



## Hazırlık Okulu Öğrencilerinin İngilizce Eğitim İhtiyaçları

### English Education Needs of the Preparatory School Students

Fulya KURTULUŞ<sup>1</sup>, Zeki ARSAL<sup>2</sup>

#### Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Karadeniz Bölgesinde bulunan bir üniversitenin İngilizce hazırlık okulunda okuyup eğitimin İngilizce olarak verildiği Fen ve Edebiyat Fakültesine kayıt yaptıran öğrencilerin İngilizce eğitim ihtiyaçlarını belirlemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda karma yöntem izlenmiş ve toplam 7 öğrenci ve 5 öğretim üyesi ile çalışılmıştır. Öğrencilerle odak gurup görüşmesi yapılırken, öğretim üyeleri ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiş ve öğrencilerin İngilizce eğitim ihtiyaçları araştırılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre; öğrenciler iletişim becerilerinde (konuşma ve dinleme) ve akademik kelime bilgisi alanlarında eksik durumdadırlar. Bu bilgilere istinaden ise hazırlık eğitim programında konuşma, dinleme ve akademik kelime bilgisine daha çok önem verilmesi gerektiği yapılan öneriler arasındadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** ihtiyaç analizi, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, dil öğretimi, öğretim dili olarak İngilizce

#### Abstract

The aim of this study is to define needs of the students who studied at English Preparatory school at a university located at the Black Sea region of Turkey and registered Faculty of Science and Letters (FSL) where medium of instruction is English. For that purpose, a mixed method design is employed. Total 7 students and 5 professors participated in the study. While focus group interview was conducted with the students, professors were interviewed separately at FSL and the language needs of the students are sought out. The results revealed that the students lack in communicative skills -speaking and listening-, and academic vocabulary in their field. Speaking, listening and academic vocabulary are recommended to be focused on more at School of Foreign Languages before the students register to FSL.

**Keywords:** needs analysis, english as a foreign language, english preparatory school, language teaching, english as a medium of instruction

1. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7835-7611>

2. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey; <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9597-8973>

**Atf / Citation:** Kurtuluş, F., ve Arsal, Z. (2019). Hazırlık okulu öğrencilerinin İngilizce eğitim ihtiyaçları. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 27(3), 1005-1014. doi:10.24106/kefdergi.2319

## 1. Introduction

In several faculties the medium of instruction is English in Turkey. In order to fulfill their requirements at those faculties, students are required to claim their proficiency in English by entering the proficiency exam at the preparatory school of the university they enrolled or by claiming the equivalent exam results. Students who are not proficient enough, study English for two semesters and at the end of the year, they take a proficiency exam to indicate their level of English. Provided the students are successful, they get the chance to enroll to the faculties. They continue their education at Faculty of Science and Letters (FSL) where 100% of classes are held in English (<http://yabancidiller.ibu.edu.tr/tr/>). In order to prepare the students for their classes at the faculty, the preparatory school provides them with the Basic English at preparatory school. However, the English proficiency of most students who enrolled the preparatory school is unfortunately usually very low; they begin learning English in a beginner (A1) level (CEFR, 2001). When the students graduate from preparatory school, most of the students acquire a good level of Basic English, but they lack the required academic skills. Thus, several students, although they have succeeded in preparatory classes, face difficulties covering the courses in English at FSL. They have difficulty in understanding professors, as well as exam questions, and even textbooks. This situation shows that there is a gap between what the students know and what they are required to do. This gap is called education needs (McKillip, 1986; Queeney, 1995). Under the shades of that information, the researcher aimed at finding out the English education needs of students who passed the preparatory school proficiency exam, yet have difficulty in following the classes covered in English at FSL.

To shed a light on the issue at preparatory schools, this study will serve useful and precious information and insight. Further, the implications part would be a guide to curriculum developers and several preparatory schools facing the same problems, which is a common issue not only in Turkey, but also in all other countries teaching English as a foreign language.

