AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE ACADEMIC ENGLISH LANGUAGE NEEDS OF STUDENTS AT YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY AND DISCIPLINARY TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH-MEDIUM INSTRUCTION AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL

A MASTER' S THESIS

BY

CEMİLE GÜLER

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

JULY 2004

To the memory of my beloved father, Mahmut GÜLER, who is always in my mind and heart though not being with me any more.

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE ACADEMIC ENGLISH LANGUAGE NEEDS OF STUDENTS AT YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY AND DISCIPLINARY TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH-MEDIUM INSTRUCTION AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

CEMİLE GÜLER

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

JULY 2004

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MA THESIS

EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

JUNE 28, 2004

The examining committee appointed by for the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Cemile Güler

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Title:	An Investigation Into the Academic English Language Needs of Students At Yıldız Technical University and Disciplinary Teachers' Attitudes towards English-medium Instruction at the Tertiary Level
Thesis Supervisor:	Dr. Julie Mathews Aydınlı Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Committee Members:	Dr. Martin J. Endley Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
	Associate Prof. Dr. Arif Altun Abant İzzet Baysal University

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Julie Mathews Aydınlı)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Martin J. Endley)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Associate Prof. Arif Altun)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

(Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan)
Director

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE ACADEMIC LANGUAGE NEEDS OF STUDENTS AT YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY AND DISCIPLINARY TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH-MEDIUM INSTRUCTION AT THE TERTIARY LEVEL

Cemile Güler

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Dr. Julie Mathews Aydınlı

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Martin J. Endley

July 2004

This study investigated the Academic English language needs of students at Yıldız Technical University through the perspectives of their disciplinary teachers. Yıldız Technical University is a Turkish-medium university, where the language of instruction has recently been switched from partial English to full Turkish medium instruction. Therefore, the secondary aim of this study was to determine the attitudes of disciplinary teachers towards English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the Academic English language requirements of students studying in different departments at YTU through the perspectives of their content teachers?
2. According to the English language use requirements of content teachers, which skills should be given priority for the students of different disciplines?

3. What are the content teachers' attitudes towards English-medium instruction at the tertiary level?

Data were collected from the disciplinary teachers currently working in eight different faculties at Yıldız Technical University. In order to collect data, a questionnaire was prepared and delivered to 400 disciplinary teachers. The 254 completed questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Chi-square tests, ANOVA tests, Post hoc Tukey tests and Crosstabs analysis for multiple comparisons among departments.

The results of the study revealed that most of the content teachers at Yıldız Technical University agree on the importance of English in the academic studies of learners. Nevertheless, when the results concerning the Academic English requirements of different disciplines were considered, 'reading' was shown to be the required skill given most priority. Only a small number of disciplinary teachers reported that the remaining academic skills, i.e. writing, listening, speaking, were required for the academic studies of the learners in their departments. When the data results about English-medium instruction were evaluated, it was concluded that most of the content teachers at Yıldız Technical University are in favor of Turkish medium instruction and they believe that students should be taught in their mother tongue in their content courses.

An investigation of the academic English language needs of students through the perspectives of disciplinary teachers may provide a sound basis for curriculum renewal projects in the future. Through this study, current curriculum may be modified and specific needs-based curricula may be implemented for different departments. Moreover, the results of this study

may provide empirical insights into the ways that non-native English speaking scholars in one country view the role of English in educational domain.

Key Terms: English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Needs Analysis, English-medium Instruction, Disciplinary/Content Teachers.

ÖZET

YILDIZ TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ'NDEKİ LİSANS ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN AKADEMİK İNGİLİZCE DİL GEREKSİNİMLERİ VE ALAN ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YÜKSEKÖĞRENİMDE YABANCI DİLLE EĞİTİME YÖNELİK TUTUMLARI ÜZERİNE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Cemile Güler

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Julie Mathews Aydınlı

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Martin J. Endley

Temmuz 2004

Bu çalışmada, Yıldız Teknik Üniversite'sindeki lisans öğrencilerinin Akademik İngilizce Dil İhtiyaçları araştırılmıştır. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Türkçe eğitim veren bir üniversitedir. Yakın bir tarihte, üniversitenin eğitim dili %30 İngilizce'den tamamen Türkçe'ye çevrilmiştir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın ikinci amacı, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'nde farklı bölümlerde eğitim vermekte olan alan öğretmenlerinin yüksek öğrenimde yabancı dille eğitim konusundaki görüşlerini almaktır. Çalışmada aşağıdaki sorular araştırılmıştır:

1. Yıldız Teknik Üniversite'sinde farklı bölümlerde lisans eğitimine devam etmekte olan öğrencilerin alan öğretmenlerinin görüşüne göre, Akademik İngilizce dil ihtiyaçları nelerdir?
2. Alan öğretmenlerinin görüşüne göre, farklı bölümlerdeki öğrenciler için hangi dil becerilerine öncelik verilmelidir?
3. Alan öğretmenlerinin Yüksek Öğrenimde yabancı dille eğitim konusundaki tutumları nelerdir?

Bu çalışma için gerekli olan veri, halen Yıldız Teknik Üniversite'sinde farklı fakültelerde görev yapmakta olan alan öğretmenlerinden toplanmıştır. Bu amaçla bir anket hazırlanmış ve 400 alan öğretmenine dağıtılmıştır. Cevaplanmış olan 254 ankete, frekans ve yüzde analizi, Ki-kare testleri, varyans analizi, ve Tukey testi uygulanmıştır.

Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'ndeki alan öğretmenlerinin büyük bir çoğunluğu bölümlerindeki öğrencilerin akademik çalışmalarında İngilizce'nin önemli olduğuna dair ortak bir karara varmıştır. Farklı bölümlerdeki ihtiyaç analizi sonuçları göz önüne alındığında, yabancı dil programlarında öncelik verilmesi gereken İngilizce dil becerisinin 'Okuma' olduğuna karar verilmiştir. Çok az sayıdaki alan öğretmeni diğer dil becerilerinin bölümlerindeki öğrencilerin lisans çalışmalarında gerekli olduğunu belirtmiştir. Yüksek Öğrenimde yabancı dille eğitim konusunda, alan öğretmenlerinin büyük bir çoğunluğunun alan derslerinde Türkçe kullanılması taraftarı olduğu görülmüştür. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'ndeki alan öğretmenlerinin büyük bir çoğunluğu lisans eğitiminin Türkçe yapılmasının öğrenciler için daha faydalı olduğuna inanmaktadır.

Alan öğretmenlerinin bakış açısından, farklı bölümlerde eğitim görmekte olan lisans öğrencilerinin akademik İngilizce dil ihtiyaçlarını belirleme amacıyla yapılan bir çalışma, gelecek yıllarda yapılacak müfredat geliştirme çalışmalarına sağlam bir temel teşkil edecektir. Bu çalışmadan elde edilen veriler, var olan müfredatlar üzerinde gerekli değişiklikleri yapmak veya farklı bölümlerin ihtiyaçlarını göz önüne alarak yeni müfredatlar geliştirmek için kullanılabilir. Ayrıca, bu çalışmanın sonuçları, yabancı bir ülkede, anadili İngilizce olmayan akademisyenlerin eğitim

alanında İngilizce'nin rolü üzerine düşüncelerini yansıtacak ve benzer araştırmalara bilimsel veri oluşturacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Özel Amaçlı İngilizce, Akademik Amaçlı İngilizce, İhtiyaç Analizi, Yabancı Dille Eğitim, Alan/Bölüm Öğretmeni.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank and express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Julie Mathews Aydınlı, for her invaluable guidance, and support throughout my study. Without her assistance and useful contributions, this thesis would never have been completed. Apart from her invaluable suggestions and comments, she also provided me with support and encouragement throughout the year. She always made me feel better whenever I felt confused during my study with her smiling face. She set a perfect teacher profile to me not only by her deep knowledge in her field but also her patience and friendly attitude towards us. It was a real privilege for me to be one of her advisees.

I also would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Martin Endley, my examining committee member, for his contributions and invaluable guidance for my thesis. I owe much to him not only for his support and encouragement during my defense but also for his assistance and kindness in his courses throughout the year. I would like to express my special thanks to Dr. William Snyder and Dr. Kimberly Trimble for their continual assistance, understanding and morale support throughout the year.

I owe special thanks to Perihan Akbulut, the Director of Foreign Languages Department at Yıldız Technical Universtiy, who encouraged me to apply to the MA TEFL Program and gave me permission without any hesitation to attend it. I am really indebted to her for her support and trust in me. I am also grateful to all the faculty members at YTU, who participated willingly in my study and devoted their invaluable time to fill in the questionnaire within their heavy workload. My special thanks are for the research assistants at YTU, who helped me really a lot while I was

conducting the pilot study and distributing the questionnaires to the faculty members in their department during the actual study. I also would like to thank to Associate Professor Dr. Arif Altun, my external jury member from Abant İzzet Baysal University, for his suggestions at the correction stage of my thesis.

I would like to express my deepest love and gratitude to all of my classmates at the MA TEFL 2004 for their invaluable friendship, support and continual assistance throughout the year. I really owe so much to them for their true friendship and kindness. I am sure there will always be a nice smile on my face whenever I think any of them in the future.

Finally, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my beloved family without whose support and encouragement I could have never achieved in this program. I owe much to my beloved mother, Fevziye Güler, and my sisters, Hale Güler and Şule Uzunsoy, for their invaluable support, love and understanding throughout the year. I am also grateful to my little nephew Denizhan Uzunsoy who has always been a source of joy and morale support in my life whenever I feel stressed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT……..… iv

ÖZET…… vii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS……. x

TABLE OF CONTENTS……. xii

LIST OF TABLES……... xv

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction…….. 1

Background of the Study…….. 2

Statement of the Problem……. 5

Significance of the Problem……. 7

Research Questions…….. 8

Conclusion…… 8

Key Terms…… 9

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction…….. 11

English for Specific Purposes…….. 11

English for Academic Purposes…… 14

Types of EAP Courses…….. 15

EAP in EFL Settings……. 19

Controversial Views on EAP Courses at the Global Level.. 22

EAP Courses in Turkey…… 24

Controversial Views on EAP Courses in Turkey……. 27

Needs Analysis..... 34

Steps Involved in Needs Analysis…… 36

Making Basic Decisions about Needs Analysis……... 37

Data Sources in Needs Analysis……... 40

Gathering Information in Needs Analysis…… 41

Similar Needs Analysis Studies…… 44

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction…….. 46

Setting…….. 47

Participants……... 48

Instruments……... 50

Procedures…… 53

Data Analysis…… 54

Conclusion…… 55

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

Overview of the Study…… 56

Information Gathered about Respondents through Demographic Data……. 57

Attitudes of Disciplinary Teachers towards English and English-Medium Instruction and the Shift in the Language of Instruction at YTU……. 59

Questions Related to English Usage at YTU…… 62

Perceptions of Disciplinary Teachers about the Language Requirements of their Students in Specific Language Skills……... 72

Conclusion…… 84

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Overview of the study……. 86

Discussion of Results……... 87

General Language Skill Requirements of Students…….. 87

Specific Language Needs of Students Concerning their Disciplines…… 90

Perceptions of Disciplinary Teachers at YTU towards English-Medium Instruction at the Tertiary Level and their Attitudes towards the Shift in the Medium of Instruction… 94

Pedagogical Implications…….. 96

Limitations of the Study……... 99

Implications for Further Research…… 99

Conclusion..... 101

REFERENCES..... 102

APPENDICES..... 106

A. Sample Questionnaire (English)..... 106

B. Sample Questionnaire (Turkish)..... 113

LIST OF TABLES

1. Faculties at YTU…….. 48
2. The distribution of the participants according to departments……. 49
3. Number of questions in the questionnaire in terms of sections 51
4. Teaching experience……. 57
5. Current academic titles of respondents…… 58
6. Importance of English in the content-based studies of students….. 60
7. Reasons provided for the importance of English……. 61
8. Disciplinary teachers' experience in teaching their courses in English and courses given in English-medium…… 63
9. Distribution of disciplinary teachers giving their courses in English and the departments that provide English courses…….. 64
10. Attitudes of disciplinary teachers towards the change in the medium of instruction at YTU……. 65
11. Language Preferences of content teachers in classroom practice… 66
12. Reasons underlying the choice of Turkish as the medium of instruction……. 69
13. Reasons underlying the choice of using English as the medium of instruction……. 71
14. Disciplinary teachers opinions on the importance of certain language skills……. 73

15. Skills causing the most problems for the learners in their content courses…….. 75
16. Necessary English skills for undergraduate students at YTU…….. 76
17. Undergraduate students' needs for reading particular genres…….. 77
18. Results indicating variance among respondents in terms of the faculties…… 79
19. The distribution of responses on question item 21e……. 79
20. Undergraduate students' needs for writing particular genres……... 80
21. Results indicating variance among respondents in terms of the faculties…… 81
22. The distribution of responses on question item 23a……. 82
23. Undergraduate students' listening needs…….. 82
24. Undergraduate students' speaking needs……. 83

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

With developments in technology and science and the extensive use of English in educational and professional settings (Cook, 2003; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Quirk & Stein, 1990), English language instruction has received more attention than ever in recent years. Most tertiary institutions offer English language programs to their students in order to equip them not only for their current academic studies but also for their future careers (Köksoy, 2000; Sinanoğlu, 2004). However, language courses offered in institutions often differ from each other due to their learners having different profiles and, subsequently, varying language needs. While the focus at some institutions is on the development of students' Basic English skills and general language adequacy, at others the focus may be on the specification of study skills required for academic purposes (Jordan, 1997). Since the needs of students might vary in different educational settings, a specification and determination of these needs and arranging the learners' priorities in terms of their importance in their academic studies can provide course designers with the guidelines for the development of effective curricula (Brown, 1995; Graves, 2000; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Munby, 1978; Smith, 1990; Tarone & Yule, 1989).

The primary aim of this study was to conduct a needs analysis research at Yıldız Technical University (YTU) in order to determine the academic language requirements of students majoring in different disciplines. The investigation focused

on the language needs of students through the perspectives of their disciplinary teachers, who were considered best to be able to judge the necessities and lacks of their students in their departments and determine the academic English requirements that should be given priority in their language courses. Moreover, these disciplinary teachers, as practicing scholars in their disciplines, were seen as being in the best position to comment at a broad level on the role that English may play in their students' future academic lives. The secondary aim of this study was to find out what disciplinary teachers at YTU think about the importance of English in the undergraduate academic studies of their learners and to what extent they prefer using English while teaching content courses. Thus, their language of instruction preferences were sought to provide insights about their attitudes towards English and English- medium instruction at the tertiary level, an increasingly controversial issue among scholars both in Turkey and abroad. Data concerning both issues were gathered by means of a questionnaire distributed to 254 disciplinary teachers working in different faculties at YTU.

Background of the Study

The role of language in academic settings is of vital interest to those concerned with tertiary education, since, as Swales (1995) notes, English has become the world's major language for the communication of research findings. Since the international language of research and academic publication is English, anyone who wishes to have ready access to these academic materials needs to know the language. Granted, this dominance has not gone unquestioned. Indeed, many second language researchers and teachers have explored ways of resisting the spread of English in academia (Demircan, 1988; Evans, 2000; Master, 1998; Pennycook, 1994; Köksoy, 2000; Lucas & Kartz, 1994, Sinanoğlu; 2004). Nevertheless, the predominance of

English as the 'lingua franca' in educational settings (Cook, 2003, p. 29) and its increasing importance in science and technology has continued. In the field of English teaching (ELT), this growth has brought attention on English for Specific Purposes (ESP), which has been considered as the most "innovative and vibrant area of language teaching" (Hyland, 2000, p. 297). Along with ESP, its two principal branches of English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) have also gained importance, with the focus for both of these being on the particular purposes of language courses either job-related or school-related. Between these two, EAP tends to dominate, certainly in terms of research and research-based application (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001).

EAP is concerned with "the communication skills in English, which are required for study purposes in formal educational settings" (Jordan, 1997, p.1). As the term 'EAP' implies, a focus is being given to the purpose of the language programs and the specification of the study skills that should be given importance in these programs. Therefore, a vital step in the development of EAP courses or programs is to produce a comprehensive description of the needs of that particular group of EAP learners. Since the needs and the wishes of EAP learners are distinct and clearly identifiable from those of English for General Purposes learners, EAP course designers should investigate and try to determine these needs within the context of the relevant EAP courses (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001). This requires the specification of study skills matching the requirements of EAP learners for different disciplines (Jordan, 1997).

With the rising demand for specialized language programs and the emphasis on the determination of learners' needs, the attention of many institutions has shifted towards learner-centered approaches. In learner-centered approaches, "learners are

seen to have different needs and interests, which would have an important influence on their motivation to learn and therefore on the effectiveness of their learning" (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p.8). Therefore, their learner needs are given primary concern and the study of these needs becomes an important part of the curriculum development process. As Chan (2001) states, language curriculum development should start with determining how syllabus design addresses the specific needs and wants of target learners. The focus on the determination of specific language requirements of learners led to the introduction of a new concept in language teaching in the 1980s (Richards, 1990). The term 'needs analysis' or 'needs assessment' has been a key component in language programs such as ESP and EAP courses since then. As Phillips and Shettlesworth state, it is difficult to "conceive of an EAP course", which is not centered on certain study skills determined by considering the needs of the target learners in a specific discipline (as cited in Jordan, 1997, p. 5). There is a general consensus that needs analyses are the defining feature of EAP courses (Brown, 1995; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997; Tarone & Yule, 1989). Hutchinson and Waters identify the needs analysis phase as the "coming of age" in EAP, because learner needs defined as the identifiable elements of students' target situations, appear to be the obvious basis for designing EAP and ESP courses (1987, p. 12). Therefore, the identification of students' "necessities" and their current "lacks" and their future "wants" may enable curriculum developers to prepare more efficient programs for learners (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 12)

In order to design effective programs, these needs should be examined from different points of view, such as those of teachers'-either disciplinary teachers or language instructors- students', or program administrators'. Obviously, it is not easy to cover all these participants in a large- scale needs analysis study. Therefore,

researchers should carefully and purposefully select the participant groups (Brown, 1995). For the purpose of this survey, the participants will be the disciplinary teachers. Since the primary goal of language programs should be to prepare students for the demands required from them in subject-matter classrooms or in their academic studies (Jordan, 1997), the expectations of different discipline teachers from their learners can provide a good deal of data for curriculum developers about the actual needs of students in their disciplinary studies.

Statement of the problem

Although the importance of English as an international language in today's global work life has been acknowledged (Cook, 2003; Master, 1998; Pennycook, 1994; Quirk & Stein, 1990), its increasing dominance in educational settings remains controversial. In Turkey, there is a dispute over the medium of instruction in higher education, with some (Alptekin, 1998; Doltaş, 1998) maintaining that English is a prerequisite for students' academic and professional success and their opponents arguing that English is an obstacle on the way to students' success in their content courses (Demircan, 1988; Köksoy, 2000; Sinanoğlu, 2004). Due to these controversial arguments, foreign language education is treated differently in different institutions in Turkey. While some universities offer their education totally or partly in English, others give their instruction in Turkish. Although the amount of English courses may vary in different institutions, foreign language courses have nonetheless become obligatory in all universities according to directives of the Higher Education Council (YÖK) (Köksoy, 2000). Although all universities have to cover compulsory English courses in their curricula, they have the right to determine their own foreign language policies and develop their language programs by considering their own learner profiles.

By considering the fact that different learners may have different needs, special attention should be given to the purposes of language programs in order to equip students well for their academic and future careers. Therefore, needs analyses, which are defined as the process of determining the needs for which a learner or a group of learners requires a language and arranging these needs according to priorities, become an inevitable component of the curriculum development process. Different students may need English for different purposes, thus, needs analysis can help teachers, curriculum developers, or program designers to make choices as to what to teach and how to teach it. If students' needs are not taken into consideration in the process of curriculum development, this may cause gaps between actual and desired performance of students and this in turn results in the demotivation of the students towards the course (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). However, at many universities in Turkey, this issue has not been given primary concern and certain problems such as student demotivation and negative attitudes towards the courses may be experienced (Köksoy, 2000).

Yıldız Technical University is a Turkish-medium university where such problems are experienced. After compulsory English preparatory education, students are required to attend advanced English courses for three years. The content of these courses are mainly based on the improvement of certain skills students learned in their preparatory courses. The English Department's practice of providing joint programs for all departments without considering any differences among different disciplines may be a contributing factor to the generally observed lack of motivation among many of the students attending these courses. Such demotivation could also be resulting from a mismatch between the objectives of the current programs and the students' actual academic needs in their fields. In this study, students' actual

academic needs will be explored through the perspectives of their disciplinary teachers.

Significance of the Problem

Although there have been many needs analyses conducted for determining the language requirements of students in different institutions in Turkey (Arık, 2002; Atay, 1999; Çelik, 2003; Gündüz, 1999), only one of them (Arık, 2002) has looked at a broad range of students' academic language requirements from the perspectives of content teachers. In that study, however, the context was a full Turkish-medium university. In the current study, the context is quite different due to the recent switch from partial English to full Turkish medium instruction.

Since there has been no specific research study investigating both the academic English language requirements of students through the perspectives of disciplinary teachers and the attitudes of these teachers towards English medium instruction, the results of this study may fill a gap by providing a great deal of data for both of these issues. The findings may reveal whether students majoring in different disciplines have different academic language requirements and whether any language skills should be given priority over the others in the English language curricula of different departments. This finding could in turn contribute evidence to the debate over discipline-specific study (Spack, 1988). The results concerning English-medium instruction can also provide empirical insights into the ways that non-native English speaking scholars in one country view the role of English as a lingua franca in educational domain. The results may either support or refute the critical researchers' calls for resistance to English dominance (Master, 1998; Pennycook, 1994).

The results of this study will also be valuable for YTU, since an investigation of the language requirements of different disciplines through the perspectives of disciplinary teachers will provide a sound basis for curriculum renewal projects in the future. Through this study, the current curriculum may be altered in a way to be more responsive to the specific demands of different disciplines and specific needs-based curricula may be implemented for different departments in the future. Moreover, the results of this study may provide a general understanding about the attitudes of disciplinary teachers working currently in different departments at YTU towards the decision to discontinue English medium instruction.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions:

1. What are the language requirements of undergraduate students studying in different departments at YTU through the perspectives of their disciplinary teachers?
2. According to the English language use requirements of disciplinary teachers, which skills should be given priority for the students of different disciplines?
3. What are the disciplinary teachers' attitudes towards English-medium instruction at the tertiary level?

Conclusion

In this chapter, first a brief account of background information was given about ESP, EAP, learner-centered approach and the role of needs analysis and its importance in curriculum development process. The statement of the problem, the significance of the problem, and the research questions were also covered. The second chapter includes a review of literature on ESP, EAP course types including

the contexts of EAP courses abroad and in Turkey and attitudes towards English-medium instruction, the importance of needs analysis in EAP course design, and steps involved in conducting a needs analysis study. In the third chapter, methodology including the setting of the study, participants, instrument, and data analysis procedures is included. In the fourth chapter, the data analysis procedures are presented and the last chapter discusses the results of the study with regard to research questions, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

Key Terms

English for Specific Purposes: It is an approach which uses need assessment as the basis of curriculum development and makes all decisions concerning course content, materials development, methodology, assessment around the data gathered from needs analysis.

English for Academic Purposes: EAP is concerned with the development of communication skills in English, which are required for study purposes (Jordan, 1997).

Needs Analysis: It is the sum of the processes in collecting information about the learners' current and future language needs in order to give priority to the ones that are considered the most important for target learners in the curriculum development process.

Foreign Language Education: It can be simply defined as education given in a foreign language rather than one's mother tongue. In a foreign language program, the medium of instruction is a foreign language both for the instructor and the students.

Disciplinary/Content Teachers: These two terms will be used interchangeably within the current study to refer to the lecturers who give disciplinary education in different departments at Yıldız Technical University.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The aim of this study is to investigate the academic language requirements of Yıldız Technical University (YTU) students through the perspectives of their disciplinary teachers. In this chapter, the researcher will try to set up a framework in order to provide a general understanding of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) through giving a brief account of information on its origin English for Specific Purposes (ESP), EAP courses provided worldwide, and its application in Turkey, attitudes towards English-medium instruction both at the global and local level. The chapter also explores issues surrounding curriculum design in EAP courses, in particular the important role played by needs analysis.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

In order to understand EAP, its origin, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), should be considered first. With the new developments in technology, science and commerce in the 20th century, many radical changes have taken place in the approaches taken to language teaching (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997). Traditional approaches, in which the priority is given on the language forms rather than learners' needs while deciding on the content of the courses, have been in many cases replaced with newer approaches, in which learners and their particular needs are seen at the center of the teaching and learning process (Jordan, 1997;Todd, 2003). This shift led to the development of a new area in language teaching, which is

known as English for Specific Purposes (ESP). ESP has developed its own approaches and methodology and is generally seen as a very "active", even "feisty" movement that has had considerable influence over the general activities of TESOL and applied linguistics (Dudley-Evans, 2001, p.131). With ESP approaches, the importance of learners in the teaching and learning process was recognized and particular learners' reasons for learning the target language and their real communication needs became the primary concern of curriculum developers. The basic notion, which underlies ESP, is that learners may have different reasons for learning a language. Thus, the first questions when launching preparation for designing an ESP course are almost always the same. ESP searches for "what learners need to do with English, which of the skills they need to master and how well, and what genres they need to learn" (Dudley-Evans, 2001, p. 131). To teach learners successfully, the answers of these basic questions should be investigated and focus should be put on the reasons why learners want to learn the language in the curriculum development process (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). Only if they are identified should it be possible to design programs responsive to learners' needs (Richards, 1990). The key-defining feature of ESP courses is that its teaching and materials are founded on the results of needs analysis, which is regarded as the "cornerstone" of ESP courses (Dudley-Evans, 2001, p. 132). The purpose of ESP courses is to provide learners with the competence to cope with a specified set of tasks in order to achieve occupational or academic targets (Jordan, 1997).

The concept of "target situation" introduced by Munby, forms the basis of ESP courses (1978, p.3) and makes it different from traditional English Language Teaching (ELT) methods. Certain features of ESP such as its being "designed to fulfill specific needs of learners", "related in content to particular discipline,

occupation, and activities", "centered on language appropriate to the target situation", and its "introducing learners to particular academic discourse and genres" make it stimulating for learners, particularly adults (Johns & Price-Machado, 2001, p.44). Since learners may have a chance to do practice on authentic materials, which they will likely use in target situations, ESP has outweighed the importance of other traditional methods in ELT (Dudley-Evans, & Johns, 1998; Graves, 2000).

As demand for language courses which have been prepared for specific learners' needs has grown, so too has the interest towards ESP. The growth in ESP has led to the development of various subcategories, however; two main branches have emerged: English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP). These classifications have been made according to their field of target activity (Flowerdew, 1990). That is to say, these two subdivisions of ESP courses are developed according to the target situations, either work related or study related, in which learners will use the target language.

Of these two branches, EAP is better known due to the dominance of English as the language of research and academic publication (Swales, 1995; Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991). With the growing demand of people who want to gain access to these academic resources, the field of EAP has developed rapidly in the past 25 years to become a major force in English language teaching and research (Dudley-Evans, 1991). In order to provide a fuller picture of what EAP is, the next section will focus on this issue and will provide a brief account of information about EAP, and types of EAP courses.

English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

EAP, which can be defined as an approach focusing on the language of professional content subjects or disciplines, plays an important role in educational settings in terms of "research and research-based application"(Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, p.177). EAP is concerned with the development of communication skills in English, which are required for study purposes (Jordan, 1997, p.1). In a way, EAP means tailoring instruction to the specific needs of the learners rather than general purposes. For instance, if the learners' need is to improve their reading skill concerning their majors, the curricula is developed in a way to meet this goal by focusing specifically on reading strategies such as skimming, scanning, paraphrasing, reading for the gist, and so on. Therefore, what makes EAP different from English for General Purposes (EGP) is that it is based on instruction that focuses on the specific communicative needs and practices of particular learner groups in different academic contexts. It grounds its instruction in an understanding of the cognitive, social, and linguistic demands of specific academic disciplines such as Economics, Engineering, Law, Architecture, Medicine and so on (Dudley-Evans, 2001).

EAP aims at equipping students with the communicative skills to participate in particular academic and cultural contexts (Hayland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002). Therefore, in a way it facilitates learners' study and research in that language (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001; Jordan, 1997). In order to achieve this goal, the communicative requirements in these environments should be known and the content that needs to be covered should be determined (Todd, 2003). Therefore, a vital step in the development of EAP courses or programs is to produce a comprehensive description of the unique needs and wishes of that particular group of EAP learners. Since the needs and the wishes of these learners are different from that of students

learning English for general purposes, EAP course designers should investigate and try to determine these specific needs within the context of the relevant EAP courses (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001).

EAP course content may be designed according to different purposes in different contexts, where the learner profile significantly differs from each other. Jordan (1997) makes a classification among EAP courses in terms of their content, courses' length of time and the different contexts they are provided.

Types of EAP Courses

In terms of their content, EAP courses may either be "common core or subject –specific" (Jordan, 1997, p.4). These divisions can be labeled respectively as English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP). The content of EGAP is mainly based on common core element, which is generally associated with study skills. In the past, EAP and study skills were often regarded as synonymous; however, according to the recent majority view, despite the close relationship between language and study skills, they are not regarded as the same thing. Language skills form the basis of study skills. However, study skills, which are regarded as the key component of EAP courses, differ from language skills with some additional features such as a "general academic English register incorporating a formal, academic style, with proficiency in the language use" (Jordan, 1997, p.5). Therefore, study skills form the basis of EGAP course content rather than language skills. In order to make EGAP course content more clear, study skills should be defined briefly, since they should be developed to an appropriate level for the subject to be studied, in conjunction with the development of language proficiency.

Study skills are simply defined as "abilities, techniques, and strategies, which are used when reading, writing, listening or speaking for study purposes" (Richards, Platt & Platt, as cited in Jordan, 1997, p.6). The term study skills is used for the different aspects of study such as reference skills, the use of the library, skimming, scanning, reading for the gist, the layout of dissertations and theses, so on. As Robinson states all these skills need to be taught not only to the native speakers of English but also to non-native learners in order to be successful in academic studies (as cited in Jordan, 1997). The same study skills may form the basis of different language skills, since there is an integrated relationship between study skills and language skills. For instance, note taking, which is taught extensively in most EAP courses as an important study skill, may form the basis of different language skills due to the inevitable integration between language skills. According to Jordan (1997), receptive skills provide the necessary input for productive skills. Therefore, the same study skill can be used for different purposes on different occasions. Note taking, which is regarded as a joint skill in listening and reading, i.e. receptive skills, may also be frequently used in speaking and writing, i.e. productive language skills. For instance, students may be asked to write a reflection paper on a topic, which they have listened to from a tape-recorder and taken notes while listening to it. As in this example, the application of study skills on receptive skills may provide the required input for the productive activity. For different study situations or activities, different study skills may be required.

The content of ESAP differs mainly from study skills due to its focusing on the language needed for a particular academic discipline such as Economics, Medicine, Engineering, Law. EGAP course content not only includes the language structure, vocabulary, the particular study skills needed for the subject, but also the

appropriate academic conventions. Once the students have developed their language and study skills required for their subject matter, they are introduced to the academic code of their field of study through appropriate authentic materials.

In terms of the length of time, EAP courses are classified under three headings: pre-sessional EAP courses, in-sessional EAP courses, and long-term EAP courses. Pre-sessional EAP courses are given in L1 countries such as America, Australia and Britain. The basic aim of these courses is to equip the students with the study skills required for their subject matter. The content is based on the immediate needs, i.e. objective needs of the learners. In order to include the relevant aspects in course content, the focus is put on the essential language and a prioritization is made among the study skills appropriate to the purposes of learners. They are merely based on the "target situations", in which students will actually perform these skills when required (Munby, 1978, p.3).

In-sessional EAP courses are given within the term as a service for students. Unlike pre-sessional and long-term EAP courses, for which students are required to pay tuition, they are free for students who have already registered for their disciplinary courses. The content of these courses are usually geared according to immediate and known needs of students. Courses are given usually at time intervals when students are free from their departmental studies. They are generally given in two-hour sessions, in which the focus is on one area of need. Throughout these courses, students are given opportunities to do adequate practice on the target study skills, which they will actually require in their academic studies.

Long-term EAP courses are given at least in three terms and students are given certificates if they pass the examination given at the end of the course. Since these courses are given over a longer period of time, their content significantly

differs from the pre-sessional and in-sessional EAP courses. By determining the level of students prior to the course, the syllabus is designed around language and study skills. The lower the level is the more general English is incorporated into the course content. In the first term, students do more practice mainly on language skills. Only one third of the course time is allocated for EAP study skills. Once students have made progress on language skills, more focus is put on EAP study skills in the second term and two thirds of the course content are based on study skills. In the last term, students only do practice on EAP skills appropriate to their purposes. The main components of these courses are determined by conducting a needs analysis. With the information gathered, the course content is designed by prioritizing of skills, in which students experience more problems. In such courses, content can be designed in a variety of ways by considering the learner profile and their specific needs.

With regard to the contexts, EAP courses may take place in a variety of settings. These include entirely English speaking contexts such as Australia, Canada, England, Ireland, New Zealand or the USA. International EAP courses are developed not only to prepare native speaker learners, who may not have adequate competence such as in research skills, for their academic studies but also for students planning to attend universities in these countries to study their majors and need some special academic courses. Therefore, the students in a long term EAP course may need English for their higher education studies in their own countries, e.g. for reading academic texts or for writing theses, or for higher education in L1 countries, e.g. all skills may be needed. They may also use EAP in pre-departure courses in their own countries before studying abroad. These courses aim at providing students with language and study skills that will be used in their content-based studies given in English. Apart from these contexts, EAP courses are also provided in countries

where English is taught as a Foreign Language (EFL) such as Germany, Finland, or Turkey, or in contexts, where it is used as an official or second language (ESL) or medium of instruction in schools such as Singapore. Since the secondary aim of this study is to find out the attitudes of non-native scholars in an EFL setting, EAP courses given in ESL/EFL settings will be discussed in the next section in conjunction with the attitudes of scholars towards the dominance of English in the educational domain.

EAP in EFL Settings

With the dominance of English as the lingua franca of the today's global work life, its importance in the educational domain increased relatively. Since English is the primary language for many scientific and technological written information sources, some countries started to make some innovations in their educational systems either by incorporating foreign languages partly into their programs or completely adapting foreign languages as the medium of instruction. As a result of this, there has been an increase in the number of universities where English is used as the medium of instruction (Master, 1998; Pennycook, 1994). This has resulted in an increasing demand for EAP courses worldwide. Especially in countries such as the Czech Republic (Hlavicka & Pakerek 1995), Hong Kong (Flowerdew, Li, & Miller, 1998), Poland (Chojnacka & Macukow, 1995), Denmark (Jensen & Johennesson, 1995), and Turkey (Köksoy 2000; Somer, 2001), a remarkable increase has been seen in the number of faculties that give their content education in English. Some educational changes have been undertaken in such countries in order to improve the quality of education and make their learners ready to take part in the global market after their graduation. When the reasons underlying the radical changes in educational domain in different countries are evaluated, some

common factors affecting the attempts to internationalize their educational systems can be detected.

One of the reasons affecting the educational decisions in the countries, where radical educational revolutions have been made in the last twenty years, is related to political changes. For instance, the Czech Republic and Poland are two countries that have internationalized their educational policies after having become members of the European Union (EU). Due to their bonds with the other members of the EU, they have made some attempts in their educational systems to bring their national level of education up to European standards. In this process, English has gained more importance than ever in educational settings in these countries and most of the tertiary institutions have converted their language of instruction into English to fulfill the demands of the EU. Today, approximately ten of the tertiary institutions in Poland give their education in full English (Chojnacka & Macukow, 1995). Similarly, most of the courses, particularly engineering courses, are given in English in the Czech Republic (Hlavacka & Pekarek, 1995). With the free market policy and the mobility of learners among members of the EU, a demand has emerged in Europe for qualified specialists, particularly engineers. Therefore the Czech Republic has been one of the countries that have made attempts in the educational domain to prepare their learners to be a part of the global market. Similarly, in Denmark and Hong Kong importance is given to English-medium instruction in order to meet the demands of the challenging international job descriptions. In Hong Kong, a former British colony, an increase in the number of universities has been witnessed in conjunction with the increasing demand for qualified employees in different fields such as Economy, Political Sciences and International Relations. According to Flowerdew, Li and Miller (1998), parental pressure plays an important role on the

demand towards tertiary institutions giving their education in English. Most of the parents in Hong Kong want their children to be educated in English with the belief that they may have better professional careers in the future. Flowerdew et al. state that with this increasing demand towards English-medium instruction, four out of six universities have converted their education into full English and even if the other institutions give their education in Cantonese, they offer intensive EAP courses to better equip their students for international positions after their graduation.

Also affecting educational changes around the world are economic reasons. Since providing content-based instruction in foreign languages and offering intensive EAP courses as a preparation stage for English-medium instruction help make universities attractive to foreign students, increasing numbers of tertiary institutions in European countries have started running international EAP courses. For instance, through student exchange programs and intensive EAP courses, education in Poland has internationalized in the last ten years and this has been a good source of income for the universities (Chojnacka & Pekarek, 1995). In Denmark as well, many tertiary institutions now offer international exchange programs. In recent years, the Danish government has been attempting to increase the number of universities that give their education in English not only to improve the quality of education in Denmark but also to provide a good source of income by means of these programs.

However, the dominance of English in educational settings and the changes in the educational systems towards English-medium instruction has not gone unquestioned. There are both positive and negative views on this issue among international scholars.

Controversial Views on EAP Courses at the Global Level

Scholars who are in favor of English-medium of instruction believe that countries' educational systems should be internationalized to reach a certain level of quality in education and they approve the increase in the number of universities giving their education in English (Chojnacka & Macukow, 1995; Hlavicka & Pakarek, 1995; Jensen & Johonnesson, 1995). They believe that learners and professionals can only follow the latest trends in their field by following the latest resources written in English. Another reason, which is put forth by the advocates of English-medium instruction, is that one's being competent in his field does not guarantee success in his academic or professional career unless the person is competent in another language as well, since this has become a requirement of taking part in today's global work life.

On the other hand, there are some scholars, who disapprove of education in a foreign language (Lucas & Kartz, 1994; Master, 1998; Pennycook, 1994). They believe that education in a foreign language prevents learners' comprehending their specialist subjects fully. Therefore, content education should be given in students' native language. Master (1998) emphasizes the importance of students' being taught in their mother tongue for a qualified education. He states that one can learn the content of a course better if the content is given in mother tongue. He adds that students may miss the important parts of course due to their comprehension problems in the target language. The opponents of English-medium instruction maintain that content education in a foreign language may cause some problems in classroom practice due to either students' or the lecturer's lacks in the target language. This causes motivation problems in the courses due to students' being passive and avoiding participation.

A survey conducted by Flowerdew, Li, and Miller (1998) provides some useful insights for the views concerning the problems students encounter in English-medium courses. The study was conducted in Hong Kong University and it explored the attitudes of 20 lecturers towards English-medium instruction. When the respondents were asked about their language preferences in classroom practice, 19 respondents reported that they used both Cantonese and English according to the situation in classroom practice. The reasons underlying their choices are all related to the problems they encountered in teaching practice such as students' potential comprehension problems and subsequently their developing negative attitudes towards the courses of lecturers using merely English. According to the lecturers, most of the students experience certain problems in English due to their not having mastery in the target language. The lecturers stated that if they persisted in using only English, this results in the lack of students' participation, which turns the teaching and learning process into an unpleasant experience for both sides. Therefore, lecturers reported that they had to use Cantonese when they realized that students could not comprehend the subject and had missed the important points within the lesson. The solution they found to this problem was to allow their students to use Cantonese in order to encourage them to talk and ask the points they missed because of their inadequate English knowledge. This classroom practice may reveal some useful insights about the problems of non-native English speaking students in English-medium content courses.

Debates over English-medium instruction raise another discussion over whether specific language courses should be given to students by their content teachers or language instructors. Spack (1988) argues that the teaching of specific skills in different disciplines such as academic writing should be left to the teachers

of that department, who are more familiar with the genres and academic discourse of the department. Alternatively, Coffrey states that if language instructors give these courses, students should be grouped according to their disciplines and collaboration or team-teaching, i.e. adjunct teaching approaches, should be adopted (as cited in Spack, 1988). However, the effectiveness of such courses has also been questioned. According to Coffrey, one of the disadvantages of content-based studies is that due to being unfamiliar with the genres of different disciplines, language instructors may find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being less knowledgeable than their students. However, he states that this problem may be overcome or at least reduced by collaboration between disciplinary teachers and language instructors. If necessary, disciplinary teachers may be consulted in terms of content and similarly language instructors may be consulted about the language use.

There are some disputes over the role of English-medium instruction and students' being taught according to their disciplines in Turkey as well. Prior to giving information about Turkish scholars' attitudes towards English-medium instruction, a brief account of information will be given on the educational changes that have taken place in Turkey in recent years.

EAP Courses in Turkey

The debate over language of instruction in Turkish higher education is similar to that of many other EFL countries mentioned in the previous section. In Turkey, as a result of recent economic, technological and political developments, learning a foreign language has gained more importance than ever and the Turkish educational system has changed significantly, particularly in the last twenty years (Köksoy, 2000; Sinanoğlu, 2004, Demircan, 1988; Özden & Çağatay, 1993). There has been an increase in the number of schools giving their education in English. Since today

English is generally regarded as a world language and thus the primary language in any kind of international relations, its usage as a medium of instruction is more extensive than other languages such as German or French (Köksoy, 2000). This is directly related to English's gaining importance more than ever in different parts of life such as business, science, and education. With the increasing demand for highly qualified employees in business life, people need to improve themselves in order to be accepted for better positions in their profession. Even many adults in the middle of their professional careers make efforts to learn English since having English competence is regarded as an asset to be admitted or promoted to better positions in international companies (Özden & Çağatay, 1993, Köksoy, 2000). Having competence in a foreign language entails some advantages even for state employees, who are paid more due to having competence in a foreign language. These factors have led to some educational changes in Turkey. There is a growing demand for institutions to give their education in foreign languages. Parents prefer private secondary schools or private universities for their children with the hope of increasing their children's opportunities to have better careers after graduation (Demircan, 1988).

However, there is not a common policy for education in English or foreign language education in Turkey (Köksoy, 2000). Köksoy states that out of seventy-two universities in Turkey, twenty-eight of them give their courses either in full or partial English-medium.

Although diversity is seen among the language policies of universities in Turkey, the only common procedure among universities is that they are obliged to provide compulsory language courses for at least two terms. According to the

Directive of YÖK guidelines, language programs currently adopted in Turkish universities can be grouped under four headings (Köksoy, 2000).

The first group includes full Turkish-medium universities, where students are required to attend sixty hours of compulsory English courses unless they are exempted from English language education by passing a proficiency examination. The second group includes full Turkish-medium universities such as Gaziosmanpaşa University, where interested students may attend voluntary English Preparatory Class Education. Even if students fail this voluntary language program, they are allowed to continue their departmental studies, since their failure is not an obstacle for their attendance to their departments.

The third includes the institutions where 70% of the mainstream courses are given in Turkish, and the remaining 30% percentage is given in English. In these institutions, such as İstanbul Technical University or Hacettepe University, there is compulsory preparatory class education; nevertheless students who fail to pass the proficiency examination are allowed to start their content studies and these students are given the right to take the proficiency examination in the following years until they pass it. Ultimately, unless they pass the proficiency test, they cannot graduate from their departments.

The last group includes universities where most or all of the content courses are given in English, such as Boğaziçi University, Middle East Technical University, and Bilkent University. There is again obligatory preparatory class education in such institutions and unless students pass the final proficiency test given at the end of the preparatory year, they are not allowed to start their departmental studies and lose their right to study in their department.

With the foundation of new universities, particularly private institutions, the number of universities giving partial or full English-medium instruction is on the increase (Köksoy, 2000). However, this situation has not gone unquestioned among Turkish scholars as well. Though English medium instruction has become widespread at most tertiary institutions, the discussion of foreign language education is a controversial issue in Turkey (Özden, & Çağatay, 1993).

Controversial Views on EAP Courses in Turkey

Scholars who are in favor of English-medium instruction believe that students' having knowledge in at least one foreign language is an asset for them in order to improve themselves in their subject matter (Alptekin, 1998; Doltaş, 1998). They believe that students need to learn a foreign language well in order to follow the latest developments in their field and gain access to the materials written in English or other foreign languages. Alptekin, the head of the Teaching English as a Foreign Language Department at Boğaziçi University, states that there are plenty of content course books and journals written in English and using such materials in education is a requirement of contemporary education. He also emphasizes the importance of intensive language exposure in second language acquisition. He states that the more frequently students need to use foreign languages the more they have a chance to do practice. Since learning a foreign language is a cumulative process, teaching content courses in English may help not only for learning necessary terminology in their subject matter but also enable them to be exposed to more English. Doltaş, who is a professor in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Boğaziçi University, states that she does not agree with scholars such as Sinanoğlu (2004), and Köksoy (2000) who suggest that English language education should be elective rather than compulsory, and who suggest that existing compulsory preparatory

education should be abolished because not all students are equally talented and eager to learn English and, therefore, should be given a chance to make their own decision about attending a foreign language class. Doltaş argues that making English not compulsory may lead students to underestimate the importance of English, which will be a requirement for the students in their academic and professional careers. In addition to this, she argues that learning a foreign language is not a matter of talent. According to her, it is the same for all courses. The ones who are not very talented need to do the same thing in all courses. They have to make more effort to learn in comparison to those who can learn easily.

On the other hand, scholars who are against English-medium instruction report different reasons for their opposition to English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. These reasons can be grouped under two headings: political and educational.

In terms of politically based reasons, some scholars (Köksoy, 2000; Sinanoğlu, 2004; Zeybek, 1999) regard education in a foreign language as a threat to Turkish national identity and Turkish language. Sinanoğlu states that "national identity is a matter of national language" and regards the dominance of English in educational settings as a threat to Turkish national identity and Turkish language (2004, p.29). He believes that only countries that can preserve their national identities may develop and have a stable position in the world. According to him, the dominance of English in educational settings prevents the development of Turkish as a science language and leads to Turkish's having an inferior position.

Concerning the same issue, Zeybek (1999), the former Minister of Culture, and Köksoy (2000) report that educational policies that are in practice in Turkey today are not even adopted in the former colonial countries. Zeybek states that if the

situation in terms of English dominance in educational settings continues like this, future generations may not be able to learn and use Turkish at schools as the language of instruction. Similarly, Köksoy states that this generally observed tendency towards English usage in all levels of the Turkish educational system may eventually result in Turkish learners' alienation towards their own native language and culture, which he regards as the greatest threat for the future of the Turkish Republic. Furthermore, they both underscore the importance of the Turkish government's introducing of certain legal measures to prevent foreign language usage as the medium of instruction at all levels of education.

While expressing their opinions concerning education in foreign languages, Zeybek and Köksoy particularly emphasize that they are not against foreign language education and state that students' having competence in at least one foreign language may be an asset for them not only to improve themselves in their subject matter but also to have better job opportunities. However, they agree on the fact that foreign language education should be the task of foreign language classes rather than the content courses, the goals of which should be limited to providing students with a sound knowledge base in their specialist areas. According to Zeybek, foreign language education and education in a foreign language are two entirely different concepts and he believes that most of the problems encountered in the teaching process in Turkey derive from confusion between these two concepts. He states that the increase in the number of universities giving their content education in a foreign language has popularized a wrong impression among the public about the importance of content education in a foreign language and today most people think that foreign languages may be learnt better if students are given content education in that language. Zeybek believes that the public should be made aware of the fact that

teaching content courses in a foreign language may not guarantee a student's success in that foreign language and foreign languages may also be taught effectively by adopting other contemporary methods that have proven successful in language teaching worldwide.

From an educational aspect, scholars also maintain the idea that students are not given a quality education if they are taught totally in English rather than in Turkish (Demircan, 1988; Köksoy, 2000; Sinanoğlu, 2004). They believe that content education should be given in the mother tongue. According to these scholars, education given in English or any other foreign languages may prevent students' full comprehension of their content lessons and lead them to rely on memorization. Due to not being competent in the target language, students can neither learn well their content lessons nor English in institutions where the language of education is in full English. Sinanoğlu reports that students' tendency towards memorization due to their lack of knowledge of the target language may eventually result in their not developing their skills of critical analysis. Thus, education in foreign languages makes students more passive in the lessons and causes them to avoid speaking in class discussions. According to Sinanoğlu, particularly students who have not overcome the basic hurdles of the target language may experience serious problems in this process and may miss the important parts of the content. He believes that:

> A student can learn the content courses best in his/her mother tongue, since using a foreign language well means being able to think in that language without any restrictions. Unfortunately, students' not having full competence in the target language turns out to be an obstacle in their comprehension of the content courses by restricting their judgment of the course content and they memorize the course content rather than make a synthesis of it in order to pass these courses (Sinanoğlu, 2004, p. 77).

He regards students' lack of making comments concerning the content of their disciplinary courses as a potential problem for their future professional careers.

Sinanoğlu also criticizes the existing language policies adopted at most tertiary institutions in Turkey by reporting that "there is not a scientific method in teaching, which introduces two completely different but equally difficult subjects to learners simultaneously" (2004, p. 78). He questions the effectiveness of the current language policies at the tertiary level by raising an important question: "What will the students do in such courses? Will they try to grasp the gist of the course content that is introduced to them for the first time or will they be concerned about whether they can express themselves adequately in English or not?" (2004, p. 78-79). He maintains the idea that teaching content courses, which are entirely new to students, and developing students' English knowledge through content courses cannot be achieved simultaneously unless one of them is sacrificed for success in the other. He also states that the one sacrificed in Turkish educational system is unfortunately the content courses. In order to eliminate the problems encountered in the teaching process in terms of medium of instruction, he suggests that English should be taught in separate courses rather than in content courses, and preparatory class education should be abolished or at least should be changed into a voluntary system.

He also evaluates the issue from an economic aspect and states that Turkey is a country where educational resources are rather limited and he believes that making a four-year tertiary education into five or six years with the inclusion of a preparatory class is not something that even economically more powerful countries can afford. He reports that the abolition of preparatory class education may not only relieve the government from this economic burden but also provide more chances to the students who are not admitted to universities due to the student quota of the tertiary institutions. He suggests that instead of wasting time and resources on preparatory class education, technical translation courses should be offered to the students by

grouping them according to their disciplines rather than teaching all content courses in English throughout the academic year. Alternatively, he suggests that enthusiastic students who would like to improve themselves in English may be encouraged to attend intensive summer courses, where they could be offered elective courses responsive to their needs with a reasonable tuition. He believes that such courses will give students a chance to learn the necessary terminology related to their subject matter and give them chances to have more practice either in language skills that they have weaknesses in or in study skills required for their content-based studies. These intensive summer courses may also provide a good source of income for the tertiary institutions.

Köksoy (2000) also agrees with Sinanoğlu on most of the issues discussed and states that content education should not be sacrificed for the sake of teaching English. According to him, students' being competent in their specialist areas is more important than their being competent in the target language. Therefore, learning English should be a means in tertiary education rather than being the mere goal of the educational system. He believes that foreign language education should be the task of secondary education and students should start tertiary education after having solved their language problems at the secondary level. Therefore, the Ministry of Education should make some regulations to provide more efficient language programs at the secondary level. Köksoy states that the task of tertiary institutions should be to enable students to gain more practice in a foreign language that they previously learnt and make them familiar with the terminology of their specialist areas. He also believes that the quality of education in content courses is relatively lower than the courses given in Turkish due to the lack of either students' or course teachers' proficiency in English.

He also introduces a different aspect to this debate. He states that education in a foreign language prepares the necessary basis for "brain drain" (2000, p. 58-59). He reports that after their graduation, some of the new graduates, who have been taught in a foreign language during their undergraduate studies, prefer going and living in foreign countries. Since most of these students experience some adaptation problems such as their being unfamiliar with Turkish terminology and having a lack of communication with other colleagues during their apprenticeship, most of them prefer going abroad with the hope of finding better job opportunities.

Somer's (2001) study provides some additional insights about the attitudes of scholars currently teaching in some of the English-medium departments at Anadolu University towards English-medium instruction. She conducted her study in the engineering and architecture departments with 33 content teachers. Her study aimed at revealing whether the faculty members preferred English or Turkish in content teaching, and whether and how they used English or Turkish in their classes. According to the results of her study, the largest group of faculty members stated that they teach both in English and Turkish because of students' not having adequate proficiency in English and having some comprehension problems in courses merely taught in English. They also justified their language preferences by stating that if they do not use any Turkish to make a summary of the course content, students miss the important parts of the course.

It is not clear how the discussion over foreign language education will result. However, it is clear that English is getting more important in educational settings. The number of EAP courses provided by the institutions as preparation for their content courses are on increase due to demands towards these courses. However, the programs offered in such courses may show variance among different institutions.

According to Jordan (1991), not all EAP courses have the same components and time allocation. In principle, EAP courses are comprised of basic components, which are language and study skills and non-EAP components, which serve as a necessary adjunct to the main study skills such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. The distribution of the main components is decided upon the light of needs analysis. By means of a needs analysis, they are ordered in terms of importance, and the ones that have the most difficulty for learners are prioritized. As in the other curriculum development processes, needs analysis forms the basis of EAP courses. In the next section, information will be given on needs analysis and the steps involved in conducting a needs analysis.

Needs Analysis

A needs analysis can be simply defined as the sum of processes in collecting information about the learners' current and future language needs in order to give priority to the ones, which are thought to be more responsive to the immediate needs of learners in the curriculum development process (Brown, 1995; Richards, 1990; Tarone & Yule, 1989). The identification of learners' needs and making the curricula relevant to them are the essential steps forming a sound basis for good language programs (Brown, 1995; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997; Richards, 1990; Smith, 1990, Tarone & Yule, 1989). A needs analysis enables course designers to develop the most appropriate syllabi for their target learners. In general terms, the process of needs analysis refers to the activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for a curriculum fulfilling the "learning needs of a particular group of learners"(Brown, 1995, p.35). Pratt provides a more detailed description of needs analysis and defines needs analysis as 'the array of procedures for identifying and validating needs, and establishing priorities among them' (as

cited in Richards, 1990, p.1). The term "array of procedures" refers to a variety of information gathering sources and the term "validating needs" implies that needs analysis is an ongoing process, in which learners and other resource groups can be systematically consulted before, during, or after a course (Richards, 1990, p. 1). An on-going needs analysis may lead course designers to continually refine curriculum as teaching and learning develop. With each assessment, they may find it necessary to reconstruct the definition of learner needs due to changes in the values of assessor and the educational system (Berwick, 1989). In order to successfully teach a second or a foreign language, teachers should adjust their methods, materials, and assessment tools on the basis of the identification of the local needs of their learners. Only by means of the specification of learners' needs, can the gaps between the educational goals (outcomes) and actual needs of students can be determined (Smith, 1990).

The growing demand for the development of language programs appropriate to the language requirements of students has led to a growing importance for needs analyses, especially in ESP and EAP courses, since the determination of needs forms the basis for the development of a curriculum. When the needs of learners are identified, they are stated in terms of goals and objectives around which the syllabi, courses, materials, the methods of the courses and assessment procedures can be developed (Brown, 1995, Jordan, 1997; Richterich & Chancerel, 1980; Richards, 1990). Needs analysis forms the "integral" step of "systematic curriculum development" (Brown, 1995,p. 35), since the statement of the general goals and the specific objectives of programs can only be set through needs analyses (Graves, 2000; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997).

The data gathered by means of a needs analysis can be used for different purposes. These data not only help to develop new curricula but also to review and evaluate existing curricula (Richards, 1990). By means of a needs analysis, a great deal of information can be collected about the learners, institution and teaching staff. Since, needs assessment is intended to be an ongoing process, its conduct during and after a course may also give course designers an opportunity to check whether the curriculum is operating in a way to fulfill the predetermined objectives of the course (Graves, 2000; Richterich & Chancerel, 1980). If it is identified by means of needs analysis that existing curriculum is not responsive to students' needs, it is modified in a way to match with the goals and objectives of the course. That is to say, needs analyses are made use of to compensate the deficiencies detected in the curricula (Brown, 1995; Graves, 2000; Richards, 1990). As Brindley states students' needs can best be revealed by considering present language performance and desired language performance (1989), Robinson (1991) asserts that this can only be achieved by evaluating learners' needs and by systematically comparing and analyzing the present and the target situation of the learners.

Steps Involved in Needs Analysis

Before any needs analysis study is conducted, certain basic decisions should be made by the analysts in order to improve the effectiveness of this process. There are three stages that should be followed in all needs analysis studies (Brown, 1995; Schutz & Derwing, 1987; Smith, 1990). Any needs analysis study should begin with a preparation stage, covering basic decisions such as defining the purpose of the program, identifying the target population, determining the scope of the investigation and deciding on the data collection techniques. The second stage involves the process of gathering information, and the last one focuses on the usage of this information to

reach conclusions about the program and to make the required changes in it in the light of the research findings.

Making Basic Decisions about Needs Analysis

The first basic stage focuses on the determination of approaches, that will be adopted, the types of information that should be collected, and the stakeholders that will be included in the study (Brown, 1995). The type of information that will be collected and the participants may vary from institution to institution according to the purpose and scope of the study. This variety may stem from analysts' adopting different approaches as well. Therefore, one of the crucial decisions that should be made by needs analysts is to decide on which type of approach they will adopt before they start collecting information in their study. Brown (1995) labels these approaches as philosophies and reports four basic types that may be adopted in needs analyses studies: discrepancy, democratic, analytic, or diagnostic philophies.

In discrepancy analysis, learner needs are seen as discrepancies or differences between their current linguistic abilities and the desired performance expected from them. This philosophy is based on collecting information that will be used to find out what is needed to compensate the gaps in students' knowledge. Such a philosophy implies that the analysts are concerned with what the learners already know and what they ought to know (McKillip, 1987). In assuming an analytic philosophy, a need is defined as the determination of linguistic items, which should be taught one after another, and is thus related to the hierarchical steps involved in the learning process. A democratic philosophy presumes that a need is any change that is desired by a majority of the group involved. It can be seen as the gathering of information about the learning most preferred by the chosen group. In a diagnostic philosophy, a need is defined as anything missing in the program, the absence of

which causes serious problems. It is related to the identification of the important points that should be covered in programs. Since one of the aims of the current study was to determine the academic English language requirements of undergraduate students through the perspectives of their disciplinary teachers and make a reevaluation of the existing language programs at YTU, a discrepancy approach was adopted in the current study in order to detect the gaps between the content of the existing languages courses and the demands of the different departments.

Determination of the philosophy that will be adopted in the study may not be sufficient to determine what type of information will be collected. Researchers should also decide on the type of information that they would like to focus on in the study. Learners may have different needs, which may vary from person to person or even from situation to situation. This makes it crucial to determine the type of needs to be collected before launching the needs analysis study. While doing this, needs analysts should consider different need types and decide on the one that will provide them with the most reliable data. Different needs types have been labeled in the literature according to different dichotomies. They can be grouped as target and learning needs (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997; Nunan, 1988), objective and subjective needs (Brindley, 1989; Jordan, 1997), situational and communicative needs (Richards, 1990), situation and language needs (Brown, 1995), and felt and perceived needs (Berwick, 1989; Jordan, 1997).

The first dichotomy is based on the specification of two types of information. The main difference between target and learning needs is that the former refers to what the learners are required to learn in order to function successfully in the target situation whereas the latter refers to what the learners need to do in order to meet the target needs (Brown, 1995). This dichotomy is evaluated from another perspective by

Hutchinson and Waters (1987), who elaborate on target needs by breaking them into "necessities, lacks and wants" of learners. They define lacks as the gaps between the target proficiency and the existing proficiency of learners, necessities as the things they need to acquire, and wants as the learners' own perceptions of their needs. In this survey, the focus was on target needs of students majoring in different departments.

Objective and subjective needs have been presented as another dichotomy. Objective needs can be defined as "the needs, which are derivable from different kinds of factual information about learners, their use of English in real-life situations as well as their current language proficiency and language difficulties"(Brindley, 1989, p.70). Objective needs are determined on the basis of data gathered about the situation, the learner, and the language that learners must acquire, and learners' present proficiency level (Brown, 1995). Subjective needs, on the other hand, can be defined as the "cognitive and affective needs of learners in the learning process, derivable from information about the effective and cognitive factors such as personality, confidence, self-esteem, learners' wants with regard to the learning of English and their individual cognitive styles" (Brindley, 1989, p.70).

Still another dichotomy is related to need types, which are situational and communicative. Situational needs refer to the general parameters of a language program. They involve the goals, expectations, learning styles, and proficiency levels of learners, while communicative needs refer to the learners' requirements in the target situation. The latter is concerned with the setting in which the language will be used and the roles of the learners in this specific target situation (Richards, 1990).

Other scholars have referred to situation and language needs. Brown states that in language teaching, some information should center on the programs' human

aspects, that is, the physical, social, and psychological contexts in which learning take place. Needs concerning such information is known as situation needs. The second type of information concerns the target linguistic behaviors that the students need to acquire at the end of a program (Brown, 1995). Information in this group will include the specification of the contexts in which the language will be used. Brown's definition of target needs is closely associated with the characteristics of the terms target situation and communicative needs. The common point among these three is that they all put special emphasis on the target requirements of learners.

The last dichotomy refers to felt needs and perceived needs (Berwick, 1989). The former is related to the feelings, thoughts and assumptions of the learners. In other words, they are concerned with the "wants" and "desires" of learners (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). Perceived needs are the thoughts of experts about the educational gaps of learners.

Data Sources in Needs Analysis

Another fundamental decision that should be made before any needs analysis study takes place is the determination of stakeholders (Brown, 1995). In any situation where a needs analysis is being undertaken, there are different stakeholders who have a particular interest or involvement in the issues or programs that are being examined. A stakeholder is a "person or a group of people with a right to comment on, and who have input into the curriculum process" (Richards, 2001, p.56). Different stakeholders may expect different things from the curriculum. According to Graves (2000), a needs analysis should include input not only from students but also from people who are related to the course such as teachers, parents, employers, or administrators. Brown (1995) identifies the groups, which should be included in a needs analysis as the target group, audience, needs analysts, and resource groups and

he underlines the importance of their equally being held responsible for the identification of needs in the curriculum development process.

The target group is comprised of those about whom information will be gathered, such as the language learners or potential language learners. However, there may be others also involved in the study, depending on whether they can provide information useful in meeting the purpose of the needs analysis. This group is called the audience. Typically, in language programs, teachers or program administrators are the ones who will be consulted regarding the needs of the target group. The third group, which is known as the resource group consists of those who serve as additional sources of information about the target population. This group includes people such as academic specialists, employers, or parents. The final group is that of the needs analysts, who are responsible for conducting the study.

The determination of stakeholders depends largely on the scale of the study. If the population of the target group is small, different stakeholders may be included in the study in order to obtain data from various sources and triangulation method may be adopted. If it is a large-scale study, however, this approach may not be feasible and may make it necessary to select among the different stakeholders who will take part in the study (Brown, 1995). Since the aim of the current study was to determine the academic language requirements of students majoring in different departments at YTU and the number of participants was high, it was not possible to include different stakeholders. Therefore, data were collected only through the perspectives of content teachers on their learners' objective needs.

Gathering information in needs analysis studies

Needs analysts can benefit from a variety of procedures while conducting their studies. Once they have clarified which approach will be adopted and what kind

of information will be collected, the next step that should be followed is the actual collection of data by using pre-determined techniques. According to Brown (1995), these procedures are classified as follows: gathering existing information, tests, observations, interviews, meetings, and questionnaires.

The first category refers to the collection of data about existing information. This procedure is used to make use of any preexisting information that is available within the current program or external information that can be gathered from other existing programs with similar student profiles. Preexisting information may be collected by looking at records of current or past years' students, teachers' evaluations, or textbooks. External information can be obtained by evaluating the literature in order to find out similar programs with similar aims. Library resources in the forms of books and journals can also be used to provide data about similar programs with similar learner profiles.

Brown regards tests, as an inevitable source of information in needs analysis studies. Information can be obtained about the general language ability and the levels of students by means of different types of tests such as placement, proficiency, diagnosis, and achievement tests.

Observation is another way of gathering data about the target group. This process involves watching a learner or a group of learners and recording their behaviors. The behaviors of interest are related to language and classroom behaviors. There are a variety of procedures that can be applied in observations, such as case studies, diary studies, behavior observation procedures, or interactional and inventory procedures (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001).

Another type of information gathering instrument, which is very extensively used in needs analysis studies is interviews. Interviews can either be done

individually or in groups. Individual interviews allow the analyst to gather data from participants on their personal responses and views. Group interviews are sometimes preferred to avoid the time constraints of individual interviews. Similarly, meetings may be held to collect data. Meetings differ from group interviews in terms of their purposes. A needs analyst can hold different meetings such as advisory meetings, interest group meetings and review meetings to obtain the necessary data.

Questionnaires are perhaps the most common instrument for collecting data, and may help to provide useful information on the needs of students. They are especially regarded as practical in large-scale studies, since they are relatively easy to prepare and can be used with large numbers of subjects. For achieving different purposes, different forms of questionnaires may be preferred such as biodata surveys, opinion surveys, self-ratings, or judgmental ratings. (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001). The instrument of the current survey was a questionnaire that explored the opinions of disciplinary teachers concerning two different issues at YTU: their opinions on the academic language requirements of their undergraduate students in their disciplines and their opinions on English-medium instruction at the tertiary level.

In the last stage of a needs analysis, the data gathered by means of one of the procedures mentioned in the previous section are analyzed to obtain results of the research. The next step following analysis is the interpretation of results and discussion. The analysis and interpretation of the results need to be reported in order to benefit the curriculum development process.

Similar Needs Analysis Studies

There is a great number of needs analysis studies in the literature. Most of the institutions are in favor of implementing language courses, which can meet the needs of their learners. Although the aim of all these studies is the same, since they all aim at finding out the language requirements of their particular students and understanding their own contexts, they often differ from each other in terms of the procedures used. The participant groups, the type of instruments used, the kind of information that is sought for can make one study different from the others. In the rest of this section, two sample local studies similar to the current study in terms of their participants will be discussed (Arık, 2002; Çelik, 2003).

Arık's study investigated the academic English language requirements of students studying in different faculties and vocational high schools of Niğde University (NU). His study aimed at finding out whether there was any significant difference between the academic language requirements of students according to different disciplines. He collected his data by means of a questionnaire, which was completed by 177 content teachers. His findings revealed that all content teachers working at NU believe in the importance of English in the academic studies of their learners and reading was the most important skill required for students academic studies. The remaining skills were not required for the academic studies of the learners. Arık's study is the only study in the literature, which is similar in scope to the current study. Both studies' focus is on the academic requirements of students and they investigate their data through perspectives of content teachers.

Çelik conducted his study in the Office Management and Secretarial Studies departments of Niğde University's Vocational High Colleges. His study aimed at finding out the occupational and academic language requirements of learners from

the perspectives of currently enrolled students, former students, content teachers, and employers. His participant group mainly differs from Arık's and the current study in that he tried to gather data through triangulation method and included many resource groups in his study. He used four different questionnaires to collect data. His results revealed that a new curriculum was required for the students studying in Office Management departments and reading and speaking were the two skills that should be priority in the curricula of these departments.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the academic language requirements of students majoring in different departments at Yıldız Technical University (YTU) through the perspectives of their content teachers. YTU is a Turkish-medium university, where the students are required to attend English courses for three years after their compulsory preparatory class education. The medium of instruction at YTU has recently been switched from partial English to full Turkish. Due to this recent change in the language policy, in addition to identifying the English language requirements of students at YTU, the secondary aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes of content teachers towards English and Turkish medium instruction and the change in the language policy at YTU. The study was considered to provide an opportunity to evaluate the current English language programs by considering whether the existing English programs fulfill the academic language demands of different departments at YTU. Therefore, the data obtained from this study were intended to serve for guiding possible changes in the current language program. In addition to this, the results of the current study aimed to provide a general understanding about the attitudes of content teachers towards the decision to discontinue English-medium instruction at YTU.

Setting

Yıldız Technical University is a Turkish- medium University, where the language of instruction has recently been changed into full Turkish from 30 % partial English. Although the medium of instruction has been changed into Turkish, there is a still compulsory English preparatory program for all students, whose English level is insufficient to allow admittance to the advanced classes given after preparatory class education. At YTU, students who have been exempted from preparatory classroom education or those who have completed this education successfully are required to attend advanced English courses simultaneously with their departmental studies. These English courses are given over six terms in three years, the first two years of which are taught by English instructors of the Modern Languages Department (MLD), and the last year of which is given by the content teachers in their departments. The content of the third year English courses is based on the terminology of the discipline required for the students in their academic studies. The aim of the first two years of advanced courses is to improve students' academic language skills, which the students will need to use throughout their academic studies for different purposes. The English Language Department (ELD) prepares the content of these courses and joint schedules are followed for all disciplines without considering any differences among disciplines.

YTU consists of eight faculties and two vocational high schools. The vocational high schools were not included in the scope of this study, since the language programs given in these high schools are quite different from the language programs offered in the faculties. Because the vocational high schools provide only two-year training, there is no compulsory preparatory class education and students are given English courses only at the basic level. In this study, the focus was on the

faculties, which provide a four-year training program to their students. Table 1 lists the eight faculties of YTU.

Table 1

Faculties at YTU

Faculties at YTU
Faculty of Electric and Electronic Engineering
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering
Faculty of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering
Faculty of Architecture
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Faculty of Arts and Design

The current study was conducted in all eight faculties of YTU, since students of all these faculties are required to attend the same English language courses provided by the ELD. In the remainder of this chapter information will be given about the participants, the instrument, the data collection and data analysis procedures.

Participants

The participants of this study were the content teachers currently working in the different faculties of YTU. Although the language requirements of students are collected by means of questionnaires given to language instructors and students as part of the English Language Department's annual evaluations, the content teachers at YTU have never been consulted in terms of their perceptions of their students' English language needs in their departments. Only lecturers who were responsible for teaching full courses were given the questionnaire, as some parts were based on classroom practices. Research assistants who assist in the laboratory sessions and do not have experience in teaching content courses were not included in the scope of this study.

There are 400 content teachers currently working in the different faculties at YTU. The survey instrument was distributed to all of these lecturers and 254 of them completed it. Table 2 provides information about the number of the participants according to departments.

Table 2

The Distribution of the Participants according to Departments

	Name of the department	F	P
Faculty of Electric and Electronics	Computer Engineering	5	2.0
	Electric Engineering	13	5.1
	Electronic Engineering	5	2.0
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	Industrial Engineering	5	2.0
	Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering	5	2.0
	Mechanical Engineering	21	8.3
Faculty of Civil Engineering	Environment Engineering	11	4.3
	Civil Engineering	31	12.2
	Geodetic and Photogrammetic Engineering	17	6.7
Faculty of Metallurgical Engineering	Mathematical Engineering	12	4.7
	Metallurgical Engineering	6	2.4
Faculty of Architecture	Architecture	36	14.2
	City Planning	11	4.3
Faculty of Economics And Administrative Sciences	Economics	7	2.8
	Business Administration	8	3.1
	Political Science and International Relations	8	3.1
Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Physics	14	5.5
	Statistics	5	2.0
	Chemistry	13	5.1
	Mathematics	15	5.9
Faculty of Art and Design	Integrated Arts	6	2.4
	Total	254	100

Note: F: Frequency, P: Percentage

Instrument

The study was conducted in the eight faculties of YTU via a questionnaire. The time constraints of the study, the high number of the participants and the researcher's desire to provide a general understanding of the needs of students in all departments were all critical factors in the decision to use a questionnaire as the tool for data collection. A single questionnaire including different sections was used in order to gather data about the two different but equally important purposes of this study: The perceptions of content teachers on the academic language use requirements of the students in their departments and their attitudes towards English medium-instruction at tertiary level.

The questionnaire was initially prepared in English and then was translated into Turkish by the researcher. A current MA TEFL student translated the first draft of the questionnaire back into English in order to ensure that there was a match between the Turkish and English versions of the questionnaire. Comparisons were then made between the two translations and those parts containing mismatches were discussed to form the final version of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was given in Turkish to the participants in order to prevent time constraints and potential comprehension problems.

In order to ensure that the questionnaire did not have any parts causing misunderstandings or ambiguities, a pilot study was done at YTU on 18 March 2004. The questionnaire was given to 20 research assistants working in different departments to check the face and content validity of the instrument. The research assistants were asked to answer the questions and then informal interviews were conducted with 10 of the respondents concerning questions or parts causing misunderstandings or difficulties. The research assistants were also asked to

comment on the length of the questionnaire and the time it took to complete. After the piloting, the questionnaire was revised according to the feedback received from the respondents.

The instrument was prepared by consulting the existing questionnaires used in previous similar studies (Arık, 2002; Atay, 2000; Çelik, 2003; Gündüz, 1999; Somer, 2001), and then by making necessary adaptations and additions in consideration of the context in which it would be administered. There were 90 items on the questionnaire, which were arranged around 27 basic questions. The questionnaire consisted of Yes/ No, rank order, multiple response, Likert-scale, and open-ended questions. Table 3 presents the sections of the questionnaire and the number of questions in each section.

Table 3

Number of Questions in the Questionnaire in terms of Sections

	Demographic Information	Attitudes towards English-medium	Language Skills			
			RD	WR	LIS	SP
N	9	10	2	2	2	2

Note: N: Number of the questions, RD: Reading, WR: Writing, LIS: Listening, SP: Speaking

As can be seen in Table 3, there are basically three main sections in the questionnaire. The first section consists of questions that provide background information about the respondents. The nine questions in this section are mainly based on the information concerning the faculties and the departments where the participants work, the participants' professional experience, their teaching experience at YTU, their current title and, if they have any, information about their previous academic research such as the number of the academic articles they have published in Turkish, English, or other languages.

The second section in the questionnaire consists of ten questions, which provide data about the attitudes of content teachers towards teaching in English. In this section, questions are asked to participants concerning the role of English in their undergraduate students' academic lives and questions about whether and why they believe it is necessary for the students to learn English. The respondents are also asked to rank order the English language skills of reading, writing, listening, speaking and translation in terms of their importance for undergraduate students' success in their department. There are also some questions concerning their personal language preferences while teaching their content courses, whether they have current or previous experience in teaching content courses in English, and, if they have such experience, the problems they observe that their students encounter in the content courses given in English.

The third section in the questionnaire is based on specific language skills. There are four sub-sections concerning the four basic skills in English: Section A, Reading; Section B, Writing; Section C, Listening; Section D, Speaking. In each subsection, two questions are asked to participants about the extent to which their students need that language skill in their undergraduate academic studies and for what purposes they will use it. Most of the questions in these sections are multiple response questions offering participants a chance to choose more than one option if they would like. Under each multiple response question, participants are asked to add any other points concerning the issue in the question if it is missing among the given options.

In all the sections of the questionnaire, there were Likert-scale questions offering the same options to the respondents. The respondents were given chance to choose options ranging from (1) "very important" to (4) "not important". Thus, the

interpretations of the means of the responses for this type of Likert-scale question was done according to the scale below:

Likert-scale Choice Scale (Arık, 2002)

1. Very Important: mean values between 1.00 and 1.75
2. Important: mean values between 1.76 and 2.50
3. Not very Important: mean values between 2.51 and 3.25
4. Not important: mean values between 3.26 and 4.00

In order to determine the overall reliability of the instrument of the survey, the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was calculated by using a Cronbach's alpha test. A value of 0.81 was found, indicating the high reliability of the instrument as a whole.

Procedures

In order to conduct this study, the researcher first talked to the head of the English Department at YTU and on 26 January 2004 got approval to conduct the study. The head of the department informed the researcher about the official procedures that should be applied in the process of conducting research in the departments of the institution. On 5 March 2004, the researcher petitioned for official permission to conduct the study, made appointments with the head of the departments and informed them about the study on 18 March 2004. With the help of the department secretaries, each faculty member was informed about the questionnaire. The researcher personally delivered the packs of questionnaires to department secretaries and got their help in the distribution of the questionnaires, particularly in crowded departments, on 29 March 2004. Content teachers were given one week to complete the questionnaires, which were then collected by the researcher from the department secretaries.

Data Analysis

The items in the questionnaire were analyzed by means of different statistical tests. However, all the data gathered via the questionnaire were computed and analyzed by using The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 9.0).

The data reported were analyzed first by using descriptive statistical techniques including percentages and frequencies. The calculations of frequencies and percentages provided the researcher with the general information about the perceptions of the participants. Then the means and the standard deviations of some of the items were also calculated to determine the extent of agreement among the responses of participants. Then further statistical analyses were applied in certain sections of the questionnaire, particularly in the section concerning the language requirements of students, which aimed at finding whether there were any significant differences among disciplines in terms of the importance of different language skills or not. This further analysis included the use of Chi-squares and ANOVA Tests, along with post hoc Tukey tests. The reason underlying the use of Chi-squares was to find out whether there were any significant differences among the respondents in terms of their answers to the certain question items, ANOVAs and post hoc Tukey tests were used in order to confirm and then find out which faculty or discipline(s) caused any significant variance found. For some of the questions, the frequencies were calculated by using Crosstabs in order to see the distribution of the responses in terms of disciplines. This made it easier for the researcher to make interpretations concerning variance among departments.

Conclusion

In this chapter, information about the location, participants, instruments, procedures and the data analysis of the study was given. In the next section, the data will be analyzed in terms of the data analysis procedures summarized in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

Overview of the study

The study was intended to investigate the academic English language needs of students majoring in different disciplines at Yıldız Technical University (YTU) through the perspectives of their content teachers. The primary aim of this study was to find out whether there were any differences or similarities among the language demands of different disciplines in order to make an overall evaluation of the existing courses and to determine the English language skills that should be given priority in the curricula of the English language programs. The secondary aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes of content teachers in different disciplines towards English medium instruction in general and towards the recent shift in the language of instruction at YTU.

In this chapter, the data are presented by grouping the questions under certain headings in terms of their content. In the first part, data about the personal and professional background of the respondents are analyzed in order to provide general information about the participants. In the second part, question items concerning disciplinary teachers' attitudes towards English in general, English-medium instruction and the change in the medium of instruction at YTU are analyzed. The last section includes data analysis procedures concerning the language requirements of students in terms of specific language skills.

Information Gathered about the Respondents through Demographic Data

By means of the second and third questions, data were gathered about the professional experience of respondents both in their specific fields and at YTU. Although there are a few respondents who did not answer these questions, most of the participants answered the concerning questions. The teaching experience of respondents is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Teaching Experience

Number of Years	Total Professional		YTU	
	F	P	F	P
Less than 1 year	0	0.0	1	0.4
1-5 years	10	4.0	27	10.7
6-10 years	25	10.0	41	16.2
11-15 years	65	25.9	69	27.3
16-20 years	60	23.9	53	20.9
More than 20 years	91	36.3	62	24.5
Total	251	100.0	253	100.0

Note: F: Frequency, P: Percentage

The question concerning particularly the respondents' experience at YTU was included to indicate the respondents' familiarity with the previous system of content instruction at YTU in terms of language of instruction. Obviously, the respondents, whose experience at YTU is at least more than one year, were in a better position to judge the shift from partial English to full Turkish medium instruction. These individuals may also have taught some of their courses in English, since in the previous years it was obligatory to teach at least 30% of content courses in English in all departments. Only one participant reported having taught less than one year at YTU.

The fourth question in this section provides the readers with more information about the qualifications of the respondents, by asking about their current academic titles. The positions of the respondents at YTU are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Current Academic Titles of Respondents

Title	F	P
Professor	68	26.9
Associate Professor	44	17.4
Assistant Professor	88	34.8
Instructor	37	14.6
Specialist	1	0.4
Other	15	5.9
Total	253	100.0

Note: F: Frequency, P: Percentage

When the percentages in the Tables 4 and 5 are evaluated, it can be concluded that the participants of the current study consisted largely of experienced lecturers, with more than 70% reporting having taught between ten and twenty years. Approximately 80% of the participants were senior staff with academic titles. Assistant professors come first in the ranking list at 35% and professors closely follow them at 27%. Based on these data, we can say that the information collected through the perspectives of these participants is worth considering as they have been working at YTU for a long time and are familiar with the language programs provided by the English Language Department.

Questions 6-9, concerning the academic publications of the lecturers, were asked in order to gather information about the number of the articles the respondents have written in Turkish, English, or any other foreign languages. The rationale behind asking these questions was to find out the general tendency of content teachers towards the use of any foreign language in their academic publications and thus provide useful insights on the importance of foreign languages in academic

research. Two hundred and thirty-nine respondents, or 94%, stated that they had published articles in their fields. Unfortunately, there were a number of missing answers in this section. This may partly be related to the respondents' not remembering the exact number of their articles. This was a problem the researcher witnessed personally in informal interviews with, in particular, senior scholars whose academic publications were higher in number. According to the results, 188 disciplinary teachers, or 79% of the respondents, stated that they had articles published in Turkish. Similarly, the number of content teachers who had articles written in English was relatively high. Two hundred and nine, or 87% of the respondents, stated that they had written articles in English. Some respondents cited articles written in other languages, however, the percentage of these respondents, 13%, is relatively low. Some of the other languages noted were German, French, Russian, and Greek. Overall, the data gathered in this section confirmed that content teachers find it important to use English and other languages in their writing up of research studies.

Attitudes of Disciplinary Teachers towards English and English-medium Instruction and the Shift in the Language of Instruction at YTU

In this section, the results of eight questions are reported about content teachers' opinions concerning English and English-medium instruction. The respondents were asked to give their opinions on whether they regard English important for the academic studies of learners during their undergraduate studies, the reasons they have put forth if they think English is important, their experience in teaching content lessons in English, whether there are any content courses which are currently being taught in English in their department, their opinions towards the recent change in the language of instruction at YTU, their language of instruction

preferences while teaching content lessons, and the reasons which justify their language choices.

The responses to question 10 provide a basic picture of what the scholars at YTU think about the importance of English for the academic studies of undergraduate students majoring in their departments. The results are reported below in Table 6.

Table 6

Importance of English in the Content-based Studies of Students

	VI (1)		I (2)		NVI (3)		NI (4)		M	SD
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P		
The Importance of English in students' content studies	89	35.3	135	53.6	23	9.1	5	2	1.78	0.69

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not Very Important, NI: Not Important, M: Mean, SD: Standard Deviation.

By considering the data in Table 6, it is clear that the majority of content teachers at YTU believe in the importance of English in the academic studies of the undergraduate students studying in their departments. Two hundred and twenty four participants out of 250, or 89% of the total number, believe that English is 'important' or ' very important' in the students' content-based studies. When the mean (1.78) and the standard deviation (0.69) of the question are evaluated, we see first that there is not a large difference in terms of the distribution of the responses. The mean of the responses is within the range corresponding to 'important' and ' very important', and thus this reflects that the majority of the respondents believe very much that their students need English.

Question item 11 follows up on the previous question by asking the respondents why they think that English is important for their learners. Question 11 offers the respondents the possibility to choose their reasons from multiple options.

This question is an optional question, as those respondents with negative opinions on the importance of English for their students were instructed to skip to question 12. In total, 223 participants answered this question.

The analysis of this question item was done through multiple response analysis. The distribution of the selection of question items was analyzed by taking into account whether an option was ticked or not ticked by the respondents. Table 7 presents the options that were ticked, and ranks them according to the number of times selected.

Table 7

Reasons Provided for the Importance of English (Rank Order)

Reasons for learning English	F	P
To follow the new developments in their discipline	214	96
To read materials in English	204	92
To pursue M.A or PhD degrees	124	56
To attend conferences	114	51
To be accepted for job/apprenticeship in the companies	85	38
To be considered as professional in their disciplines	55	25
To help Turkey's modernization and globalization	50	22
To help Turkey's admittance to European Union	23	10
Other reasons	10	4

Note: F: Number of the ticked responses, P: percentage of the responses in total

When the data in Table 7 are evaluated, it can be concluded that a great majority of the content teachers agree on the importance of academic English for their learners, since the options which were commonly preferred by the respondents were all related to academic purposes. Most of the respondents (96%) felt it was necessary for their students to learn English in order to follow the latest developments and innovations in their subject matter. Directly related to this, they felt that students needed to have adequate knowledge in English in order to gain access to materials written in English. In addition to understanding new developments and materials written in English, and thus enabling learners' easy

access to the innovations in their academic discourse, a majority of respondents, 56%, agreed on the importance of English for undergraduate students to continue on to the M.A. or Ph.D. studies. This choice can be explained by the fact that all M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Turkey include English or another foreign language competence as a prerequisite for admittance. Another academic-related option, which ranks among the top options in the table, is about students' need to learn English in order to attend conferences that are held in English. This is also closely related to pursuing developments in the field.

Some other reasons that were put forth to indicate the importance of English for learners are that 38% of the responses show that students need to learn English in order to be accepted for jobs or apprenticeship in companies. Twenty-five percent of the responses indicate that students need to learn English in order to be accepted professionals in their field in the future. The two options ranking lowest in the table are those related to the effect of English on Turkey's globalization and on its admittance to the European Union. Only 32% of the responses indicate that these options are among the reasons for students' need to learn English. The reasons for the low frequency of the last two options in the table may be explained by comments made during the informal interviews held with the respondents. While filling out the instrument, some of the respondents expressed their opinions that there is not a direct relation between Turkey's globalization, its admittance to the European Union, and Turks' language competence. They expressed other factors, such as political issues, which they thought to have a much greater effect than educational issues.

Questions Related to English Usage at YTU

Questions 13 and 14 were related to whether the content teachers have had any experience in teaching their courses in English, and whether there are any

courses in their departments currently being taught in English. Table 8 presents results for these two questions.

Table 8

Disciplinary Teachers' Experience in Teaching their Courses in English and Courses Given in English-medium

Question Items 13 and 14	YES		NO	
	F	P	F	P
Q13: Have you ever taught content courses in English?	55	21.7	199	78.3
Q14: Are there any content courses still being taught in English in your department?	234	92.1	20	7.9

Note: F: Frequency, P: Percentage

When the data in the preceding table are considered, it can easily be seen that a great majority of the content teachers have not had any experience in teaching in English. One hundred and ninety-nine teachers (78%) stated that they have never taught their content lessons in English. Only fifty-four participants, approximately 22%, reported having used English as the medium of instruction in their lessons. In looking this data, one may think that there is not a demand from the departments for the use of English in the content courses; however, the results for question 14 suggest some contradictory insights concerning the issue.

According to the data presented in Table 8, two hundred and thirty-four respondents, or 92% of the participants, stated that there are still courses being given in English in their departments. In order to find out which departments do not give any of their courses in English, the frequency of Question 14 is calculated again by using Crosstabs. Table 9 shows the distribution of the responses for questions 13 and 14 in terms of faculties.

Table 9

Distribution of Disciplinary Teachers Giving their Courses in English and the Departments that Provide English-medium Courses

Department Name	Q13		Q14	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Computer Engineering	2	3	5	0
Electric Engineering	2	11	13	0
Electronic and Communication Engineering	1	4	5	0
Physics	3	11	13	1
Statistics	3	2	5	0
Chemistry	1	12	13	0
Mathematics	1	14	12	3
Industrial Engineering	2	3	5	0
Naval Architecture and marine Engineering	3	2	5	0
Mechanical Engineering	3	18	19	2
Architecture	8	28	28	8
City and Landscape Planning	1	10	11	0
Economics	5	2	7	0
Business Administration	2	6	8	0
Political Science and International Relations	5	3	8	0
Environment Engineering	3	8	11	0
Civil Engineering	4	27	30	1
Geodetic and Photogrammetric Engineering	1	16	17	0
Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	1	5	6	0
Mathematical Engineering	3	9	11	1
Integrated Arts	1	5	2	4

Note:
Q13: Have you ever taught content courses in English?
Q14: Are there any content courses still being taught in English in your department?

When the data in Table 9 are considered, we can see that all departments at YTU have content courses reportedly still being given in English. This seems somewhat unusual since so few teachers report ever having taught in English. By considering these results one might ask who is responsible for teaching these courses. A possible answer is that there may be a limited number of teachers in each department to teach these courses. Table 9 reveals other apparent contradictions, as in cases when teachers in the same department report conflicting responses. For instance, in the responses of the Integrated Arts Department, we can see that two of the instructors stated that there are English content courses in their department but

four others stated the opposite. The reason for this contradiction may be related to some of the respondents' comprehending the question wrongly or some of the departments' being very large and encompassing several branches. It may be possible that in some of the branches of the department English content courses are given, but not in others. Within the informal interviews, some of the lecturers from the Arts and Design Faculty stated that they do not need to give courses in English, since the success of their students in their faculty depends solely on their performance in most lessons. For instance, one of the respondents from the Arts and Design faculty stated that he gives piano lessons and there is no need even to talk in Turkish while the students are practicing. This teacher may not be completely aware, however, of what the other department teachers are doing in their courses.

The following question items, questions 15-18, provided information about the attitudes of content teachers towards English-medium instruction, and thus sought to respond to the third research question of the study. In question 15, participants were asked whether they approved or disapproved of the change in language of instruction from partial English to full Turkish- medium instruction at YTU. The results for this question are provided in the Table 10 below.

Table 10

Attitudes of Disciplinary Teachers towards the Change in the Medium of Instruction at YTU

	APPROVE		DISAPPROVE	
	F	P	F	P
Q15- What do you think about the change in the language policy of YTU from 30% to full Turkish instruction?	191	75.2	63	24.8

Note: F: Frequency, P: Percentage

All the participants involved in the study answered question 15 and significant results were obtained from the data in terms of the third research question.

One hundred and ninety-one respondents, or 75% of all participants, stated that they approved of the shift in the language of instruction. In other words, they are pleased with the shift away from English-medium instruction, and prefer 100% Turkish medium.

When the data for question 16 are considered, readers may have a clearer picture of the content teachers' views about the language of instruction. Question 16 searches for more detailed information about the language preferences of content teachers while they are teaching their courses. In this question, several options are provided for the respondents, however, they are asked to choose only that option which best identifies their choices in classroom practice. The data about the language preferences of content teachers are presented below in Table 11.

Table 11

Language Preferences of Content Teachers in Classroom Practice

Q16: Which of the following statements reflects how you feel when teaching content courses?	F	P
I use only Turkish and I am happy with it.	149	58.7
I use only English but I wish I could teach in Turkish	3	1.2
I use both English and Turkish but I wish I could teach only in Turkish.	23	9.1
I use only English and I am pleased with it.	3	1.2
I use only Turkish but I wish I could teach in English	32	12.6
I use both Turkish and English but I wish I could teach only in English.	4	1.6
I use both Turkish and English and I am pleased with this.	33	13
Other	7	2.8

Note: F: Frequency, P: Percentage

The data presented in Table 11 were evaluated by means of grouping the questions in three groups: those who are in favor of using Turkish, those who prefer using English and those who prefer using both languages depending on the situation. In looking at the data above, we can say that approximately 69% of the respondents stated positive opinions on the side of Turkish-medium instruction. In this group, one

hundred and forty-nine respondents, or 58.7%, stated that they use only Turkish in their classes and they are happy with it. There are also three people who use only English but would rather be using Turkish. Since English is not compulsory for the content courses in any of the department any more, their statement seems rather odd. The reasons underlying their statements may be related to their being the only lecturers in their department who have adequate competence to teach content courses in English. If this is the case, they may be asked to give courses in English although they are not willing to do so. In the same group, among the respondents who prefer using Turkish, a fair number of participants, about 9%, stated that they use both languages in their classroom practice but they would prefer to use Turkish only. One conclusion that may be derived from their statement is that these respondents presumably experience certain problems in their teaching process such as potential comprehension problems of students, or their own personal problems while using English.

In the second group, there are some respondents in favor of using English only. There are three respondents who are in favor of using English and happy with it. Some respondents, 12.6%, report that they use only Turkish but would rather be using English. It seems apparent from their statements that these respondents are obliged to use Turkish in their classroom practice although they are not in favor of it. They may not be teaching in English due to administrative restrictions in their department or the content of their subject or possible comprehension problems of students mentioned above. There are also four respondents using both Turkish and English in their courses but who claim that they would prefer only English if possible. While conducting the survey, the researcher had a chance to talk to a respondent from the Economics department who stated that he would use only

English in his courses if it were possible. He felt however that his students became stuck at a certain level in his courses if he insisted on using only English. He added that his students avoid answering questions and participating in discussions just because of their lack of competence in English. He said that he solved such problems by holding discussions in Turkish to make a general summary of the content.

In the last group there are thirty-three respondents, about 13%, reporting that they use both Turkish and English in their courses and they are happy with it. Again according to informal talks with the participants, it actually appears that these respondents largely prefer using Turkish in their courses, however, they like to keep open the possibility of incorporating English at certain points in order to make their students familiar with the terminology of their subject matter. Some of the respondents also reported that they assigned some tasks to their students in English in order to make their students do some practice in English. Apart from Turkish and English, seven content teachers, who ticked the 'others' option on the questionnaire, stated that they prefer using other languages, while teaching such as German or French, if students in their group had taken German or French as a social elective course at YTU.

According to their answers to Q16, respondents were asked to provide further details on their reasons for their preferred language of instruction in questions 17 and 18. Respondents reporting to prefer Turkish were asked to answer Q17, and those preferring English were asked to respond to Q18. Both Q17 and Q18 are multiple response questions offering respondents the possibility of choosing more than one option. The distribution of the selection of the question items was analyzed by taking into account whether the option was ticked or not ticked by the

respondents. Table 12 presents the options that were ticked, and ranks them according to the number of times selected.

Table 12

Reasons Underlying the Choice of Turkish as the Medium of Instruction

Q17: If you prefer to teach your content courses in Turkish, what are your reasons?	F	P
Learning in one's mother tongue is better	192	77.4
To help Turkish develop as a science language	140	56.5
Students' inadequacy in English	68	27.4
Departmental requirements on the side of Turkish	38	15.3
Personal inadequacy in English	32	12.9
Other reasons	26	10.5

Note: F: Number of the ticked responses, P: Percentage of responses in total

According to the data presented in Table 12, the most frequently checked reason for their preference for Turkish instruction is based on the belief that students' being taught content courses in their mother tongue is better than their being taught in a foreign language. This option's having been ticked 196 times, 77%, reflects that a great majority of the respondents are in favor of instruction in the mother tongue. Within the informal interviews, some of the respondents stated the reasons underlying their beliefs. By depending on their in-class observations, they stated that instruction in English restricts students' thinking freely about the subject matter. They believe that instead of focusing on the topic, students focus on how to express themselves in the target language. With the fear of making mistakes in English, they avoid talking and expressing their ideas on the topic. One of the respondents summarized the problems of the students by saying that only by allocating the last twenty minutes of his course to Turkish is he able to get students to discuss the topic. When he does not summarize the subject in Turkish, he is generally greeted by silence. He also added that if he insists on using only English, students avoid asking questions or discussing the topic with him even if they have not understood the

content. Some of the other respondents stated that they see the usage of English in content courses as an obstacle, which demotivates students towards the course.

Others stressed that students' knowledge in their subject matter is more important than their competence in English and that even if students have an excellent competence in the target language, it is meaningless if the students' knowledge in their specific field is not adequate. One respondent complained that in most institutions, institutional priorities have been changed and they seem to give more importance to language education rather than content courses. Some of the other respondents agreed and made clear their feelings that language should be only an instrument in content-based studies, one that will serve for the greater improvement of students' knowledge in their subject matter. In other words, first a sound basis in terms of knowledge in a specific field should be laid in the native language, and then this knowledge should be improved by following innovations in the field via a foreign language. Since they felt, unfortunately this was not the case in Turkey, the result is students' being competent in neither their field nor in the target language.

The second most frequently ticked option was in support of the usage of Turkish as the medium of instruction in order to help its development as a science language. Orally, some of the respondents stated that if Turkish is not used as the language of instruction, then how can we expect technical terms to be incorporated into it? According to these content teachers, Turkish should be used instead of other languages in classroom practice and scholars should be encouraged to write their research in their native language. If necessary, they should be encouraged to find technical terms corresponding to the foreign terms.

The third most commonly selected choice was that students have inadequate knowledge in English and are therefore unable to follow the content courses when taught in English. This provides useful feedback about the success of students in practice after their preparatory and advanced English courses. Although not as frequently checked as the first two options, this result does suggest that the students are not meeting the content teachers' standards in terms of English preparation. Question 18 was designed to find out, from those reporting to use English instruction, their reasons for preferring to do so. In many cases the results mirror those found at the beginning of the survey on Q11. Table 13 provides information about which items were chosen more frequently in the list, and then ranks them according to the number of times selected again.

Table 13

Reasons Underlying the Choice of Using English as the Medium of Instruction

Q18: If you prefer to teach your students in English, what are your reasons?	F	P
So they can follow developments in their field by reading in English	54	91.5
So they can be successful in their profession	39	66.1
So they can pursue an M.A. or Ph.D. degree	38	64.4
So they can read education materials most of which are written in English	30	50.8
It is obligatory to teach in English	6	10.2
Other reasons	3	5.1

Note: F: Number of the ticked responses, P: Percentage of responses in total

Most of the respondents to this question checked the first option, which reflects the academic needs of students. Ninety-two percent of the respondents report that students need to follow the developments in their subject matter by reading in English. Another option, which is rated high on the list, is related to students' future careers. About 66% of the responses were given in support of the idea that students will need to know English in order to be successful in their profession and about the

same amount of responses indicates students' need to be taught in English in order to pursue M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. During the informal interviews, these respondents stated that students will need to use English some time in the future related to their occupation and the earlier they start learning it, the easier it will be for them to improve their knowledge in the target language. Approximately 51% of the given responses indicate that students will need to use English in order to gain access to the materials written in English. Concerning this option, some of the respondents stated that most of the materials related to their field are in English, which makes English knowledge a prerequisite for the learners in order to understand their content. Only a few respondents cited that their English usage in their classroom is related to the compulsory regulations of their departments on the usage of English in lessons.

Perceptions of Disciplinary Teachers about the Language Requirements of their Students in terms of Specific Language Skills

In this section, the results of ten questions concerning English language skills were discussed in order to determine the perceptions of content teachers about the language requirements of students in their departments. All the questions are based on the four Basic English language skills and translation. The data gathered from this part respond to the first and second research questions of the study.

Question 12 served to provide valuable data for the English Language Department for the evaluation of the existing language programs at YTU. In question 12, participants were asked to state their opinions on the particular language skills they find important for the academic success of the learners. Their answers were intended to provide both general and specific information about the language needs of the learners. Table 14 provides information about the language skills, which content teachers in general think are important for the students.

Table 14

Disciplinary Teachers' Opinions on the Importance of Certain Language Skills

Language Skill	VI		I		NVI		NI		M	SD
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P		
Reading	142	56.3	96	38.1	11	4.1	3	1.2	1.50	0.64
Writing	67	26.5	129	51	43	17	1	0.4	2.01	0.80
Listening	72	28.5	137	54.2	32	12.6	12	4.7	1.94	0.77
Speaking	46	18.1	148	58.3	42	16.7	16	6.3	2.11	0.77
Translation	109	43.1	120	47.4	22	8.7	2	0.8	1.67	0.67

Note: Q12: How important are the following language skills for success in your department?
VI: very important, I: important, NVI: not very important, NI: not important, M: mean, SD: standard deviation

When the results for reading skills are considered, it can be seen that 238 respondents stated that reading is important or very important for the students' success in their disciplines. This stands for approximately 94% of all respondents, which is a very high percentage. The high mean value (1.50) and the low standard deviation (0.64) of the question also confirm that most of the respondents chose options 1 and 2, which stand for 'very important', and 'important'. These results provide clear evidence for the English language Department that most content teachers would probably be in favor of reading courses.

One of the interesting findings of this study concerns translation. Two hundred and twenty-nine content teachers, approximately 91%, stated that translation skills were either important or very important for their students. By considering these data, we can say that after reading, translation is the second skill that should be given priority in the curricula of the language programs.

When the results concerning the remaining skills are evaluated, it can be said that they are also rated quite high by the respondents, though somewhat less so than reading and translation. One hundred and ninety-six respondents, or 76%, agreed on the importance of writing skill. Most of these respondents, however, chose option 2, which stands for 'important'. In comparison with reading, therefore, it can be

concluded that content teachers' priority is on the side of reading, which the majority consider as 'very important'. Among the responses in terms of writing, there are also 44 content teachers who stated negative opinions about the importance of writing by choosing options 3 and 4, which stand for 'not very important' and ' not important'.

