-gereçler bulunduklara bağlama daha kolay uyarlanabilirler. Buna bağlı olarak, birinci ve ikinci durumlardaki hemen hemen tüm katılımcılar, kullanılabilirlik ve uyarlanabilirlik konularında, kullandıkları araç-gereçlerin uygunluğunu savunmuşlardır.

Sonuç olarak, katılımcıların bazı fikirlerinde, son yıllardaki akademik yazma konusu ile ilgili yapılan araştırmalar ile doğru orantı mevcuttur: Bilgisayar destekli dil öğrenimi, süreç odaklı ile sonuç odaklı yazma tekniklerini birleştirme gereksinimi, öğrencilerin alanları ile ilgili konulara daha fazla odaklanılması. Bununla beraber, bazı konularda ise büyük oranda farklılıkla görülmektedir: Akran değerlendirmesine karşın öğrencilerdeki olumsuz görüşler, işbirlikçi yazma etkinliklerinin yeterli derecede akademik yazma araç-gereçlerinde yer almaması.

Yukarıdaki konulara ilaveten, öğrenme bağlamı ve ihtiyaçları, kültürel uygunluk ve öğrencilerin yazmaya başlangıç esnasındaki bilgi birikimi gibi sonuçların da, genel İngilizce – akademik amaçlı İngilizce, genel kitaplar – kurumlarda geliştirilen kaynaklar, becerilerin birbirleri ile uyumlu şekilde öğretimi gibi yıllardır süregelen tartışmalara katkıda bulunacakları düşünülmektedir. Son olarak, özellikle iki konuda daha fazla araştırma yapılması gereksinimi de, bu çalışmada ortaya çıkan sonuçlardandır: Akademik amaçlı İngilizce sınıflarındaki dil yeterlik seviyesi olarak farklı öğrencilere yönelik uygulamalar ve bu programlarda serbest yazmanın rolü.

APPENDIX I – Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü √

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Barut
Adı : Kenan
Bölümü : Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü – İngiliz Dili Öğretimi ABD

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : An Evaluation of Academic Writing Materials at the Tertiary Level: A Case Study of Three Universities

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora √

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. √
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve / veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: