



## HOW ARE ELT MATERIALS CHOSEN IN HIGH SCHOOLS? SOME SUGGESTIONS

### LİSELERDE İNGİLİZCE DERS KİTAPLARI NASIL SEÇİLİYOR? BAZI ÖNERİLER

Ali IŞIK \*

**ABSTRACT :** The aim of this paper is to investigate how English language teaching materials are chosen in Turkey. Thirty-seven schools were visited and observed for this study. The data were obtained from 107 English teachers from private high schools, state Anatolian high schools, and regular state high schools through a questionnaire and interview. The research indicated, rather than taking sound materials evaluation criteria into account, some non-academic factors are considered while choosing ELT materials. Furthermore, English teachers have limited role in the evaluation process. In addition to these findings, the method in which ELT materials should be chosen and what system should be used in the materials evaluation process are also discussed in this paper.

**Keywords:** ELT materials, materials evaluation, materials evaluation criteria

**ÖZET:** Bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye’de lise düzeyinde İngilizce yabancı dil ders malzemelerinin nasıl seçildiklerini araştırmaktır. Veriler özel liselerde, devlet anadolu liselerinde ve düz devlet liselerinde görev yapan toplam 107 İngilizce öğretmeninin katılımı ile elde edilmiştir. Bulgular İngilizce yabancı dil ders malzemelerinin seçiminde bilimsel bir ölçütün kullanılmadığı ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin malzeme seçiminde sınırlı bir rollerinin olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu olumsuz bulgular üzerine çözüm olarak, çalışmanın sonunda, yabancı dil malzemelerin nasıl değerlendirilebileceği konusunda bir sistem önerilmiştir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** İngilizce ders malzemeleri, yabancı dil malzemesi değerlendirme, yabancı dil malzemesi değerlendirme sistemi

## 1. INTRODUCTION

English language teaching (ELT) materials are of significant importance for foreign language education. They determine the quality and quantity of input, the affective and cognitive involvement of learners in the language learning process, what is to be taught, language teaching methodology, syllabus organization, teacher training, and learner training (Brown, 2007; Grossman and Thompson, 2008).

Language is acquired when learners understand messages; that is, when they are exposed to enough comprehensible samples of a language (Brown, 2007; Ellis, 2008; Krashen, 2008; 2012). That is why choosing the appropriate ELT materials is of great importance in an EFL country like Turkey, where ELT materials are the main means of obtaining English language input. In today’s global world, learners have more chance to be exposed to English in their daily lives. Computers, internet, media, and films are some means through which learners receive authentic input (Mishan, 2005). However, they are not so common yet and not everyone has access to them. Nor are they systematically organized to facilitate language learning. Since they are authentic and have no language teaching purpose, they are generally incomprehensible for learners. Thus the quality and quantity of English input learners receive are generally limited with what ELT materials provide to students. It can be concluded that EFL materials shape how much and what kind of input EFL learners are exposed to, and consequently determine the rate and level of language acquisition to a great extent (Brown, 1995; Graves, 2000; Krashen, 2003).

It is also pointed out that for a successful language education, affective factors are at least as important as the input factors (Gass and Selinker, 1994; Krashen, 2003; Nunan, 1999; Richard-Amato,

1988). It is stated that the level of interest determines the level of motivation and high level of student interest ensures high motivation (Harmer, 2003). ELT materials, which offer instruction that is sensitive to learners' linguistic levels, provide variety and present information in a comprehensible and enjoyable manner, increase the involvement of learners in the teaching/learning process and predict the success level in L2 (Hernandez, 2006). For example, a group of computer engineering majors at an English medium university in an EFL country attend an English prep class in order to follow the academic program. The needs of these students are focused on a specific field. Throughout their education they will study books on computer programming and do computer related tasks. So, the materials ought to foster the students' academic language skills to support their education in their field. These students not only need language skills but also initial background knowledge and terminology in their field in order to experience a smooth transition to their subsequent education by getting academically, cognitively, and linguistically prepared and ready for the next year. If they study English by using general ELT materials, it is obvious that this kind of education cannot prepare them for their subsequent education (Mishan, 2005). Thus, the match between the materials and learners' needs and also fosters both cognitive and affective involvement of learners and predicts the success level in L2 (Graves, 1996; 2001; Gebhard, 1999; Richards; 2001). Hence, ELT materials and classroom activities should meet the linguistic, cognitive, and academic levels and interests of learners and be designed in such a way that learners can easily relate themselves to them and have optimal exposure to L2 (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986; Yuen, 2011).

Furthermore, the research has shown that it is important to give voice to students in the management of their learning (Breen and Littlejohn, 2000; Tomlinson, 2003). Learners are a part of the teaching-learning process and inevitably have preferences in their language classes as all human beings do. They are aware of their wants and when they are given a chance to verbalize them, they can contribute a lot to the language program. This is especially true when the students actively participate in the materials selection process thorough different means such as piloting certain parts of ELT materials, questionnaires and interviews. They begin to believe that their ideas are valuable and they have power over the language materials selection process. Consequently, they psychologically take ownership of the learning process. If in fact the classroom atmosphere is created by the teacher, the learners and the materials, the value of choosing the most relevant materials by the active participation of learners in the materials selection process can create the most optimized learning experience (Mishan, 2005). Students feel that the materials are not imposed on them by an authority, but that they are the result of their choice. Hence, a kind of positive attitude towards the material can be fostered and a close match between materials and learner characteristics can be achieved which make classroom tasks more meaningful, purposeful, and enjoyable. It can be concluded that if a language program is to be successful, the program must carefully take into account the means in reach learners participate in the materials selection process.

ELT materials control input, learner involvement, and classroom activities, but what teachers do in the classroom as well (Santos, 2006). They serve as a syllabus for many teachers. In most schools, teachers do not have a syllabus of their own but rely totally on the course outlined by the ELT materials. They just allot the units in those materials to certain weeks and their syllabus is ready. In addition, ELT materials have a teacher-training role. They guide teachers, especially novice ones, about how to present a topic, teach skills, organize a unit, and carry out different tasks. While teaching a language, teachers tend to follow the order, approach, and pace set by ELT materials. Thus teachers' beliefs about language teaching and what they do in the classroom are outlined by ELT materials. These ELT materials become the indispensable teacher trainers (Grossman and Thompson, 2008). In other words, materials form, if not dominate, the basis for language teaching methodology. Likewise learners are also directed about how to study/learn a foreign language through direct/indirect tasks and clues in ELT materials which are the products of certain trends and approaches in language education. For example, if they prioritize learning strategies some tasks are inserted in materials to develop/improve learners' exploitation of some strategies to be successful learners. Each activity they carry out shapes their conceptualization of language learning and how to improve language skills, grammar and vocabulary. In short, the choice of ELT materials influences the language

teaching/learning process and the success of an ELT program in an EFL context to a great extent (Cunningsworth, 1995; Harmer, 2003; McGrath, 2006).

Another issue that should be tackled is the number of ELT materials that are available. There are plenty of publishers and ELT materials in the market. This is both an advantage and disadvantage. It can increase the likelihood of choosing the most appropriate one from among so many alternatives. On the other hand, it increases the burden of ELT materials evaluation, because every single candidate EFL ELT materials should be evaluated. For this reason, it becomes a must to spend a lot of time and energy on the ELT materials evaluation process. Moreover, ELT materials are produced commercially and target a large population of learners. They are too general and not specific to any specific group of learners. So it is vital to select the one that meets the needs and interests of learners, fits a particular context, and helps realize the language teaching/learning goals. It should also be kept in mind that there are no perfect ELT materials and what is needed is to choose the one that most fits the criteria developed by the teachers. Choosing the most appropriate one from among the many choices helps teachers to adapt the material to their contexts with less effort (Johnson et al., 2008; McDonough and Shaw, 1996; Sheldon, 1987; Skierso, 1991).

It is obvious that evaluating and choosing ELT materials is a scientific business and to overcome this demanding task, a scientific criterion based on the findings in linguistics, pedagogy, psychology, and other related fields is to be employed (Ehrman et al. 2005; Mishan, 2005). This gives rise to the evaluation of ELT materials from different perspectives. By establishing explicit criteria for evaluation, a basis can be provided for an informed, professional judgment and selection which consequently influences the success in EFL classrooms. Otherwise, the wrong choice would lead to a waste of time, energy and money. In addition, it may be demotivating for both teachers and learners and doom EFL education to failure.

If the ELT materials evaluation is of such great importance, then how should it be carried out? This study investigated the ELT materials selection process in high schools in Istanbul, Turkey. As a result of this study, a framework for ELT materials evaluation is suggested.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. Aim

The purpose of this study is to answer the following research question:

How are ELT materials chosen in high schools in Turkey?

### 2.2. Subjects

For this project 37 schools in Istanbul were visited for three years. Nineteen of these schools were private high schools and eighteen of them were state schools. Ten of the state schools are so called Anatolian high schools. Private high schools and state Anatolian high schools emphasize English and spend a lot of time and resources on English learning. They specify ten class hours in the ninth grade, and four hours in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades for the mastery of English. Eight of the state schools are regular schools, which offer four class hours of EFL instruction for a week.

**Table 1. The Number of Schools and Teachers**

|                              | Number of schools | Number of teachers |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Private high schools         | 19                | 52                 |
| State Anatolian high schools | 10                | 37                 |
| Regular state high schools   | 8                 | 18                 |
| Total                        | 37                | 107                |

### 2.3. Materials

In private high schools and state Anatolian high schools commercial ELT materials were used. International publishers such as, Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Longman, Heinemann, and Heinle and Heinle were the main producers of the ELT materials. These companies produce materials for global use and their materials are not specifically designed for the Turkish EFL learners.

On the other hand, in regular state high schools locally produced materials are used. These materials are generally produced by the Ministry of National Education. Some local publishers produce the materials in accordance with the guidelines set by the Ministry of National Education. Hence locally-produced materials are similar in content.

### 2.4. Data Collection

Through the questionnaire (Appendix A) and interview, the teachers' ideas about the ELT materials evaluation and selection were elicited to see how the ELT materials were selected in high schools in Istanbul. The same questions asked in the questionnaire were also addressed in the interview to the teachers to make them elaborate on the issue. The data were collected during a three-year period.

### 2.5. Data Analysis

SPSS was used to analyze the data obtained in this study. To investigate the relationship between school type and the answers given to the questionnaire Kruskal Wallis Test was used. The percentages related with the questionnaires and interviews were obtained by using descriptive statistics.

## 3. RESULTS

To investigate if school type affects the replies given to the items Kruskal Wallis Test was used. The results indicated that except for item twelve, which is about the relationship between the ELT materials and syllabus, school type is in effect ( $p>0.01$ ). For all other items significant differences were elicited in teachers' responses from different schools and school type influenced the teacher responses ( $p>0.01$ ).

**Table 2. Kruskal Wallis Test Results**

|             | S1     | S2     | S3     | S4     | S8      | S9      | S10    | S11    | S12   |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------|
| Chi-Square  | 10.372 | 21.053 | 14.675 | 99.400 | 106.000 | 106.000 | 37.839 | 34.182 | 1.057 |
| df          | 2      | 2      | 2      | 2      | 2       | 2       | 2      | 2      | 2     |
| Asymp. Sig. | .006   | .000   | .001   | .000   | .000    | .000    | .000   | .000   | .589  |

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Schools

Table 3 indicates that in private high schools ELT materials are determined by the department heads (56%) and school administration (33%) to a great extent. The role of the ELT teachers in this process is only 11%. In state Anatolian high schools teachers (53%) and department heads (34%) dominate the material election. Administration (14%) takes part in the process, too. On the other hand in regular state high schools the Ministry of Education has full control in the process. Private high schools tend to change ELT materials every 2-3 years. State Anatolian high schools choose the materials every year. In regular state high schools, on the other hand, no specific duration can be mentioned since the Ministry determines which ELT materials are used. In all three types of schools, however, the ELT syllabus is conceptualized as dividing the number of units in ELT materials by the number of weeks in the academic calendar and then allocating the units to weeks. Likewise for the materials evaluation process no needs analysis was carried out and learners do not have any active roles in the process. Besides, teachers (except for 1%) have no academic training about materials evaluation.

**Table 3. The Summary of The Results Of The Questionnaire And Interview About ELT Materials Evaluation**

|  | Private high schools                         | State Anatolian high schools                 | Regular state high schools                   |
|--|--|--|--|
| Administration chooses the ELT materials               | 33%  | 14%  | -  |
| Department head chooses the ELT materials              | 56%  | 34%  | -  |
| Teachers all together choose the ELT materials         | 11%  | 53%  | -  |
| Teacher chooses the ELT materials                      | -  | 0.2%   |  |
| The Ministry of Education chooses ELT materials        |  |  | 100%   |
| Learners get involved in materials evaluation          | -  | -  | -  |
| Needs analysis carried out before evaluating materials | -  | -  | -  |
| ELT materials are evaluated through a criterion        | -  | 0.2%   | -  |
| Teachers have training about ELT materials evaluation  | 0.5%   | 0.5%   | -  |
| The frequency of ELT materials selection process       | every 2-3 years                              | every year                                   | depends on the Ministry                      |
| How ELT materials affect syllabus                      | units in ELT materials are allotted to weeks | units in ELT materials are allotted to weeks | units in ELT materials are allotted to weeks |

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The results show that there are significant differences among the different high schools with respect to the school type. The results also indicate that in private high schools teachers do not generally choose their own ELT materials themselves. They obey the decisions of either the schools administration or the department head. Teachers may raise their opinion in the ELT materials selection process only when they choose ELT materials as a group. While selecting ELT materials, there are no scientific criteria or a systematized evaluation process. Finally, the ELT materials are changed every 2 or 3 years in private high schools. On the other hand, in state Anatolian high schools teachers seem to have more control on the materials selection process. In this school type, teachers have no individual freedom to choose ELT materials, however they raise their voice within the group and influence what kind of materials are selected. Like private high schools, they have no scientific materials evaluation

criteria. Only one teacher reported that he chooses his own ELT materials based on his own criteria for ELT materials evaluation. He mentioned that his method of choosing the best ELT material was choosing the most economical one. Another finding is that in state Anatolian high schools they generally change their ELT materials every year. The situation in regular state high schools is different. They use one of the ELT materials from among locally-published materials approved and provided by the Ministry of Education. They have no criteria for ELT materials evaluation and use the same materials for many years.

In terms of syllabus organization, in all three types of schools there is perfect harmony. In these schools ELT materials function as their de facto syllabus. What is done is quite simple: The number of units in ELT materials is divided by the number of weeks (36 weeks) in the academic calendar and then the units were assigned to each week accordingly. This process forms the basis on which they carry out their ELT activities. Again with respect to the role of learners in the materials evaluation process there is no difference among the schools. Materials evaluation is considered as the responsibility of administration, department heads and/or teachers. Learner contribution is not expected. Hence they are just the consumers of what is served to them. Moreover, in all three types of schools materials evaluation and selection process is not handled scientifically or academically. Nevertheless materials function as their syllabi and determine all their teaching activities.

The data given above indicates that the materials evaluation process is a subjective process rather than an objective and scientific one. Needs analysis, which is the first step in any materials selection, is neglected. Without taking into account the students' needs it is impossible to choose the most appropriate materials. What also is disturbing is that only 1% of the teachers who participated in this study had any training at all about materials evaluation. Since those who are choosing the ELT materials do not have enough academic and practical knowledge about materials evaluation, they cannot carry out needs analysis. In addition, they create no opportunity for learners to take part in the process and they cannot develop a sound criterion for the process. In short, the way the ELT materials selection process is undertaken seems to be inappropriate and one of the topics that must be handled seriously in ELT in Turkey.

## 5. IMPLICATIONS / CONCLUSIONS

The study indicates that teachers almost have no or limited right to select their own ELT materials although teachers are the ones who know the needs and interests of their learners and are the ones who use those books in the language classrooms with their students. It was also reported that there are no criteria developed for ELT materials evaluation. Some assumptions or the advertising ability of the publishing companies influence the choice of ELT materials. Private high schools do not change ELT materials as often as state Anatolian high schools but still change them every two to three years. Both schools tend to choose the materials that are published more recently, most probably because of the novelty effect - the belief that the new one is always the best. State Anatolian high schools change ELT materials every year. They have additional concerns other than scientific ones while choosing ELT materials. It was stated that it was their desire to have better ties with all publishing companies. By doing so, the school received extra teaching aids or ELT materials. It is because of this that ELT materials are changed every year. ELT materials are chosen from a different company each year or they choose the some materials from different companies within the same academic year. On the other hand, in regular state high schools ELT materials are provided by the Ministry of National Education and teachers have no control on the selection process. In all three types of schools, students have no contribution or right to choose the ELT materials they study while learning English. No one asks for their ideas about the ELT materials or the content of the ELT materials they study. Thus, students are just consumers who are not involved in the decision-making processes.

What is the solution? First of all, the EFL teachers, who are the ones who teach in the classroom and have expertise on language teaching, should be given the responsibility of choosing the EFL ELT

materials for their students (Johnson et al. 2008; Yuen, 2011). To do this, the needs and the interests of the students should be identified and the materials should be chosen accordingly by teachers. Since the international commercial ELT materials are published for global use, then the EFL teachers should adapt them to their own context. As a result, with the guidance of the needs analysis, it becomes possible to use the most appropriate ELT materials in schools. This process is likely to help carry out activities which are interesting, purposeful, and relevant to students' future goals. As a result, the language learning experience will become more meaningful and enjoyable. Consequently, with the help of choosing the right EFL ELT materials, optimal affective context, which is vital for language learning can be created in language classes.

### **5.1. Implications for Foreign Language Education**

The ELT materials evaluation and selection must be carried out on a scientific basis. Data about a particular context and group of learners needs to be collected through a carefully planned experimental design. Considering the data, scientific criteria should be developed using the recent findings in psychology, linguistics, pedagogy, and other related fields (Davies, 2006). This theoretical evaluation should be supported and validated by the actual use of materials and practical data. Based on the practical data, the adaptation process should be carried out for the materials, which are already used, to increase their effectiveness. Finally, the following information may provide a useful framework about the ELT materials evaluation process to use the ELT materials more effectively and improve the quality of ELT instruction.

#### **5.1.1. The ELT Materials Evaluation Process**

The ELT materials evaluation is a scientific and ongoing process. Since every year the target learners to whom the EFL course are offered are different, their needs and interests will be different. Thus materials that may work well for a particular group of learners in one academic year may not work for another group of students in another year. Moreover, teachers may come up with different ideas about ELT materials every year (Johnson et al. 2008). Consequently, the evaluation and adaptation process never ends (Pardo and Tellez, 2009). It should also be kept in mind that this process is not linear, but cyclical (Brown, 1995; Graves, 2000).

The elements of the ELT materials evaluation process can be summarized as follows:

##### **5.1.1.1. Predictive Evaluation**

#### **Form the evaluation team from both teachers and students**

Since the expertise and experience of the EFL teachers are required and the needs and interests of the EFL learners need to be identified, an ELT materials evaluation team composed of teachers and learners can be formed. Even the school administration can be included in this group. In this way, everyone who can influence the EFL teaching/learning process may be given an opportunity to raise his/her voice about the ELT materials. Naturally, the ELT materials adopted compromisingly by such a group are likely to help create optimal environment for EFL learning (Graves, 2000; McGrath, 2006; Tomlinson, 2003).

#### **Know the learners**

To evaluate ELT materials it is necessary to know the ones who are going to use the ELT materials (Daloğlu and Işık Taş, 2007). Hence, the demographic information about learners; their education background, language learning experience, what they bring to the classroom are all necessary to choose the most appropriate ELT materials for a particular group of learners. In addition, the reason why learners are learning a foreign language and what their ultimate goals are need to guide the ELT materials evaluation process. Moreover, learner interest has to be considered (Yuen, 2011). The degree of learner interest determines the degree of learner involvement in the foreign language education. Hence, the information about learners is indispensable for the ELT materials selection process (Ehrman et al. 2005; McGrath 2002; 2006; Tomlinson, 2003).

### **Know teachers**

Teachers are the ones who use the ELT materials in the classroom together with their learners. They cannot use ELT materials fruitfully that they do not approve of. That is why, in the ELT materials evaluation process there should be enough knowledge about teachers as well (Büyükduman, 2005; Yuen, 2011). Their theoretical and practical background about language teaching, their beliefs about language teaching, in short, what they bring to the EFL classroom about language teaching should be identified and a match between these and the ELT materials should be sought. Since the degree to which ELT materials fits to their frame of reference determines the success in ELT, knowing who the EFL teachers are is of great importance for the ELT materials evaluation process (McGrath, 2006).

### **Know the context**

While choosing ELT materials it is a must to know the constraints of context (Kaewpet, 2009; Pardo and Tellez, 2009; Richards, 2006). If English is the medium of instruction for just one school subject, the needs of that subject has to be emphasized. However, if English is the medium of instruction for all subjects in the curriculum, this also must be taken into account and the ELT materials should be selected accordingly. When English is the school subject, then the ELT materials evaluation becomes less complex and it is enough to focus on the EFL course only. Moreover, while choosing ELT materials: international trend, national policy, expectations of parents, attitudes towards the target language, time, class size, availability of materials, quantity and quality of technological equipment are to be considered. For example, if ELT materials require heavy use of software and there are not any or enough computers at school, that material cannot be chosen. Similarly, if ELT materials were heavily focused on group work activities, in a class of 50 students it would be too difficult to carry out such an activity. In short, it is essential to know the weaknesses and strengths of context in order to choose ELT materials that best fits a particular context (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986; Tomlinson, 2003).

### **Know the goals**

It is also necessary to know why learners are studying English. What are they are going to do with it? The answer to this question needs to directly affect the overall aim of the course impacting the language skills, study skills, and knowledge base that will be taught. What kind of activities should be used in order to reach the learners goals in learning the language? This then leads to the ELT materials evaluation because it determines the type of tasks learners carry out and the activities students will be engaged in to a great extent. In this way, ELT materials selection can facilitate or hinder the fulfillment of the overall goals of the course. It cannot be overstated that choosing the right ELT materials is vital to what extent the course goals can be realized (Kaewpet, 2009;Purgoson, 1991; McGrath, 2006; Petter, 2000).

### **Develop the criteria**

The above factors, the information about teachers, the information about learners, context, and overall goal provide the basis on which evaluation is based. Without this preliminary knowledge, it is impossible to create a sound criterion for ELT materials' evaluation and selection (Skierso, 1991). In other words, the starting point is to know each specific context, the learners and the learners' goals well. Then by using this information together with the scientific findings in the related fields, such as linguistics, psychology, pedagogy, etc. a scientific and valid criteria for ELT materials evaluation can be developed. Since each context and group of learners are unique, it can be concluded the criteria developed for each specific case will be different (Graves, 2000; Petter, 2000).

### **Undertake external evaluation**

External evaluation provides a general picture about ELT materials and is a prerequisite for a more detailed evaluation of ELT materials. By looking at the cover pages, blurb, and introduction it is possible to get information about required proficiency, intended age group, aim of the ELT materials, the theory of language and language learning and the methodology of the ELT materials; and, it can be



inferred and concluded whether the ELT materials are appropriate or not. After examining the table of contents, page layout, pictures and drawings, and the type of interaction required, it can be decided if it is the one which makes the learners get interested and involved in the activities. In addition, the peripheries -audio-visual materials, teacher's book, workbook, test booklet, software and internet support- help teachers to see to what extent the course package supports the EFL instruction to fulfill its intended goal(s). Based on the external evaluation, ELT materials can be eliminated or chosen for more detailed analysis, internal evaluation (McGrath, 2002; Petter, 2000).

### **Undertake internal evaluation**

Internal evaluation is the detailed examination of ELT materials in terms of skills, activities, type of interaction, learner autonomy, learners' self-assessment, unit organization, presenting content, presenting linguistic elements, etc. by using the criteria. Consequently the candidate ELT material(s) is/are selected for practical evaluation (McGrath, 2006; Petter, 2000).

#### **5.1.1.2. Practical Evaluation**

##### **Piloting**

No predictive evaluation is complete without actually using ELT materials to see how it works in the classroom and to what extent it serves to fulfill the overall goal of the program. Hence, piloting is very important to see the practical part of the evaluation. By using the criteria, candidate books can be determined and piloted to see whether they are appropriate for that specific context. For this reason, several units from the beginning, middle, and end of the ELT materials should be chosen and applied in the classroom. By using the criteria and through observation and questionnaires, data is collected. The results of such evaluations lead to the appropriate ELT materials to be chosen (Tomlinson, 2003).

##### **Micro analysis**

A particular teaching task is selected and evaluated empirically. A particular task of special concern or importance is chosen and with the help of quantitative and/or qualitative data collection procedures data is collected and analyzed. Finally, conclusion and implications for language learning are reported. Micro evaluation provides the basis for macro evaluation (Ellis, 1997).

##### **Macro analysis**

It is the overall empirical evaluation of ELT materials. It provides information if the ELT materials has worked or not. Similar to micro-evaluation, with help of an experimental design and qualitative and quantitative data collection procedures, data is collected and analyzed. Then the conclusion and implications of language learning for that particular ELT materials are reported (Petter, 2000).

#### **5.1.1.3. Overall Evaluation**

The data obtained from the predictive and practical evaluation is brought together to assess the overall value and usefulness of ELT materials. Each type of evaluation presents the usefulness of ELT materials from a different perspective and is used to have a more valid evaluation. Overall data reveals to what extent ELT materials meets the needs and interests of learners to reach the aim of the language program. It can also show in what respect ELT materials should be improved (Cunningsworth, 1995; Tomlinson, 2003; Willis, 2000).

#### **5.1.1.4. Adaptation**

All commercial materials are prepared for a general audience and no ELT materials fits to each context completely. Therefore, ELT materials should not be used without adapting to the particular context. But how is it carried out? The data obtained from predictive and practical evaluation reveals the weaknesses of ELT materials, which parts of it may not and did not work. To better improve ELT materials and adapt it to a particular group of learners and context, a series of changes and improvements has to be carried out. This process improves the future use of ELT materials (Barrios and de Debat, 2006; McGrath, 2006; Tomlinson, 2003).