With regard to data concerning listening and speaking skills, the results are similar to those of writing. Respondents again stated positive attitudes towards the importance of these skills for students' success in their disciplines. Two hundred and nine content teachers, i.e. 83% of the respondents, stated that listening is important or very important for the academic success of the learners. On the other hand, 44 respondents, or 17% of the participants, do not believe in the importance of listening in the success of students. Concerning speaking skills, 194, or 77%, of respondents reached a common consensus on the importance of this skill. Again though, a fairly large percentage, approximately 23% of the respondents, stated negative opinions on the importance of speaking.

Question 19 also sought information about language skills. It was designed for the respondents, who are currently using English as the medium of instruction in their content courses. The respondents were asked to rank order the given skills by considering the problems their students face in their lessons, giving a 1 to 'the most problematic skill' and a 4 to the least. Although all the respondents who teach in English were required to answer this question, some of the respondents left this question unanswered. This may have been related to the content teachers' being undecided about which skills cause more problems in their courses. Some of the other respondents interpreted the question inaccurately and wrote 1 for all the skills. Such responses were regarded as invalid and not included in the data. Table 15 presents the skills and how problematic they are thought to be for the students.

Table 15

Skills Causing the Most Problems for the Learners in their Content Courses

Q19: Problematic skills	MP		P		LP		NP	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
SPEAKING	31	72.1	8	18.6	1	2.3	3	7
WRITING	6	14	19	44.2	13	30.2	5	11.6
LISTENING	4	9.5	13	31	22	52.4	3	7.1
READING	3	7	2	4.7	5	11.6	33	76.7

Note: MP: most problematic, P: problematic, LP: less problematic, NP: not problematic

When the data presented in Table 15 are evaluated, it can be concluded that students are exhibiting to the content teachers more problems in productive skills than in receptive skills. According to the data, speaking is selected as the most problematic skill as thirty-nine respondents out of 43 placed it first. Similarly, 25 respondents considered writing as either 'problematic' or 'most problematic'. On the contrary, a general tendency has been observed towards the choice of reading as the least problematic skill. Thirty-eight respondents out of 43 rated reading as least problematic or next to least. Like reading, listening does not appear to cause as many problems for the students. Informally, the content teachers reported that they believe the students can follow what is being told in the classroom, but when the students need to produce the target language, they experience certain problems. There are some respondents who stated that students cannot express themselves well orally in English, and therefore, avoid talking in class. Similarly, they do not express their opinions in English properly if they are required to write something in English. Thus, some of the respondents stated that they prefer preparing multiple response questions for their courses due to their students' lack of proficiency in writing. They said that if they were to ask open-ended questions instead of multiple choices, most of the students would lose many of their points because of the errors they make in English.

In the last section of the questionnaire, the participants were first asked to respond to a series of questions about whether particular language skills were necessary for their undergraduate students' studies. Then, according to the answer they gave, they were asked to answer a complementary question for each skill. If they gave a negative response, they were asked to skip to the following question. Table 16 presents results for the four language skills.

Table 16

Necessary English Language Skills for Undergraduate Students at YTU

LANGUAGE SKILLS	YES		NO		χ^2
	F	P	F	P	
Q20-READING	205	80.7	49	19.3	8.87
Q22-WRITING	93	36.6	161	63.4	13.68
Q24-LISTENING	125	49.2	129	50.8	8.71
Q26-SPEAKING	101	39.8	152	59.8	4.82

Note: Q20/22/24/26: Is it necessary for the undergraduate students in your department to read/write/listen /speak in English for their academic work either in your course or other courses?
F: Frequency, %: Percentage, M: Mean, SD: Standard Deviation, χ^2: Chi-square

By considering the results in Table 16, we can see that most of the respondents agree on the importance of reading in the academic studies of the learners. These findings support the attitudes expressed in question 12 as well. Approximately 81%, or 205 of the respondents report that students need to use English reading skills in their courses. The other three skills, i.e. writing, listening, and speaking, have not been rated as important as reading. Particularly, writing and speaking skills are not thought to be required much for the content courses. Although negative opinions were stated about the need for listening by approximately 51% of the respondents, it is the second most highly rated skill. A subsequent Chi-square test on these results found no significance differences in responses according to the respondents' faculties. In other words, it can be understood that there are no

significantly different language demands between different faculties concerning their students' language needs.

Although there were no significant differences between the general language skills, clear differences among respondents did emerge when the focus turned to more specific purposes within each skills group. In the rest of this section, Questions 21, 23, 25, and 27 are analyzed in order to find out for what purposes the basic language skills are most needed. The results of this section are described using frequencies and percentages to show the distribution among responses. Furthermore, Chi-square tests were used to determine whether there was a significant difference in terms of the choices among the members of different faculties. Table 17 indicates the results of the subsections for question 21 concerning reading.

Table 17

Undergraduate Students' Needs for Reading Particular Genres

QUESTION 21	VI		I		NVI		NI		χ^2
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
Reading in general for their discipline	127	50	72	28.3	5	2	0	0	29.41
Reading English reference books	55	21.7	122	48	22	8.7	3	1.2	14.30
Reading reports	34	13.4	113	43.5	38	15	17	6.2	29.45
Reading articles from academic journals	57	22.4	86	33.9	51	20.1	8	3.1	48.41*
Interpreting tables/graphs	34	13.4	92	36.2	52	20.5	25	9.8	34.32
Reading lecture notes in English	34	13.4	83	32.7	66	26	18	7.1	40.44
Reading articles from weekly magazines	23	9.1	82	32.3	79	31.1	20	7.9	23.95
Reading instruction manuals/ booklets	19	7.5	79	31.1	65	25.6	40	15.7	48.41

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not Very Important, NI: Not Important

χ^2: Chi-square, *$p < .01$

According to the data presented in Table 17, 78% of the respondents state that it is important or very important for their students to do reading to gather information related to their subject matter. The other options that have been rated high on the list in terms of importance are again generally related to the students' improving themselves in their discipline. Most of the content teachers, approximately 70%, think that students need to use reference books written in English for their subject matter. Fifty-eight percent and 56% respectively find reports in English and articles from academic journals important for their students. Apart from these, nearly half of the respondents have stated that students need to improve their reading skills in order to comprehend the content of the lecture notes prepared in English. Presumably, those teachers who still prefer using English in their courses have selected this option. On the other hand the content teachers have not reported other options such as reading articles from weekly magazines and reading instruction manuals and booklets as being important.

In order to find out whether there are any significant differences among the demands of content teachers in terms of different faculties, Chi-square tests were applied on all the sub-headings of question 21. As can be seen in Table 17, there was variation among the responses of content teachers only to one question item concerning their views on reading articles from academic journals. In order to determine which faculties cause this variation, a One-way ANOVA test was applied to this question item. In Table 18, the ANOVA test results concerning this question item are presented.

Table 18

Results Indicating Variance among Respondents in terms of the Faculties

Question Item	N	M	SD	F
Q21e-Reading articles from academic journals	202	2.05	0.83	2.72*

Note: N: Number of the respondents, M: Mean, SD: Standard Deviation, F: Variance, *p ‹. 05

By means of the ANOVA test, a multiple comparison was made in terms of the faculties and it revealed that this variation derived from the different responses of content teachers working at the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences and the members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Faculty of Architecture, and Faculty of Metallurgical Engineering. Table 19 indicates the frequencies calculated through Crosstabs in order to show how many respondents from these faculties have stated the importance of articles from academic journals.

Table 19

The Distribution of Responses on Question Item 21e

Q21-Reading articles from academic journals					
Name of the faculty	VI	I	NVI	NI	Total
Faculty of Economics	14	5	2	0	21
Faculty of Arts and Sciences	6	13	12	3	34
Faculty of Architecture	10	14	6	4	34
Faculty of Metallurgical Eng.	2	9	6	0	17

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not very Important, NI: Not Important

When the results in Table 19 are considered, it can be seen that 90% of the content teachers at the Faculty of Economics have stated that reading articles from academic journals are important or very important. This result is in contrast with the degree of importance given by content teachers in the faculty of Architecture (71%), faculty of Metallurgical Engineering (68%), and the faculty of Arts and Sciences

(56%). Teachers from the faculty of Economics place greater emphasis on the importance of their students' following English-medium journals.

The next section looks at the responses of content teachers towards writing. The results of the various sub-sections are reported below in Table 20.

Table 20

Undergraduate Students' Needs for Writing Particular Genres

QUESTION 23	VI		I		NVI		NI		χ^2
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
Writing business letter/CV	26	28.3	54	58.7	8	8.7	4	4.3	20.26
Writing summaries/ abstracts	15	16.3	58	63.0	17	18.5	2	2.2	14.90
Writing reports in English	19	20.7	48	52.2	21	8.3	4	4.3	20.66
Preparing Presentations	23	25	37	40.2	26	28.3	6	6.5	23.50
Writing projects in English	15	16.3	42	45.7	28	30.4	7	7.6	36.01**
Writing research papers in English	22	23.9	33	35.9	20	21.7	17	18.5	19.40
Taking notes in class	11	12	40	43.5	26	28.3	15	16.3	17.58
Writing critiques to articles	11	12	39	42.3	30	32.6	12	13	19.08
Writing synthesis papers	10	11	27	29.7	32	35.2	22	24.2	25.42
Writing essays	9	9.8	25	27.2	37	40.2	21	22.8	36.39**
Writing laboratory reports	5	5.4	26	28.3	26	28.3	35	38	23.56
Writing descriptions of experiments	5	5.4	22	23.9	33	35.9	32	34.8	27.14

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not Very Important, NI: Not Important

χ^2: Chi-square, **p‹ .01

According to the results presented in Table 20, a great majority of the teachers (87%) have stated that being able to write business letters and CVs are important or very important for their undergraduate students. Similarly, many of the content teachers agree on the importance of students' having competence in writing

summaries or abstracts in English. A close percentage has also been determined for the option related to writing reports in English. Sixty-content teachers (73%) note the importance for their undergraduate students of writing reports in English. Following in importance are projects (62%), knowing how to take notes in English (56%) and writing critiques of articles (54%). The other options such as writing synthesis papers, essays, laboratory reports and descriptions of experiments have not been considered as important as the ones mentioned above, since the percentages of teachers finding them important are below 50.

When the Chi-square results in Table 20 are considered, a significant value is found related to the writing of essays. Although this option is considered important by only 37% of the respondents, a further analysis has been done in order to determine the faculties causing this variation. Table 21 below represents the One-way ANOVA results concerning this option.

Table 21

Results Indicating Variance among Respondents in terms of the Faculties

Question Item	N	M	SD	F
Q23a-Writing essays in English	92	1.63	0.48	3.92*

Note: N: Number of the respondents, M: Mean, SD: Standard Deviation, F: Variance, *p ‹. 05

A difference is seen again among the respondents of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences and the teachers of other faculties, such as Electric and Electronics, Arts and Science, Mechanical Engineering, Architecture and Civil Engineering. In order to understand in what ways the responses differ from each other, the distribution of the responses in terms frequencies calculated by Crosstabs is given below.

Table 22

The Distribution of Responses on Question Item 23a

Q23a-Writing essays in English					
Name of the faculty	VI	I	NVI	NI	Total
Faculty of Economics	5	4	1	0	10
Faculty of Arts and Sciences	1	5	6	4	16
Faculty of Architecture	0	4	6	5	15
Faculty of Civil Eng.	1	5	3	6	15
Faculty of Mechanical Eng.	1	2	10	4	17

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not very Important, NI: Not Important

As can be seen from Table 22, the responses of the content teachers working in the Faculty of Economics differ significantly from the other faculties. Nine out of 10 respondents (90%) in this faculty state that writing essays is important for their students. In the other faculties, between 60% and 82% of the teachers have indicated this option as unimportant.

The next section looks at the responses of content teachers towards listening. The results of the various sub-sections are reported below in Table 23.

Table 23

Undergraduate Students' Listening Needs

QUESTION 25	VI		I		NVI		NI		χ^2
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
Understanding discussions/seminars presentations	48	38.7	70	56.5	6	4.8	0	0.0	16.24
Understanding English lectures in class	62	50.0	52	41.9	6	4.8	4	3.2	35.63
Understanding daily conversations in English	30	24.4	70	56.9	21	17.1	2	1.6	28.33
Understanding authentic materials	29	23.4	68	54.8	23	18.5	4	3.2	30.79

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not Very Important, NI: Not Important,
χ^2 : Chi-square,

According to the results presented in Table 23, most of the respondents (95.2%) agree on the importance of students' developing their listening skills adequately enough to listen to and understand discussions, seminars, presentations given in English. Similarly, most of the content teachers (92%) have stated that students need to be able to understand lectures given in English. They have also stated strongly that students' listening competence in English should be good enough to understand daily conversations and authentic materials in English, the former with a percentage of 81%, and the latter with 78%. When the results concerning the Chi-square tests are evaluated, no significant difference is seen among the responses of the content teachers in terms of different faculties.

The next section looks at the responses of content teachers towards listening. The results of the various sub-sections are reported below in Table 24.

Table 24

Undergraduate Students' Speaking Needs

QUESTION 27	VI		I		NVI		NI		χ^2
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
Asking and answering questions in English	43	42.6	57	56.4	1	1.0	0	0.0	12.28
Talking to foreign colleagues about their discipline	39	38.6	61	60.4	1	1.0	0	0.0	12.93
Participating in discussions	20	19.8	60	59.4	18	17.8	3	3.0	18.05
Making presentations in English	27	26.7	51	50.5	14	13.9	9	8.9	16.97
Giving oral instructions in English	12	11.9	39	38.6	25	24.8	25	24.8	23.03

Note: VI: Very Important, I: Important, NVI: Not Very Important, NI: Not Important, $\chi 2$:Chi-square

When the results in Table 24 are considered, it can be concluded that a great majority of the teachers have stated a common opinion on the importance of two

items in the list: students' being able to ask and answer questions in English and their language competence to talk to foreign colleagues about their discipline. Ninety percent of the respondents stated that it is important for students to be able to perform these two activities in English. Also ranked highly, 79% of the respondents have expressed the importance of their students' being able to participate in discussions held in English and being able to make presentations in English. The least valued option concerning speaking is about students' being able to give oral instructions in English. Barely half of the respondents (51%) have stated the importance of this option. Similar to the listening section, the Chi-square results do not indicate any significant differences in terms of variation among faculties.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the data collected in this study have been evaluated in accordance with the content of the questions in the questionnaire. In the first section, the demographic data about the respondents was described using frequencies and percentages to provide a clear picture of the respondents. In the second section, which is about the attitudes of content teachers towards English and English-medium instruction, the data were calculated in the same manner. For those questions offering multiple options for the respondents, frequencies of the selected options were calculated through Multiple Response Analysis. According to the results of this section, the majority of content teachers at YTU believes in the importance of English in the academic studies of the undergraduate students in their departments. However, although they believe that their students need English for academic purposes, they are not in favor of English-medium instruction and they approve of the shift in the language of instruction at YTU. Most of the teachers prefer using only

Turkish in their classroom practice, since they believe in students' being taught content courses in their mother tongue is better.

In the last section of the questionnaire, concerning the language requirements of students in terms of specific language skills, frequencies were given and the Chi-square and ANOVA test results were calculated enabling comparisons among the responses of different faculty members. The results obtained from this section revealed most of the content teachers at YTU believe that reading is the skill that should be prioritized in the curricula of the English language programs. Similarly, a majority believes that translation is the second skill that their students need to improve for their academic studies. In terms of the English language problems students encounter in class practice, the respondents reported that their students experience more problems in productive skills than receptive skills. Speaking was thought to be the most problematic skill for the students at YTU. With regard to the English language requirements of students in content studies, it was concluded that reading was the most required skill for the undergraduate students' current studies.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Overview of the Study

This study investigated the English language requirements of undergraduate students at Yıldız Technical University (YTU) through the perspectives of their content teachers. It also explored the content teachers' attitudes towards the importance of English and English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. Since it was a large-scale survey including eight faculties at YTU, data were collected through a questionnaire. The question items in the questionnaire were designed to provide information about the educational and professional backgrounds of the participants, their attitudes towards English-medium instruction, and their perceptions in terms of English language needs of the students studying in their department.

Data gathered for this study were analyzed by means of descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, and further statistical analyses techniques such as Chi-squares, ANOVAs, and post-hoc Tukey tests. For certain question items on the questionnaire such as multiple response questions, frequencies were calculated by means of Crosstabs, which provides information about the distribution of the responses according to the respondents' faculties. The results obtained by means of these analysis procedures were used in order to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the language requirements of undergraduate students studying in different departments at YTU through the perspectives of content teachers?
2. According to the English language use requirements of content teachers, which skills should be given priority for the students of different disciplines?
3. What are the content teachers' attitudes towards English - medium education at the tertiary level?

In this chapter, the research questions will be answered by discussing the data analysis in consideration of the general agreements and disagreements among the perceptions of content teachers towards the specific language requirements of their students and their attitudes towards English-medium instruction in Turkey at the tertiary level. These discussions will be organized according to the research questions of the study.

Discussion of the Results

General Language Skill Requirements of Students

The respondents were asked to give their opinions on the four basic language skills as well as translation by stating their importance in general for the academic studies of the learners in their department. The results show that the respondents have agreed upon the importance of all the language skills in general, however it can be concluded that reading and translation outweigh the other three skills. Ninety-three percent of the answers indicate that reading is the most important skill directly affecting the success of the students in their discipline. In terms of the importance of 'reading' skill, the results of the current study are compatible with Arık's (2002) study. In his study, 'reading' was also considered to be the most required skill for the

learners' academic studies at Niğde University. By regarding the fact that both studies were conducted in Turkish-medium universities and the participants were the content teachers, we may conclude that students majoring in Turkish-medium universities have similar requirements in terms of English language skills.

The results obtained for translation is similar to reading, with an overall percentage of 89. While the respondents have also rated the remaining skills high, their percentages are relatively low in comparison to reading and translation. This indicates that a vast majority of the content teachers at YTU prioritize reading and translation over listening, speaking and writing for the students' success in their academic lives and think that they should be given priority in the curricula of English language programs at YTU.

These results provide useful insights for the evaluation of the current English language programs at YTU and to make a general comment on whether the current programs fulfill the expectations of content teachers in terms of their students'needs or not. The overall structure of the current English programs appear to be appropriate to address the students' immediate needs in terms of reading, since there are specific reading courses that are currently provided by the Basic English Department and Modern Languages Department.

During the preparatory class education, apart from the main course, the content of which is designed on the integration of four basic skills, separate reading courses are provided for the students. The aim of these courses is not only to supplement the main course materials by teaching students reading strategies and enlarging their vocabulary knowledge, but also to lay the necessary foundation for the advanced academic reading given by the Modern Languages Department in the first year of the students' departmental studies. Since students are required to attend

these compulsory courses, they have many opportunities to improve their general reading strategies such as skimming, scanning, paraphrasing, deducing the meaning of words from the context, and so on, which should enable them to perform these skills in the target situations when necessary. This seems to be the case when we consider that the content teachers rank reading as the least problematic skill.

One of the important results obtained in the study is about the views of content teachers concerning the importance of translation. By looking at the results, it can easily be concluded that translation is considered an important skill by a majority of participants. The results indicate that there is strong need for translation courses or training. The current programs given at YTU cannot fulfill the demand for translation, since translation courses are not given regularly and they are not compulsory. The demands of content teachers indicating a strong need for translation skills may guide the English Language Department to implement compulsory translation courses in the future.

When the results concerning writing, listening and speaking skills are taken into consideration, it can be seen that content teachers' expectations concerning these skills are still quite high, though not regarded as important as reading. It could be argued though that the content teachers' expectations concerning at least listening and speaking are more demanding than the goals set for these skills by the English Language Department. ELD does not provide separate courses for these two skills and they are incorporated within the content of other courses. Since they are not taught separately, students are not assessed in them, which directly affects their performance and attitudes towards these skills. Although there may be demand from content teachers on the improvement of these skills, it is not feasible for the current situation to provide separate listening and speaking courses at YTU due to the high

number of students and the low number of teachers. The English Language Department may consider, however, implementing elective listening and speaking courses for the students, who believe that their competence in these skills needs to be improved.