### Theoretical Base of the Study

Education needs are identified as the gap between the performance the students show and the performance expected from them (McKillip, 1987: 10). Queeney (1995) similarly described education needs as the deficiencies in the students' knowledge, skills and behaviors in terms of the objectives. In general terms, needs analysis (also called needs assessment), refers to activities involving in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students (Brown, 1995: 6). If in education, any deficiencies are detected, in order to improve the deficient situation in depth, analysis is required. That arduous process is called needs analysis. English and Kaufmann (1975: 3) explained needs analysis as 'a process of defining the desired outcomes or the products of a curriculum and an experimental process during which educational outputs are defined and the criterion which determines if a program needs to be developed or not.'

Stufflebeam suggests four approaches to identify needs: 1) discrepancy view, 2) democratic view, 3) diagnostic view and 4) analytic view. For this study discrepancy view is followed as it perceives needs as the difference between desired and the actual performance (Stufflebeam, 1985: 44). Since the desired performance of the students at FSL is regarded deficient to conduct the courses at the faculty and as the desired performance is different from their actual performance, the discrepancy view was followed. Since the change or directions desired by a majority of some reference groups are considered in democratic view of Stufflebeam (1985), the two main agents of the problems, the students and the professors are involved, therefore a democratic view is also employed for the study.

So as to do a needs analysis; the performance, in other words, the current situation of the students, the ways the desired performance is achieved and the actions to be taken to achieve those performances ought to be examined. Therefore, as Richards, Platt and Weber (1985) and Brown (1995) suggest, the situation (Faculty of Science and Letters), the objectives and purposes the language is needed (to conduct courses at FSL), the type of communication (oral- written) and the level of proficiency that will be required are discussed for this research. In order to achieve that, the researcher conducted interviews both with the students and professors at FSL in order to find out answers for the following question:

What are the needs of the FSL students in terms of English after they graduate from English preparatory department?

## 2. Methodology

### Research Design

In order to find answers for the faced problems, a sequential transformative mixed method was conducted by the researcher. Sequential transformative mixed method requires collection and analysis of either qualitative or quantitative data first. The results are integrated in the interpretation phase (Cresswell, 2003: 203). Morse presents a QUAL=>qual combination which requires 'a collection and analysis of qualitative data first, and then the collection and analysis of other qualitative data.' (Morse, 2003: 197) For this study, the data gathered from the students is analyzed first. Focus group interviews were conducted with the students. The data analyzed and results were revealed. As the second phase, the semi-structured interviews were conducted with the professors at the Faculty of Science and Letters. The interview questions were shaped considering the results of the first phase. The data gathered from the professors were analyzed. At the end, the findings of the first phase and the second phase were integrated and interpreted together.

### Participants of the study

The participants were chosen considering the needs assessment stages stated in Stufflebeam (1995), and English and Kaufmann (1975), and the data were collected from two different participant groups: the first group was sophomores who were able to give objective data about their first year at the faculty and make a comparison between the freshmen and the sophomores; and the second group was the professors at FSL who give lectures in English for the departments of Physics and Chemistry.

In order to ensure maximum variation sampling, the students with low, medium and high level of English considering the students' proficiencies at prep school from each department were chosen. Seven sophomore students from the faculty of Science and Letters participated in the focus group interview. Two of the students are at mathematics department; three of them are at Chemistry department; one student from physics and one from biology departments. In order not to reveal their names, pseudonyms are used for each student. Total four female and three males participated and they were given the names Buket (mathematics), Canan (mathematics), Ceren (chemistry), Gökay (chemistry), Emrah (chemistry), Harun (physics) and Gülay (biology).

The professors were chosen on the purpose of getting the maximum information, so a purposive sampling is employed. 5 professors from FSL participated in this study. Three of them are teaching at physics and two of them are teaching at chemistry department. Two of the participants are professors, two of them are associate professors, and one is assistant professor. In order not to reveal their identities, pseudonyms are used for the professors, either.

### Data Collection

In order to collect data from the students, a focus group interview was designed. The students gathered at the researcher's office at suitable time for every participant. The data was collected through a semi-structured interview form designed by the researcher. The questions were categorized and asked to each of the participants. The questions were asked considering the four language skills: listening, writing, reading and speaking. The four main questions guided the interviews were; 1) What are the difficulties you face while listening to the lectures (listening skill); 2) What are the difficulties you face while writing a report or answering the written exams (writing skill); 3) What are the difficulties you face while reading textbooks and articles in your field? (reading skills) and 4) Do you have difficulty in asking questions to your teachers in English? (speaking skill). Some filler questions which emerged during the interview also shed a light into the data collection process. The whole interview was recorded by getting the verbal permissions of the participants. After the interview, the recorded data was transcribed and examined by the researcher.

Data collection was conducted in a different time in different places for each professor. They were visited in their offices at an appropriate time. A semi-structured interview designed by the researcher was employed for each participant. The data gathered by the student interviews guided the researcher to form the semi structured questionnaire for the professors. The professors were asked similar questions as the students, except for the reading skill question as reading comprehension can just be interpreted by the students themselves. The main questions formed the semi-structured interview were as follows: 1) Do you recognize that students understand the lectures carried out in English or not? (listening skills). 2) Do the students make mistake in terms of English in written assignments or in written exams? (writing skills) 3) Are the students able to interact with you in English during or after the classes? (speaking skills). The responds of the participants were recorded by getting their permissions and they are transcribed by the researcher after the interviews.

## Data Analysis

The researcher conducted the interviews on the basis of categorized questions. The questions were categorized considering the language skills: listening, writing, speaking and reading. The students were asked about the four skills; yet the professors were asked about the three language skills: listening, writing, speaking but not reading.

The responds of both the students and the professors had been recorded during the interviews and were transcribed afterwards. The analysis is based on descriptive analysis as the information is presented under the themes that emerged from reviews of the researcher and a specialist. At the same time, the researcher interpreted some information gathered from the participants instead of presenting all the information. Thus, 'descriptive- interpretive analysis' (Ekiz, 2013) is employed while analyzing the data. The data was also interpreted by another specialist (curriculum development professor). To ensure triangulation and the coherence between the two interpreters, the data was analyzed and necessary modifications were held after the negotiations. The transcriptions were read and reviewed and two main problems emerged from both group participants. The first theme was titled as oral communication problems and the second theme was titles as written communication problems.

In terms of oral communication problems, the responds showed that the students and professors mentioned about different problems so, different categorizations emerged. On the other hand, in terms of written communication problems, though the main categories seemed different, both the students and the professors mentioned about vocabulary and grammar problems.

## 3. Findings

### Oral Communication Problems

#### Findings of the Student Interviews on Oral Communication

The findings of the student interviews revealed some important issues. All of the seven students stated that they had difficulties in understanding lectures and speaking in English in the class. The problems with the oral communication were classified as vocabulary problems, accent problems and speaking problems.

All of the students reported that they had difficulties understanding the professor in the first five, six weeks. They stated that they were not familiar with the new context: chemistry, physics or mathematics; further they were not familiar with the terms and vocabulary of the new context, either. During a lecture, not being able to understand a word affected their understanding of the subject matter.

One of the chemistry students, Ceren, stated the problem as follows:

When I don't understand a word while the teacher is speaking, I focus on the meaning of the unknown word, try to find the meaning and miss the rest of the lecture.

Similarly, mathematics student Canan reported her problem with the vocabulary:

When the professor writes questions and explains it, I cannot focus on the question because I stick to a word the professor uses and try to find what it means, so I cannot solve the problem just because I do not know the word.

Similarly Gökay and Emrah, both are chemistry students, stated that they had difficulty most in understanding the lectures because of lack of context vocabulary.

Gökay added that:

We have really big difficulty in vocabulary. When I came to my department, I just studied for learning the new vocabulary for one semester. That was a quite a lot time for me. If you teach the core vocabulary at preparatory school, we don't waste time on it during the semester and focus on understanding Chemistry.

Another problem the students mentioned about lectures is that they cannot understand some of the professors or classmates just because their accent. There are professors who are originally from different countries and, as the faculties cooperate with the student exchange programs like Erasmus student Exchange Program, there are students from different European, African, and Asian countries. That makes the classes quite multicultural and the English they speak may sound different to Turkish students who, until that time had the chance of only hearing Turkish instructors speaking English, or just British or American native speakers from the course book CDs.

Emrah stated the problem as follows:

I had the most problem in Yakup Hoca's classes because he is from Egypt and his accent somehow sounds different to me. But I can understand the Turkish professors, their accent is easy to understand, very clear.

Gökay stated that, he doesn't understand his African peers speaking English: "There is a boy, Abdülkerim from Kenya. I never understand his speech when he speaks English. So different!"

Likewise, Harun (chemistry student) reported that he isn't distracted from unknown vocabulary, but distracted when he is listening to foreign professors' lectures:

Professors speak very different accents. They speak too fast or, I don't know, difficult to understand. But when the Turkish professors are lecturing, I can understand them, no problem. I can understand every word of them.

It is clear from what the students reported that they are quite accustomed to hearing Turkish people or Native American or British people speaking English, yet when they hear a different accent, they have difficulty in understanding.

Another problem that the students mentioned is speaking English, or asking questions in English. All of the participants stated that they still have problems in speaking or asking questions in English, though they are sophomores.

Ceren mentioned that she has difficulty in speaking as follows:

I don't speak English in the classroom, because while speaking, I can't find the correct words, I forget, so I give up. If I prepare for a speech, yes, I can handle it, but I can't speak simultaneously.

Similarly, other students stated that they tend to ask question in Turkish, rather than English. Emrah mentioned the problem as follows:

When professors ask questions, we know the answer but don't want to say it in English, because I am afraid of making mistakes. And sometimes, I don't even make a sentence. When teachers ask if we have any questions, we ask in Turkish. Everybody, I mean Turkish students ask in Turkish. We don't have the self-confidence in speaking. That is the problem.

It is understood by students' responses that self-confidence, apart from lack of vocabulary and different accents, is a key point in their speaking skills. If they are confident enough about speaking in English, they will be better at that field. Speaking is one of the productive skills as Harmer (1998) states, and of course the most difficult, especially for the students who learn English as a foreign language (EFL), rather than a second language (ESL). And when the difficulty of speaking combines with the difficulty of the subject matter, chemistry, biology or mathematics, it becomes a more challenging skill for students to perform.

### **Findings of the Professor Interviews on Oral Communication**

The finding revealed that the professors think students have problems in speaking English and they face motivational problems. All of the five professors agreed that students are deficient in speaking. Four of the professors mentioned that students also lack in motivation. The professors thought that the students do not have motivation to talk in class or out of class with the fear of making mistakes in English while speaking. If they were motivated enough, the professors stated, the students would have been able to speak in English, they would not have worried about the unknown vocabulary. The less motivated the students are, the less willing to speak, the respond of the professors suggest.

Professor Mustafa, professor Kemal, professor Yusuf, professor Işık and professor Hakan agreed that the students lack in speaking and listening skills and have great difficulty in understanding their lectures. They also propose some solutions for preparatory school to overcome speaking difficulties the students face.

Professor Kemal mentioned the problem in his words as follows:

There are a few of students who ask questions in English, which means they cannot ask questions in English, they cannot either answer questions when we ask. They are stuck; they cannot form up even sentences. If they have more speaking clubs at preparatory school, and it must be compulsory, they would be better, because you know, students don't do anything unless it is compulsory. If you grade them for example, for speaking clubs, they take it more seriously. I think rules are important...

Professor Işık proposed more listening activities for listening and understanding lectures at prep classes, stating that the problems about reading can easily be handled, but listening deficiencies are hard to recover. He continues as



follows:

There are MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) professors' lectures on YouTube. They are the experts in our field. They are popular in physics, when students listen to those lectures; it can help, because the courses at MIT are not different from ours. A native professor lectures on the web, and you can assess how much of it the students understand. Maybe the students don't understand my English, just because my accent is not good enough...

Professors Mustafa, Yusuf, Işık and Hakan highlighted motivation in their interviews. They believe that students are low motivated and their self- efficacy beliefs are low, either. If they believe that they can do, the professors underlined, they can really speak and do better at school.

Professor Hakan mentions the problem as follows:

Students think that what if people don't understand me, what if I cannot state what I want properly... I can't speak, impossible, they believe. Motivation is low. Only you (instructors at preparatory school) can solve this problem. You must encourage them while speaking.

Similarly, professor Yusuf states that the students lack in motivation:

The problems the students face are not related to their education at preparatory school. The problem is their motivation. They are not motivated enough. No matter how much teachers try to teach them something, if they are not able to maintain a high motivation, and if they do not study themselves, they can't solve this problem.

What professor Mustafa states about students motivation is striking:

Their problem isn't the unknown vocabulary and the terms. Their problem is their belief about not understanding the instructions in English. They have prejudices. They talk to previous students, and they come to our classes with those negative beliefs ...

In conclusion professors believe that students are not proficient enough in speaking and listening to a lecture. The common belief behind that is that they don't have self-confidence or high level of motivation.

What we can conclude from both the students and professors' statements are quite similar. They think that students at FSL lack in oral communication skills, either in speaking or in listening. Professors mainly think that the problem about speaking is emerged from lack of motivation and self-confidence which can be aroused by instructors at preparatory schools by engaging the students more in speaking activities.

### **Written Communication Problems**

#### **Findings of the Students Interviews on Written Communication**

Students were asked questions about written exams, written assignments and textbooks during the interviews. The findings revealed that students do not feel insufficient in written communication, except for academic vocabulary in the written exams. In written exams they do not have a chance to check the vocabulary in a dictionary or in a textbook. Therefore if there is an unknown word in the questions, they cannot answer the questions. On the other hand, in written assignments and textbooks, although they encounter unknown vocabulary, they don't get stressed out since they have time and chance to find a correct definition or explanation for it. What is striking is that none of the students reported themselves insufficient in grammar, neither in the exams, assignments or textbooks. That shows that the students are satisfied with the grammar and writing skills they had in preparatory classes.

Students all take all their exams in English. One of the research questions was if they had any problems understanding and responding to the exam questions in English. The recorded responses sound promising. They feel that they don't have any problems about understanding or responding to the exam questions anymore. Yet, five of the students stated that they had difficulty in understanding some academic vocabulary at first. They mentioned that, if they stick to an unknown word, they cannot answer the question. Harun gives an example to clarify what they said:

We didn't understand some exam questions. If we don't, we pass the question unanswered. In one exam, for instance, the professor had asked about "fluid mechanic". I didn't remember what the term was, so I couldn't answer the question, though I had known the correct answer!

On the contrary, Buket and Canan (mathematics students) stated that they don't have difficulty in the exams, because they are not required to state the answers in words, calculations are enough to reach a solution. Likewise, all of the

students stated that they don't have problems with the grammatical structures in the exam papers. Grammar doesn't count for a hinder for their understanding of the exam papers.

Another inquiry about their difficulties in English was about the assignments. What the students recorded was that they are not supposed to do any written assignments, except for the laboratory reports. Gökay and Harun put forth it as follows:

We are to write reports after the experiments and we don't feel pressure while writing reports, because we don't have any grammar problems. We can easily state the process and results of the experiments.

Two of the students stated that they had learned the passive form very well at preparatory school so it was very useful to write the reports at FSL. The motivating thing taken out from their statements is that they learned grammar and writing very well at prep classes, which helped them to write their reports. The students also mentioned that they don't feel insufficient in terms of vocabulary while doing assignments. Gökay states:

Since we can use textbooks, dictionaries and any other resources during the report writing process, it is not a problem for me to write a report. I can find the correct words in the books or dictionaries, so I can put it right in the reports.

Similar comments were made based on the questions about reading the textbooks. Students mentioned that they feel secure when they have a textbook in their hands, on which they can take notes, underline and jot down the meanings of unfamiliar words. All of the students stated that they have no problem understanding the text in their field because they know the grammar and the forms. If they encounter any unfamiliar words, they can check it in a dictionary and continue reading. That makes them relax and feel secure to have time to check them out and read and read again.

Emrah states his feelings about the textbooks in his words below:

There are a maximum of 250 terms and words in our field. If you know them, it is a piece of cake to read all that books; I am very serious about that. We can understand it because we know the grammar. The only problem is vocabulary.

Being the main agents of the problems, students' experiences and recommendation are priceless. What we can conclude from their comments and responses is that students at FSL feel unsecure about the vocabulary just in written exams, yet textbooks and written assignments are easily handled since the students are good at grammar and writing.

### **Findings of the Professor Interviews on Written Communication**

The professors were asked questions about the exams and the assignments in terms of English use of the students. The professors agreed that students have almost no problems in grammar or writing skills, yet they lack in academic vocabulary. The findings showed that four of the professors believe students at FSL are lack in vocabulary, and only one of them think that students are problematic in terms of grammar in their written work.

Professor Kemal stated that the freshmen sometimes have difficulty understanding the exam questions:

It is necessary to explain the questions in Turkish in order to make them answer the questions appropriately. At first the students also have some grammar mistakes, but it is an easy problem to handle.

Professor Yusuf, as well as the professor Işık and Kemal, mentioned that they also explain the questions in the exams in case the students miss a point. Professor Kemal stated:

At the very beginning of the exams, I read the questions and translate them in Turkish because I know that some students know the answers but cannot answer just because they do not understand the questions just because of some unfamiliar words.

For report and assignments, professor Işık stated that students tend to use numbers and formulas instead of explaining something in words in English with an intention that they do not make mistakes, but he also added that negative situation changes when the students become sophomores. Professor Hakan undermined the reasons of not being proficient in report writing and he mentioned that it is because they lack required vocabulary:

Students ask if they could write in Turkish. That is because they don't know the necessary vocabulary. Normally students can make grammatically correct sentences. Preparatory school is far good at that point. But when a student sticks to a word, s/he wants to switch to Turkish.

Professor Yusuf believes that the key point is student him/herself, not the preparatory school education:

If s/he studies, s/he succeeds. At that point, I also recommend students read science magazines or popular science books and write a summary of the articles. If the students want to be proficient in their field, they need to study for it.

To sum up, four professors mentioned that students lack in context vocabulary in written communication. Further they believe that it helps students to explain the exam question in their mother tongue, Turkish, at the beginning of the exams. Only one professor stated that students make mistakes in written assignments in terms of grammar. The other professors believe that students can handle grammar well and express their thoughts well enough in written reports.

If we conclude the findings of the students and the professors at FSL, similar results reveal. Both agents stated that students at FSL have problems in context vocabulary. On the other hand, students as well as most of the professors think, feel sufficient in grammar and writing, only one professor mentioned about the grammar problem the students face.

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusions

The problems the students experience themselves forms a big barrier between them and the information. Similarly, the professors experience the same problems and those problems form barriers between the students and the professors. In order to knock down those barriers, the reasons behind are sought and discussed at this part of the study.

First of all, the mostly mentioned problem is that students cannot communicate in English, neither via listening, nor speaking. The findings of both the students and professor interviews showed that, though the students passed the preparatory class, they were inefficient in speaking and communication in English. This result is similar to Yılmaz's (2005) study which revealed that students cannot use the language for communication and the preparatory school is insufficient in providing students with that skill. Likewise, Akpur *et al.* (2016) conducted a study on the efficiency of preparatory school at a technical university in Turkey and the results showed that the instructors do not support the idea that prep school curriculum improves students' speaking skills. By the professors, reasons behind that problem are stated as the lack of confidence and lack of motivation to communicate in the foreign language participated in this study. Ocak *et al.* (2010: 664 ) similarly stated in their study that 'students' level of target language use increase as their motivation level goes up.' Unfortunately teachers tend to skip speaking skills either it is a backbreaking job or it is limitedly assessed in the exams. Demirtaş and Sert (2010: 167) stated the same problem in their study and mentioned that 'learning process in the classroom setting is teacher-centered and focusing on teaching grammar.' Similarly, Akpur *et al.* (2016) mentioned that the time allocated to the skills taught were not equal in the curriculum which results in more emphasis on grammar but less on communicative skills like listening and speaking. The negative situation about the speaking skill in preparatory schools in Turkey seems the same in the United States' universities as well. Another research is the case study of Kayı (2008) who examined 22 students taking classes in a western community college in the U.S., and three ESL teachers, teaching there. She found that within speaking, the students are more challenged by presentations, not knowing the best way to say something in English, while in listening they are confronted by understanding various accents of English. The situation is not different for the students participated in this study. Most of the students tend not to speak during the classes and when they are asked to, they choose their comfort zone and don't push themselves to speak. Further the students participated in this study also stated problem of understanding different accents of English. They mentioned that they had difficulties in understanding different accents of English, for instance a friend from an African country speaking English is less intelligible than a Turkish friend or a Turkish teacher speaking English. A similar finding is revealed in Koçer's study (2013) about the different accents of the target language. He states in his study that many of the students have trouble determining the best way of saying something and they have trouble in understanding the varied accents of the target language. When the students hear only their teachers or one accent of English in class, they naturally have difficulty in understanding different accents. Students at preparatory school where this study is carried out are exposed to only their Turkish teachers' speaking and the recordings of the textbook, which are predominantly recorded in American English. Thus, when they hear people speaking in different accents, they have difficulty in understanding. Therefore, enabling students to hear as many different accents as possible may help them understand the varieties of English.

The second problem mentioned many times by both the students and the professors is that students lack the academic vocabulary, or the context vocabulary. Students mentioned that they had difficulties in understanding the context, the field they are studying, because of the vocabulary related to that field. This result is similar to the results of Ekici (2003), who found that speaking, listening and specialist vocabulary should be emphasized more in order to fulfill the English for specific purposes. Likewise, in her study Tavil (2006) found that students have difficulty in understanding



the context owing to the lack of vocabulary knowledge. A similar finding comes from Edward's (2000) study on a needs assessment he conducted. He found that the students participated in his study especially needed writing and specialist vocabulary. Findings of these studies revealed that specialist vocabulary is a must to concern in terms of students' needs in language learning.

Another problem mentioned by the professors is that students lack motivation to speak in English. Students in Turkey learn English as a foreign language. This means that English is not either their mother language or an official language, but a foreign language which is just taught at schools. Therefore, there are no opportunities for the students to speak or practice English out of school. They do not even feel a need to speak English out of class. Most of the students learn English just to pass the classes. Letting them speak more in class and motivating the students about their progress may help them gain confidence about speaking the target language. Integrating more speaking clubs and informing them about the necessity of speaking and listening at the faculties seem helpful in terms of lowering the barriers between the students and English.

## 5. Recommendations

The findings of this study revealed that the English Instruction at School of Foreign Languages at the university where the study took place can be modified. Considering all the responds and the recommendations of the participants, the students and the professors at FSL - the main two agents of the problems faced- some implications can be made. Following are the only a few to be considered:

Speaking and listening skills must gain as much importance as grammar and writing at preparatory classes. In order to do that, the weekly schedule can be rearranged and the hours of classes for both skills can be increased. The speaking club hours can be increased and the attendance might be compulsory for speaking clubs. Further, students can be assigned more speaking tasks, and they can perform some tasks in front of their peers in order to get rid of the idea that they cannot do it. Teachers might also be urged to encourage students speak English in public and in class.

The curriculum may be redesigned and some vocabulary classes might be included at the second semester, so that the students become familiar with the academic context. So as to do this, a cooperation office can be assigned to contact with the FSL professors to form the content of the courses. The cooperation office can contact with the FSL professors to prepare video lecture content for students to guide the students' self-study.

This study was limited to 7 students and 5 professors at the Faculty of Science and Letters. The other faculties where the medium of instruction is English can also be included in the study for further studies. Also, the ideas of professor from other departments would also enrich the findings of the study. Moreover, the ideas of the instructors at preparatory school would be precious as they are the other important agent of the issues.

## 6. References

- Akpur U., Alici B., Karataş H.(2016). Evaluation of the Curriculum of English Preparatory Classes at Yıldız Technical University using CIPP model. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11 (7), 466-473
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The Elements of Language Curriculum*. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- Creswell, John W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications,
- Demirtaş İ., Sert N.(2010) English Education at University Level: Who is at the Centre of The Learning Process?. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4 (2) 159-172.
- Edwards, N. (2000). Language for Business: Effective Needs Assessment, Syllabus Design and Materials Preparation in a Practical ESP Case Study. *English for Specific Purposes* 19, 291-296.
- Ekici, N. (2003). A Needs Assessment Study on English Language Needs of The Tour Guidance Students of Faculty of Applied Sciences at Başkent University: A Case study; (Unpublished master's thesis). Department of Educational Sciences, METU. Ankara.
- Ekiz D. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık ,
- English, F. V., Kaufman, R. A. (1975). *Needs Assessment: a Focus for Curriculum Development*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gökdemir C.M. (2005). Üniversitelerimizde Verilen Yabancı Dil Öğretimindeki Başarı Durumumuz. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Atatürk Üniversitesi* 3, 251-264.
- Harmer J. (1998). *How to Teach English?* (2nd edition). Harlow: Pearson ELT.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Pearson Education LTD.
- <<http://yabancidiller.ibu.edu.tr/en/preparatory-department/rules-and-regulations>> (01/10/2017)

<[https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework\\_en.pdf](https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf)> (01/10/2017)

Karataş H, Fer S (2011). CIPP Evaluation Model Scale: Development, Reliability and Validity. *Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci.* 15, 592-599.

Kayı, H. (2008). Developing an ESL Curriculum Based on Needs and Situational Analysis: as case study; *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4 (1), 30-49.

Koçer Ö. (2013). Investigating the Beliefs of Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners After Target-Culture Integrated Language Courses. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 3(2), 25-36. doi:10.14527/V3N2M3

McKillip, J. (1986). *Need Analysis Tools for the Human Services and Education*. London: Sage Publications.

Morse, J. M. (2003). Principles of mixed methods and multimethod research design. *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*, 1, 189-208.

Ocak G., Kuru N., Özçalışan H. (2010). As a Classroom Language, Students' Attitudes Towards Speaking Turkish in English Prep Classes. *Procedia Socail and Behavioral Sciences* 2, 661-665

Queeney, D. S. (1995). *An Essential Tool for Quality Improvement- Assessing Needs in Continuing Education*. New York: Jossey Bass Inc.

Richards J. C., Patt J., Weber H. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman

Stufflebeam, D. C., Cormick, H., Nelson, C. O., Brinkerhoff, R. O. (1985). *Conducting Educational Need Assessments*. Boston: Kluwer – Nijhoff Publishing.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1995). *Evaluation of Superintendent Performance: Toward a General Model*. McConney (Eds), *Toward a Unified Model of Educational Personnel Evaluation*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.

Tavil, Z. M. (2006). The Reading Needs of The Students' at Hacettepe University English Preparatory School. *GÜ, Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26 (3), 207-221

Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of an English Language Teaching Program at a Public University Using CIPP Model*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Yılmaz C. (2005). The Students' Competence in Using Foreign Language As a Means of Communication In The English Department. *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 7(1), 15-23