Specific Language Needs of Students Concerning their Disciplines

Although a great majority of the content teachers believe in the importance of their students' improving themselves in all the language skills, the responses gathered by means of the four questions in part three (see question 20, 22, 24, 26) indicate a clear difference between what they think their students require in general and what they actually need in their content courses. The only common finding between the answers for question 12 and the four main questions in the following section is for reading. Reading is again considered the most important skill required in the departmental studies of learners. Most of the respondents state that students need to do readings in English for their content courses. However, the other skills, i.e. writing, listening, and speaking, are not considered as required for the current studies of learners. When these results are considered, it can be concluded that although a vast majority of the content teachers believe in the overall importance of the four language skills and translation, their students do not have immediate needs for these skills. This indicates that while curricula for English language programs are developed, the 'objective needs' of students, which they will require to use in the target situations (Brown, 1995; Munby, 1978), should be taken into consideration.

According to the results in tables 19, 22, 25, and 26, some conclusions may be derived about the objective needs of learners concerning different skills and subsequently these needs may be incorporated into the content of the current English courses. Most of the respondents who think that students need to use reading skills in

their content courses have stated similar opinions about the different specific purposes that the students will need to use reading for. In general, these all relate to reading for academic purposes such as reading about their field to improve themselves in their subject matter and reading to achieve academic success. In terms of specific academic genres, teachers report the need for undergraduate students to be able to read reference books, reports and articles from academic journals.

Unfortunately, some of the specific skill options that have been stated as important for students do not match with the content of the reading courses currently given at YTU. Most of the lecturers have stated the importance of reading English materials concerning their subject matter from authentic resources such as discipline-specific articles, reference books, reports and so on. However, in practice, the materials for reading courses come from the selected course books. Currently students from all the departments are required to study the same reading book, called 'Weaving It Together'. While a rapid change is not feasible, students may gradually be placed according to discipline such as engineering and administrative sciences and later to their specific departments. This would enable language instructors to prepare relevant materials responsive to the specific needs of learners of different disciplines and departments. Naturally, such a change would require content teachers and language instructors and language instructors' receiving training in teaching ESAP courses. The organization of such courses would take considerable time at YTU due to the high number of departments. Although content-based instruction seems inconvenient for short-term improvements of the current programs, it may be adopted in the future by fulfilling the required conditions.

In terms of writing skills, the content teachers generally point to the importance of being able to write business letters and CVs. Other options which were

emphasized by the majority of teachers were writing summaries, preparing presentations, writing projects according to appropriate formats, note-taking in content courses given in English and writing critiques to articles. When we consider these different writing skills in order to evaluate the content of the current writing courses, it can be concluded that most of the requirements of students in writing are being addressed by the writing courses at YTU. There is a Business English Course given currently at YTU, which aims at equipping students with the verbal and written communicative skills the students will need in their relationships with the foreign people or institutions throughout their professional lives. The content of this course includes CV writing, application letters, interviewing skills, telephoning, writing e-mails, taking notes during meetings, writing informative and assessment reports, and giving oral presentations (http://www.yildiz.edu/apa). In addition to this, effort should be made to ensure that courses include instruction in writing summaries and note-taking skills, which were stated as important by the content teachers.

With regard to specific skills of listening and speaking, emphasis was placed on the importance of students' improving their ability to understand the content of presentations, seminars and discussions held in English. Also considered quite important is students' improving their listening skill to comprehend the course content given in English and understand daily conversations held in English. Turning to specific speaking requirements, the majority of respondents report that students need to improve their speaking skills to be able to ask and answer questions in English, to have discussions with foreign colleagues, to express them well in a discussion concerning their discipline, and to make presentations in English.

When the courses at YTU are taken into consideration in order to find out whether the current courses are responsive to the requirements stated by the content

teachers, it can be said that at least some of them are covered in the content of the integrated courses. For instance, the integrated reading and speaking course has been designed to improve the reading comprehension and oral expression skills of learners by using texts related to current issues. In this course, students study reading texts and are then asked to take notes, which they will use for subsequent discussions of the topic. As a further stage of the lessons, the students in groups are asked to do research on the topics discussed and give a presentation of the topic to the class. Such a course may respond to some of the demands by having students participate in discussions, make presentations, and ask or answer questions concerning the topics they present. In this course, students may also have a chance practice note taking, which is regarded as important for writing skill by content teachers. The same course may also provide opportunities for the learners to improve their listening skills.

While it appears that the current English language curriculum is suitable for addressing many of the skill priorities noted by the teachers, it could still be asked whether the students' English is considered adequate for their studies. A great majority of the respondents stated that students experience most problems when they are required to express themselves orally in English and writing was considered highly problematic by more than half of the respondents. Listening, on the other hand, was not reported as very problematic for the students, and the least problematic skill for the students is considered to be reading. Obviously, the teachers feel that students experience more problems in productive skills rather than receptive ones. It is encouraging that content teachers prioritized reading as the most required skill and they think that students experience the least problems in reading skill.

When the results of the current study are compared with those of previous needs analysis studies, a close similarity is observed with Arık's study (2002). The

results of his study reveal that most of the content teachers at NU like those at YTU believe in the importance of English language for their students. With regard to specific English language skill demands of content teachers, he found out that content teachers in fact required very little English language from their students. Similar to the current study, of the four skills, reading was determined to be the most important skill and thus the one that should be given priority in the curricula of the language programs.

Perceptions of Disciplinary Teachers at YTU towards English-medium Instruction at the Tertiary Level and their Attitudes towards the Shift in the Language of Instruction at YTU

In order to provide information about what the scholars at YTU think in general about English medium-instruction and draw a general picture of their opinions about the change in the medium of instruction, six questions were addressed to the participants. The findings from these data clearly indicate that a great majority of lecturers are against the idea of higher education in a foreign language, although they do believe in the importance of learning English well.

The results provide useful insights about the attitudes of content teachers towards the change in the language of instruction at YTU. The majority of content teachers are pleased with the shift from partial English instruction to full Turkish medium instruction at YTU and in general have negative views towards using English in their content teaching.

When we turn to reasons the content teachers cite for preferring Turkish in practice, we see most of the teachers believe in the importance of students' being taught in their mother tongue rather than a foreign language. They also feel that only if Turkish is used as the medium of instruction, can we help its development as a

science language. They also refer to deficiencies in their own and students' competence in English. The reasons ticked for the question are compatible with the views of some of the scholars such as Sinanoğlu (2004), and Köksoy (2000) who also support the idea that Turkish should be used as the medium of instruction in all levels of education, since they believe that students can only learn the content of courses in their native language. According to Sinanoğlu, unless students are exposed to extremely intensive language instruction, they are not able to be competent in a target language in a year, which is the time allotted by most Turkish universities for language preparation. Köksoy maintains similar opinions and states that if the students or the teacher's English level is below the required one, then instruction in English-medium can become an obstacle for the students. The results of the current study also reflect those of Somer (2001), who investigated the attitudes of faculty members at Anadolu University. Unlike the current study, the teachers at Anadolu University generally preferred using a mixture of English and Turkish in their lessons. These differences reported in terms of the language preference of the content teachers may derive from the different contexts, as the earlier study focused on departments, in which English is the compulsory language. Although the answers are somewhat different, the teachers' rationales seem to be somewhat the same. The results of Somer's study reveal that most of the teachers prefer using both English and Turkish due to the potential comprehension problems of the content. The respondents of the current study share this view.

The last question, which provides useful insights in response to research question 3, is about the reasons that the content teachers cite for preferring to use English in their classroom practice. Most of the reasons given for this question reveal that those content teachers who prefer English in their courses do so in order to help

their students improve themselves in the target language, to enable them to read materials in English, and ultimately to be successful in their academic and professional careers. Some of the other respondents have stated that they use English in content courses because they are obliged to teach a particular skill in English.

According to the results of the questions discussed above, most of the content teachers at YTU are against English-medium instruction and prefer using Turkish in classroom practices in order to facilitate the students' learning process in content courses. Although most of the content teachers believe in the importance of English both in the educational and professional careers of their students, they place greater emphasis on the idea that students should learn English as a means that will lead them success in their careers. The role of English in content-based studies should not go beyond its being a facilitator, a finding consistent with those of such scholars such asMaster (1998), Pennycook (1994), Köksoy (2000), and Sinanoğlu (2004).

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The results obtained in the current study have provided useful insights not only for the evaluation of the current language program and determination of the skills that should be given priority in the curricula of YTU's language programs but also for providing broader insights about the attitudes of content teachers towards English-medium instruction at a Turkish-medium university.

In terms of language skills, it has been confirmed that students need to have a high level of reading skills to gain access to the materials that will enable them to improve their knowledge in their field. Although instruction of reading skills seem to be appropriate at first sight, some deficiencies of the current reading courses may be identified in consideration of the results of this study. Since common reading courses are provided for all the students without considering any differences in terms of their

departments, these courses are likely only helping students to improve their reading skills in general. However, in looking at the responses of content teachers, we may conclude that their students would benefit from practice in reading authentic materials such as articles from academic journals, or reference books specific to their discipline. This may provide a useful insight for ELD. They could consider launching content- based or adjunct teaching courses after students' having competence in general skills. Due to the high number of the departments at YTU, the development of such courses would need to be done step-by-step, first by grouping students according to disciplines and then according to their departments. In this way, it may be easier to ask for collaboration from other departments while the content of the courses is prepared.

Another recommendation of this study is for a regular translation course at YTU. Most of the content teachers, regardless of their faculties, stated that translation is an important skill for their learners. Clearly, it should prove useful to equip our students with the techniques in translation that they may need to transfer to out-of-class contexts in the future. The course may be provided first in general English in order to make students familiar with the concept of translation and the available techniques that can be used, then the aim of the course may be taken one step further and students may be given chances to study texts related to their disciplines. In these more advanced courses, students may be grouped according to their disciplines and collaboration may be asked from the departments particularly during the preparation of materials.

Given the many challenges of learning a foreign language, it might be recommended that if there is not an immediate need for students to learn English, language programs should be distributed over longer terms. Rather than rushing to

teach quickly everything within the curricula, a firmer foundation could be laid by covering less ground but doing so more deeply in the content of the courses. Since learning a foreign language is a cumulative process, it is almost impossible for beginners to reach an adequate level of proficiency in all skills in one year. Therefore, more realistic goals should be set. If the institution is a Turkish- medium university, instead of trying to teach everything to the students for the sake of making them ready for the content courses given in English, the numbers of which are very few, more sound curricula could be designed for the language programs in collaboration with the departments. This would not only help the students learn their content courses better regardless of the language of instruction but also enable them to have a better chance at long-term success in English. If the language of instruction in an institution is full English, content education in English should not start before the students have full competence over the four skills. If the students are beginners, this preparation stage may be lengthened to two years instead of the usual one. Most importantly perhaps, institutions need to consider deeply their decision to have English-medium instruction. The decision is very serious one, with deep implications for the students and the faculty. Failure to recognize this could result in graduates, who are neither competent in their subject matter nor in English.

To conclude, most of the content teachers at YTU agree that Turkish undergraduate students should be taught in Turkish rather than in English in their content courses. This is largely based on the belief that a person's being competent in English means little if the person is not knowledgeable in his/her subject matter. They also agree that students should learn all English language skills well enough to support and improve their content knowledge. Therefore, the role of learning a foreign language should not go beyond its being a means for following the latest

trends in their field. English language should be an instrument for success in subject matter rather than being the major goal of a higher education system.

Limitations of the Study

When this study is evaluated as a whole, it can be said that no significant problems affecting the overall reliability were encountered. However, due to time constraints the researcher did experience certain problems while collecting the data. Since it was a large-scale study covering eight faculties on two different campuses, the delivering and the collecting of the questionnaires was a challenge. Nevertheless, nearly 64% of the content teachers did complete the survey.

Another time-related restriction of the study was that the researcher did not have a chance to include other resource groups in her study. The data gathered for the study were obtained only from content teachers, thus leaving out the ideas of other groups such as students, language instructors, administrators or even employers. Similarly, no serious follow-up interviews could be done with the respondents in order to get a better understanding of their opinions. Such interviews could have provided deeper insights about the teachers' attitudes towards English-medium instruction and their perceptions in terms of the requirements of the learners.

Implications for Further Research

Based on the limitations of the current study, an immediately valuable further study could be conducted through in-depth interviews with some respondents in order to provide a better understanding of the opinions expressed in this work. Similarly, further studies could triangulate data found by looking at the language requirements of students through their own perspectives, or those of their language instructors, the administrators of their departments, and their would-be employers.

In terms of the English-medium aspect of the study, it could be useful to conduct a similar study by incorporating faculty from universities of different types. This could provide useful data to make comparisons among content teachers working in different medium institutions.

Instead of a broad-based survey study, a case study of one or two content teachers, including more qualitative research techniques such as classroom observations, journal keeping or interviews could provide much greater insights into the actual extent of English use, types of English used, and problems faced.

A further study may also explore whether there are any possible correlations between the teaching experience of the participants or their undergraduate, graduate or postgraduate degrees from Turkish medium, English medium or foreign institutions, and their language of instruction preferences. Since the aim of the current study was to provide general information about the perceptions of disciplinary teachers concerning their students' academic needs and their attitudes towards English-medium instruction at the tertiary level, no restrictions were made in terms of the number and type of qualifications among the participants, rather, as many disciplinary teachers as possible were included in the study. Due to the very uneven numbers in terms of the above specifications, no significant results were obtained when comparing the participants' responses. In a further study, if equal numbers of participants are included in the study in terms of their professional experience or their educational background, possible correlations may be made and conclusive results may be obtained.

Conclusion

The primary aim of this study was to determine the academic language needs of students through the perspectives of their content teachers. The study aimed at finding out whether there were any significant differences among the faculties in terms of the priorities they give to the specific language skills. According to the findings, there were only minimal differences among different departments in terms of the importance they give to specific language skills. It was concluded that reading was the skill that should be given priority in the English language programs. Many agreed as well on the importance of translation courses for the learners' academic studies.

In terms of the secondary aim of the study, the results of the study revealed that most of the content teachers at YTU believe in the importance of their students' being taught in their mother tongue. They state that English-medium instruction may turn out to be an obstacle in content courses in terms of comprehension of topic if students have problems with target language use. Their opinions concerning students' potential comprehension problems provide some support for those who argue that education in a foreign language prevents students' full comprehension of their content courses.

REFERENCES

Alptekin, C. (1998). Savlar gerçekleri yansıtıyor mu?. In Ayşe Kilimci (Ed.). *Anadilinde çocuk olmak-Yabancı dilde eğitim* (pp. 57-59). İstanbul: Papirus Yayınları.

Arık, S. (2002). An investigation into requirements of discipline teachers for academic English language use in a Turkish medium university. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.

Atay, M. (2000). An English language needs assessment of Management students at the faculty of Political Sciences at Ankara University. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.

Berwick, R. (1989). Needs assessment in language programming: From theory to practice. In R. K. Johnson, (Ed.). *The second language curriculum* (pp. 48-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL program design. In R. K. Johnson (Ed). *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Chan, V. (2001). Determining students' language needs in a tertiary setting. *Forum, 36,* 16-27.

Chojnacka, E. & Macukow, B. (1995). Engineering education in Poland. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 20*, 45-53.

Cook, G. (2003). *Applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Çelik, S. (2003). An investigation into students' English language needs at Office Management and Secretarial Studies Departments of Niğde University's Vocational Colleges. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.

Demircan, Ö. (1988). *Dünden bugüne Türkiye' de yabancı dil*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Doltaş, D. (1998). Sorun yabancı dilde değil, eğitim sisteminde. In Ayşe Kilimci (Ed.). *Anadilinde çocuk olmak-Yabancı dilde eğitim* (pp. 45-49). İstanbul: Papirus Kitapevi.

Dudley-Evans, T. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, S. (2000). Hong Kong's new English policy in education. *World Englishes, 9*, 185-204.

Flowerdew, J., Li., D., & Miller, L. (1998). Attitudes towards English and Cantonese among Hong Kong Chinese university lecturers. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 201-231.

Flowerdew, J. (1990). English for specific purposes. A selective review of the literature. *ELT Journal*, *44 (4)*, 326-337.

Flowerdew, J. & Peacock, M. (2001). *Research Perspectives on English for academic purposes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graves, K. (2000). A framework of course development processes. In D.R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.). *Innovation in English language teaching* (pp. 179-196). London: Routledge.

Gündüz, N. (1999). An analysis of students' needs in the English Languge Department of Selçuk University. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.

Hlavicka, J., & Pekarek, S. (1995). Engineering courses taught in English language at the Czech Technical University. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 20,* 41-44.

Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1,* 1-12.

Hayland, K. (2000). Book review of 'Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach'. *English for Specific Purposes, 19,* 297-307.

Jensen, P. H., & Johannesson, H. (1995). Engineering courses taught in English: An experience from Denmark. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 20*, 19-24.

Johns, A. M. & Evans, T. D. (1991). English for specific purposes: International in scope, specific in purpose. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*, 297-314.

Johns, A., M. & Price-Machaddo, D. (2001). English for specific purposes: Tailoring courses to students needs- and to the world. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 43-65). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Jordon, R., R. (1997*). English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Köksoy, M. (2000). *Yabancı dilde eğitim*. Ankara: Bilig Yayınları.

Lucas, T., & Kartz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 537-561.

Master, P. (1998). Positive and negative aspects of the dominance of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 716-727.

McKillip, J. (1987). *Needs analysis: Tools for the human services and education*. USA: Sage Publication.

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Özden, A., & Çağatay, A. (1993). Yabancı dille eğitime yol göründü. *Aktüel, 93*, 26-32.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman: London.

Quirk, R., & Stein, G. (1990). *English in use*. Essex: Longman.

Richards, J. C. (1990*). The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richterich, R. & Chancerel, J. L. (1980). I*dentifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Robinson, P. C. (1991). *ESP Today : A practitioners' guide.* Hemel, U.K: Prentice Hall.

Schutz, N. W. & Derwing, B. L. (1981). The problems of needs assessment in English for specific purposes: Some theoretical and practical considerations. In R. Mackay & J. D. Palmer (Eds.), *Language for specific purposes program design and evaluation* (pp. 29-45). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sinanoğlu, O. (2004). *Bye bye Türkçe.* İstanbul: Otopsi Yayınları.

Smith, E. C. (1990). *Needs assessment guide*. Tennessee State Department of Education (Eric Document reproduction Service No. ED 320 254).

Somer, S. (2001). The role of English-medium instruction in Engineering and Architecture Faculties of Anadoulu University. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 29-51.

Swales, J. M. (1995). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarone, E. & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Todd, R., W. (1997). Needs and constraints: The diary of a course designer. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin*, *Vol.10, 1*, 58-69.

Zeybek, N., M. (1999). *Türk olmak*. Ankara: Ocak Yayınları.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A SAMPLE OF ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleague,

I have been working in the Foreign Languages High School at YTU as an instructor since 1999. I am currently doing my Master's Degree at MA TEFL program at Bilkent University. My primary aim to prepare the following questionnaire is to gather information in order to determine the Academic language requirements of the students studying in different disciplines at Yıldız Technical University. Thus, as content teachers, who will be the best judges to determine the academic language needs of their students, I would like to learn your valuable opinions concerning this issue. The information gathered by means of this questionnaire will provide the basis for the future curriculum renewal projects of Foreign Languages High School at YTU.

This questionnaire will also serve for a secondary purpose and will provide useful insights about your attitudes as content teachers towards English-medium instruction at higher education. You are not required to fill in your name and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your completion of the questionnaire is assumed to grant permission to use your answers for this study. If you have any queries concerning my study or the questionnaire, please feel free to consult either me or my thesis advisor through the contact address given below. I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and for sharing your valuable time for my study. With my best regards.

Cemile GÜLER
(2004)
MA TEFL Program
Bilkent University
ANKARA
Phone : 0312 290 60 80
e-mail :cemile@bilkent.edu.tr

Julie Mathews Aydınlı
(Thesis Advisor)
MA TEFL Program
Bilkent University
ANKARA
Phone: 0312 290 20 15
e-mail:julie@bilkent.edu.tr

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1) Which faculty and department are you currently teaching in at Yıldız Technical University?
   Name of the faculty: _____

Name of the department: _____

2) How long have you been teaching in your profession?
   a) less than one year c) 6 to10 years e) 16 to 20 years
   b) 1 to 5 years d) 11 to 15 years f) more than 20

3) How long have you been teaching at YTU?
   a) less than one year c) 6 to10 years e) 16 to 20 years
   b) 1 to 5 years d) 11 to 15 years f) more than 20

4) What is your current title?
   a) Professor c) Assistant Professor e) Specialist
   b) Associate Professor d) Instructor

   Other (Please specify): _____

5) Please fill in the following table about your educational qualifications

	The name of the Institution	Graduation Year
High School		
B.A/B.S Degree		
M.A. Degree		
PhD degree		

6) Do you have any published articles related to your profession? Please put an **(X)** into the blank next to your answer.

   YES _____ NO_____

   If your answer to question 6 is YES, please answer questions 7, 8, and 9. If it is NO, please skip to Part 2.

7) The number of articles published in English: _____.

8) The number of articles published in Turkish: _____.

9) The number of articles published in other languages:_____.
   (Please specify these languages): _____.

PART 2: GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATION IN ENGLISH

Please answer the following questions in this section considering the undergraduate students in your department.

10) In your opinion, to what extent is English important for your students' current content-based studies at YTU?
   a) very important c) not very important
   b) important d) not important

11) Why do you think that your students should learn English? (You may choose more than one option.)
   a) to help Turkey's modernization and globalization.
   b) to help Turkey's admittance to European Union.
   c) to follow the new developments in their discipline.
   d) to read materials written in English about their discipline.
   e) to attend conferences in English.
   f) to pursue a Master or Ph.D. degree.
   g) to be accepted for employment/ apprenticeship in companies that regard English knowledge as a prerequisite.
   h) to be considered as a professional in their discipline.
   i) Other(s) (Please specify) : _____

12) How important are the following English skills for success in your discipline? Please put an **(X)** in the appropriate box for each item.

	Very important	Important	Not very importar	Not importan
READING				
WRITING				
LISTENING				
SPEAKING				
TRANSLATION				

13) Have you ever taught content courses in English so far ?
   YES _____ NO _____

14) Are there any content courses still being taught in English in your department?
   YES_____ NO _____

15) What do you think about the change in the language policy of YTU from 30% English instruction to full Turkish instruction?
   Approval_____ Disapproval_____

16) Which of the following statements reflects how you feel when teaching content courses? Please circle **only one** option.
   a) I use **only Turkish** and I am pleased with this.
   b) I use **only Turkish** but **I wish I could teach in English**.
   c) I use **only English** and I am pleased with this.
   d) I use **only English** but **I wish I could teach in Turkish**.
   e) I use **both Turkish and English** and I am pleased with this.
   f) I use **both Turkish and English** but **I wish I could teach only in Turkish**.
   g) I use **both Turkish and English** but **I wish I could teach only in English**.
   h) Other (Please specify): _____.

While teaching content courses, if you use only is Turkish, then please answer the question 17. If you prefer to use English in your lesson, please answer the questions 18 and 19.

17) If you prefer to teach your content courses **in Turkish**, what are your reasons? (You may circle more than one option).

a) Turkish language should be the language of education in order to help Turkish develop as a science language.
b) I do not have adequate English knowledge to teach my lessons in English.
c) The students' proficiency level is not adequate for them to be taught in English.
d) Turkish is the compulsory language of education in our department.
e) I believe that students' being taught in their native language is more correct .
f) Other (Please specify): _____.

18) If you prefer to teach your content courses **in English**, what are your reasons? (You may circle more than one option).

a) Students need to read materials written in English to follow the latest developments in their subject matter.
b) Students need to know English to pursue an MA or Ph.D. Degree.
c) Students need to know English in order to be successful in their profession.
d) In our department, it is compulsory to teach in English.
e) Most of the education materials in our discipline are in English.
f) I prefer teaching in English to improve myself.
g) Other (Please specify): _____.

19) If you are currently using English to teach your content courses, please rank order the following English language skills according to the given criteria by considering the difficulties the students encounter in your lessons. Please use **each number**, indicating a degree in the scale, **only once**.

1 2 3 4

the most problematic the least problematic

Writing _____
Reading _____
Listening _____
Speaking _____

PART 3: SPECIFIC LANGUAGE SKILLS

SECTION A: READING

20) Is it necessary for the undergraduate students in your department to read in English for their academic work either in your course or other courses?
YES _____ NO _____

If your answer is No, please do not answer question 21 and skip to Section B.

21) To what extent are the following English reading skills important for the undergraduate students in your department? Please put an (X) into the appropriate box for each item.

	Very important	Important	Not very Important	Not important
Reading for general information about their disciplines from foreign resources.				
Reading lecture notes				
Reading articles in weekly magazines				
Reading reference books (e.g. encyclopedia, dictionaries)				
Reading articles from professional journals				
Reading instruction manuals, user manuals, booklets				
Interpreting graphs/diagrams/tables				
Reading reports				

Other(s) (Please specify): _____

SECTION B: WRITING

22) Is it necessary for the undergraduate students in your department to write in English for their academic work either in your course or in other courses?
YES _____ NO _____

If your answer is No, please do not answer question 23 and skip to Section C.

23) To what extent are the following writing skills important for the undergraduate students in your department? Please put an (X) in the appropriate box for each item.

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not important
Writing essays				
Writing reports				
Writing projects				
Writing summaries/ abstracts				
Writing critiques to an article				
Writing synthesis paper				
Note-taking in class				
Preparing presentations				
Writing research papers				
Writing descriptions of experiments				
Writing laboratory reports				
Writing business letter/personal letter/CV				

Other(s) (Please specify): _____.

C) LISTENING SECTION

24) Is it necessary for the undergraduate students in your department to listen to in English for their academic work either in your course or in other courses?

YES_____ NO _____

If your answer is NO, please do not answer question 25 and skip to Section D.

25) To what extent are the following English listening skills important for the undergraduate students in your department? Please put an (X) in the appropriate box for each item.

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not important
Listening and understanding daily conversations				
Listening and understanding discussions/seminars/presentations in English				
Listening and understanding authentic materials in English (radio, TV and video programs)				
Listening and understanding lectures in class				

Other(s) (Please specify): _____

SECTION D: SPEAKING

26) Is it necessary for the students in your department to speak in English for their academic work either in your course or in other courses?

YES _____ NO _____

If your answer is NO, please do not answer question 27. Your questionnaire has finished here. Thank you for your cooperation.

27) To what extent are the following English speaking skills important for the undergraduate students in your department? Please put an (X) in the appropriate box for each item.

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not important
Participating in discussions in English				
Asking and answering questions in English				
Making presentations/Presenting oral reports				
Giving oral instructions				
Talking to their foreign colleagues about their subject				

Other(s) (Please specify): _____

Thank you very much for your cooperation and for sharing your valuable time for my study.

APPENDIX B

TÜRKÇE ANKET ÖRNEĞİ

Sayın Öğretim Üyesi/Görevlisi,

Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda öğretim görevlisi olarak çalışmaktayım. Bilkent Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce Öğretmenliği üzerine yüksek lisans yapmaktayım. Aşağıdaki anketi hazırlamamın temel amacı Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'nde farklı bölümlerde eğitim görmekte olan öğrencilerin akademik çalışmalarında gerekli olan yabancı dil ihtiyaçlarını belirlemektir. Bu konuyla ilgili siz öğretim üyelerinin değerli görüşlerine ihtiyaç duymaktayım. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek bilgiler, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nun önümüzdeki yıllarda farklı bölümlerdeki dil ihtiyaçlarını gözönüne alarak yapacağı **müfredat geliştirme projesinde** kullanılacaktır.

Anketin ikinci amacı ise YTÜ'de halen farklı bölümlerde ders vermekte olan siz öğretim üyelerinin, 'Yüksek Öğretimde Yabancı Dille Eğitim' konusundaki fikirlerinizi öğrenmektir. Anketi doldururken isminizi yazmak zorunda değilsiniz. Ayrıca aşağıdaki sorulara vereceğiniz kişisel cevaplarınız kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Bu anketi doldurmanız, vermiş olduğunuz bilgilerin çalışmamda kullanılmasına izin vermeniz olarak yorumlanacaktır. Yapmış olduğum çalışmayla ya da anketle ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz olursa, benimle ya da danışmanımla bağlantıya geçebileceğiniz irtibat adresi aşağıda belirtilmiştir. Yardımlarınız ve değerli zamanınızı ayırdığınız için çok teşekkür ederim. Saygılarımla.

Cemile GÜLER
(2004)
MA TEFL Programı
Bilkent Üniversitesi
ANKARA
TEL : 0 312 290 60 80
e-posta:cemile@bilkent.edu.tr

Julie Mathews Aydınlı
(Tez Danışmanı)
MA TEFL Programı
Bilkent Üniversitesi
ANKARA
TEL : 0312 290 20 15
e-posta: julie@bilkent.edu.tr

ANKET

BÖLÜM I : ÖZGEÇMİŞ BİLGİLERİ

1) Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'nde halen hangi fakülte ve bölümde ders vermektesiniz?

Fakülte Adı : _____

Bölüm Adı : _____

2) Mesleğinizde kaçıncı yılınız?

a) 1 yıldan az c) 6-10 yıl arası e) 16-20 yıl arası
b) 1-5 yıl arası d) 11-15 yıl arası f) 20 yıldan fazla

3) Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'nde kaç yıldır çalışmaktasınız ?

a) 1 yıldan az c) 6-10 yıl arası e) 16-20 yıl arası

b) 1-5 yıl arası d) 11-15 yıl arası f) 20 yıldan fazla

4) Ünvanınız:
   a) Profesör c) Yardımcı Doçent e) Uzman
   b) Doçent d) Öğretim Görevlisi
   Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz): _____

5) Mezun olduğunuz okullar:

	Mezun olduğunuz kurum adı	Mezuniyet yılı
Lise		
Üniversite		
Yüksek Lisans		
Doktora		

6) Alanınızla ilgili yayınlanmış akademik makaleniz var mı? Lütfen cevabınızın yanındaki ilgili boşluğa **(X)** işareti koyunuz.

   EVET _____ HAYIR _____

Eğer 6. soruya "EVET" cevabı veriyorsanız, lütfen 7, 8, ve 9. soruları yanıtlayınız. Cevabınız "HAYIR" ise Bölüm II' ye geçiniz.

7) İngilizce olarak yayınlanan makale sayınız: _____
8) Türkçe olarak yayınlanan makale sayınız: _____
9) Diğer dillerde yayınlanan makale sayınız: _____
   (Lütfen hangi dillerde olduğunu belirtiniz) :
   _____.

BÖLÜM II : YABANCI DİLDE EĞİTİM İLE İLGİLİ GENEL BİLGİLER

Bu bölümdeki soruları cevaplarken lütfen bölümünüzdeki lisans öğrencilerini gözönüne alınız.

10) Sizce öğrencilerinizin halen Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'nde sürdürdükleri **lisans eğitimleriyle** ilgili akademik çalışmalarında İngilizce bilmeleri ne derece önemlidir ?
   a) Çok önemli c) Çok önemli değil
   b) Önemli d) Önemli değil

Eğer 10. soruda C ya da D (<u>önemli değil</u>) seçeneklerinden birini işaretlediyseniz, 11. soruyu atlayınız ve 12. soruyu cevaplayınız.

11) Öğrencilerinizin niçin İngilizce öğrenmeleri gerektiğini düşünüyorsunuz ? (Birden fazla seçeneği işaretleyebilirsiniz.)
   j) Türkiye'nin modernleşmesine ve globalleşmesine yardımcı olmak için.
   k) Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne kabul edilmesine yardımcı olmak için.
   l) Alanlarındaki yeni gelişmeleri takip edebilmeleri için.
   m) Alanlarında İngilizce olarak yazılmış materyalleri okuyabilmeleri için.
   n) İngilizce konferanslara katılabilmeleri için.
   o) Yüksek lisans ve doktora yapabilmeleri için.
   p) Yabancı dil bilmeyi ön koşul kabul eden şirketlerde staja/işe kabul edilebilmeleri için.
   q) Konularında profesyonel olarak kabul edilebilmeleri için.
   r) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

12) Aşağıdaki İngilizce Dil Becerileri bölümünüzdeki öğrencilerinizin akademik çalışmalarında başarılı olabilmeleri için ne derece önemlidir ? Lütfen her soru için yanındaki ilgili kutucuğa **(X)** işareti koyunuz.

	Çok önemli	Önemli	Çok önemli değil	Önemli değil
OKUMA				
YAZMA				
DİNLEME				
KONUŞMA				
ÇEVİRİ				

13) Hiç bölüm derslerinizde anlatım dili olarak İngilizce'yi kullandınız mı?
EVET _____ HAYIR _____

14) Halen bölümünüzde İngilizce olarak verilen alan dersi var mı ?
EVET _____ HAYIR _____

15) Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'ndeki eğitim dilinin %30 İngilizce'den tamamen Türkçe'ye çevrilmesi hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?

ONAYLIYORUM _____ ONAYLAMIYORUM _____

16) Aşağıdakilerden hangisi sizin bölüm derslerini anlatırken kullandığınız tercihinizi yansıtır ? Lütfen **yalnız <u>bir</u> seçenek** işaretleyiniz.
   a) Yalnız Türkçe'yi kullanırım ve bundan memnunum.
   b) Yalnız Türkçe'yi kullanırım, **ancak İngilizce anlatabilmeyi çok isterdim**.
   c) Yalnız İngilizce kullanırım ve bundan memnunum.
   d) Yalnız İngilizce kullanırım, **ancak Türkçe anlatmayı isterdim**.
   e) Türkçe hem İngilizce kullanırım ve bundan memnunum.
   f) Hem Türkçe hem İngilizce kullanırım, **ancak yalnızca Türkçe anlatmayı isterdim.**
   g) Hem Türkçe hem İngilizce kullanırım**, ancak yalnızca İngilizce anlatmayı isterdim.**

h) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

Bölüm derslerini anlatırken <u>yalnızca Türkçe'yi</u> kullanıyorsanız 17. soruyu, <u>İngilizce'yi</u> kullanıyorsanız 18. ve 19. soruları cevaplayınız.

17) Bölüm derslerinde anlatım dili olarak **Türkçe'yi** tercih etmenizin sebepleri nelerdir ? **(Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz.)**
   a) Türkçe'nin bilim dili olarak gelişmesine yardımcı olmak için, eğitim dili Türkçe olmalıdır.
   b) İngilizce bilgim konuları İngilizce anlatacak kadar yeterli değil.
   c) Öğrencilerin İngilizce bilgisi anlattığım konuları İngilizce takip edebilecek düzeyde değil.
   d) Bölümümüzde Türkçe zorunlu eğitim dilidir.
   e) Öğrencilerin kendi anadillerinde öğretim görmelerinin daha doğru olduğuna inanıyorum.
   f) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

18) Bölüm derslerinde anlatım dili olarak **İngilizce'yi** tercih etmenizin sebepleri nelerdir ?
   (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
   a) Öğrencilerin alanlarıyla ilgili en son gelişmeleri takip edebilmeleri için İngilizce yazılmış materyalleri okumaları gerekmektedir.
   b) Öğrencilerin yüksek lisans veya doktora çalışması yapabilmeleri için İngilizce bilmeleri gerekmektedir.
   c) Öğrencilerin gelecekte mesleki kariyerlerinde başarılı olabilmeleri için İngilizce bilmeleri gerekmektedir.
   d) Bölümümüzde İngilizce zorunlu eğitim dilidir.
   e) Alanımızdaki eğitim materyallerinin birçoğu İngilizce .
   f) Kendimi geliştirmek için konuyu İngilizce anlatmayı tercih ediyorum.
   g) Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

19) Halen bölüm derslerini anlatırken eğitim dili olarak İngilizce'yi kullanıyorsanız, derslerde öğrencilerin yaşadığı problemleri gözönünde bulundurarak, aşağıdaki İngilizce dil becerilerini verilen kritere göre sıralayınız. **Kriter derecesini belirten her sayıyı sadece bir defa kullanınız.**

1 2 3 4
en çok problem olan en az problem olan

Yazma _____
Okuma _____
Dinleme _____
Konuşma _____

BÖLÜM III : ÖZEL DİL BECERİLERİ

A) İNGİLİZCE OKUMA

20) Bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencilerinin, sizin dersiniz ya da diğer bölüm derslerindeki
akademik çalışmaları için **İngilizce okuma** yapmaları gerekli midir ?
EVET _____ HAYIR _____

Bu soruya «HAYIR » cevabı veriyorsanız, 21. soruyu cevaplamayınız ve lütfen B bölümüne geçiniz.

21) Aşağıdaki **İngilizce okuma becerileri** bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencileri için ne derece önemlidir? Lütfen her soru için yanındaki ilgili kutuya **(X)** işareti koyunuz.

	Çok önemli	Önemli	Çok önemli değil	Önemli değil
Alanlarıyla ilgili genel bilgi edinimi için İngilizce kaynak okuma				
İngilizce ders notları okuma				
Haftalık yabancı dergilerden makale okuma				
İngilizce referans kitapları okuma (ör: ansiklopedi, sözlük)				
Akademik dergilerden makale okuma				
Talimat broşürü, kullanıcı broşürü, kitapçık okuma				
Grafik/Tablo okuyup yorumlama				
Rapor okuma				

Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

B) İNGİLİZCE YAZMA

22) Bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencilerinin, sizin dersiniz ya da diğer bölüm derslerindeki
akademik çalışmaları için **İngilizce yazma** gerekli midir ?
EVET _____ HAYIR _____

Bu soruya " HAYIR" cevabı veriyorsanız, 23. soruyu cevaplamayınız ve lütfen C bölümüne geçiniz.

23) Aşağıdaki **İngilizce yazma becerileri**, bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencileri için ne derece önemlidir? Lütfen her soru için yanındaki ilgili kutuya (X) işareti koyunuz.

	Çok önemli	Önemli	Çok önemli değil	Önemli değil
İngilizce kompozisyon yazma				
İngilizce rapor yazma				
İngilizce proje hazırlama				
İngilizce özet çıkarma				
İngilizce makalelere yorum yazma				
İngilizce sentez yazıları yazma				
Sınıfta İngilizce not tutma				
İngilizce sunum hazırlama				
İngilizce araştırma yazısı yazma				
Deney tanımı yazma				
Laboratuvar raporu yazma				
İş mektubu/kişisel mektup/özgeçmiş yazma				

Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

c) İNGİLİZCE DİNLEME

24) Bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencilerinin, sizin dersiniz ya da diğer bölüm derslerindeki akademik çalışmaları için **İngilizce dinleme** yapmaları gerekli midir ?

EVET _____ HAYIR _____

Eğer bu soruya "HAYIR" cevabı veriyorsanız, 25. soruyu cevaplamayınız ve lütfen D bölümüne geçiniz.

25) Aşağıdaki **İngilizce dinleme becerileri**, bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencileri için ne derece önemlidir? Lütfen her soru için yanındaki ilgili kutuya **(X)** işareti koyunuz.

	Çok önemli	Önemli	Çok önemli değil	Önemli değil
İngilizce günlük konuşmaları dinleyip, anlama				
İngilizce tartışmaları, sunumları,seminerleri anlama				
Ingilizce orijinal materyalleri anlama (televizyon, radyo, video)				
İngilizce verilen bölüm derslerini anlama				

Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

D) İNGİLİZCE KONUŞMA

26) Bölümünüzdeki **lisans** öğrencilerinin, sizin dersiniz ya da diğer bölüm derslerindeki akademik çalışmaları için **İngilizce konuşmaları** gerekli midir ?

EVET _____ HAYIR _____

Eğer bu soruya "HAYIR" cevabı veriyorsanız, lütfen 27. soruyu cevaplamayınız. Anketiniz burada sona ermiştir. TEŞEKKÜR EDERİM.

27) Aşağıdaki İngilizce konuşma becerileri, bölümünüzdeki lisans öğrencileri için ne derece önemlidir? Lütfen her soru için yanındaki ilgili kutuya (X) işareti koyunuz.

	Çok önemli	Önemli	Çok önemli değil	Önemli değil
İngilizce tartışmalara katılma				
İngilizce soru sorma/cevap verme				
İngilizce sunum yapma				
Sözlü talimat verme				
Yabancı meslekdaşlarıyla alanlarıyla ilgili konuşma				

Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

ANKETİNİZ BURADA SONA ERMİŞTİR, DEĞERLİ ZAMANINIZI AYIRDIĞINIZ İÇİN ÇOK TEŞEKKÜR EDERİM.