## REFERENCES

- Barrios, M.L. and de Debat, V. (2006). Minding the needs of the Argentine learner: global textbooks and their adapted version for the local context. *Folio*, 10 (2), 14-16.
- Breen, M. P. and Littlejohn, A. (Ed.) (2000). *Classroom decision-making: negotiation and process syllabuses in practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language teaching and learning*. White Plains, NY: Pearson and Longman.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Büyükduman, F.İ. (2005). The opinions of elementary school English teachers on the English curriculum for elementary schools. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 55-64.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford, Heinemann.
- Daloğlu, A. and Işık Taş, E. (2007). Assessing English language learners' needs and lacks. *Education and Science*, 32(146), 64-79.
- Davies, A. (2006). What do learners really want from their EFL course? *ELT Journal*, 60(1), 3-12.
- Dubin, F. and Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrman, M., Leaver, B. L., and Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials, *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36-42.
- Ellis, R. (2008). Principles of instructed second language acquisition. *CAL*. December. Retrieved May 4, 2012, from [http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest\\_pdfs/Instructed2ndLangFinalWeb.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/Instructed2ndLangFinalWeb.pdf).
- Gass, S. M. and Selinger, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gebhard, J. G. (1999). *Teaching English as a foreign or second language*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graves, K. (2001) A framework of course development processes. In Hall, D.R. & Hewings, A. (eds.) *Innovation in English language teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Grossman, P. and Thompson, C. (2008). Learning from curriculum materials: scaffolds for new teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 2014-2026.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- Hernandez, T. (2006). Integrative motivation as a predictor of success in the intermediate foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(4), 605-618.
- Johnson, K., Kim, M., Ya-Fang, L., Nava, A., Perkins, D., Smith, A.M., Soler-Canela, O. and Lu, W. (2008). A step forward: investigating expertise in materials evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 62 (2), 157-163.
- Kaewpet, C. (2009). A framework for investigating learner needs: needs analysis extended to curriculum development. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(2), 209-220.
- Krashen, S. D. (2008). The din in the head hypothesis: comments on de Bot: *Modern Language Journal*, 92(39), 349.
- Krashen, S. (2012). Academic proficiency (language and content) and the role of strategies. *TESOL Journal*, 2(4), 381-393.
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. (1996). *Materials and methods in ELT*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2006). Teachers' and learners' images for coursebooks. *ELT Journal*, 60 (2), 171-180.
- Mishan, F. (2005). *Designing authenticity into language learning materials*. Portland, OR, USA. : Intellect.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Pardo, A.N. and Tellez, M.A. (2009). ELT Materials: The key to fostering effective teaching and learning settings. *PROFILE*, 11(2), 171-186.
- Petter, W. (2000). *A Coursebook evaluation*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Centre for English Language Studies.

- Purgoson, K. B. (1991). Planning lessons and units (Ed. Marianne Celce-Murcia) Teaching English as a second or foreign language (pp. 419-431). Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.
- Richard-Amato, P. (1988). *Making it happen*. New York. Longman.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jack C. Richards, J.C. (2006). Materials development and research—making the connection. *RELC*, 37(1), 5-26.
- Santos, D. (2006). Framing the textbook in the classroom events. *Folio*, 11(1), 14-19.
- Sheldon, L.E. (Ed.) (1987). *ELT textbooks and materials: problems in evaluation and development*. ELT documents 126. London: Modern English Publications/The British Council.
- Skierso, A. (1991). Planning lessons and units. (Ed. Marianne Celce-Murcia) Teaching English as a second or foreign language (pp. 432-453). Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language learning*. London: Continuum.
- Willis, D. (2000). *Syllabus and materials*. Birmingham: The Center for English Language Studies.
- Yuen, K. (2011). The representation of foreign cultures in English textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 65 (4), 458-466.

### APPENDIX A: Teacher Questionnaire

The following questionnaire is designed to elicit information about ELT materials evaluation. The results will be used to better the ELT materials evaluation process. Please mark your school type and tick the appropriate box (yes or no) that describes the evaluation process in your school. Thanks for your participation.

School type

private high school       state Anatolian high school       regular state high school

|    |  | yes | no |
|----|--|-----|----|
| 1  | Administration chooses the ELT materials                                 |     |    |
| 2  | Department head chooses the ELT materials                                |     |    |
| 3  | Teachers all together choose the ELT materials                           |     |    |
| 4  | I choose the ELT materials   |     |    |
| 5  | Learners get involved in materials evaluation                            |     |    |
| 6  | Learner needs and interests are identified before the evaluation process |     |    |
| 7  | ELT materials are evaluated through a criterion                          |     |    |
| 8  | I have training about ELT materials evaluation                           |     |    |
| 9  | ELT materials are selected every year                                    |     |    |
| 10 | ELT materials are selected every two-three years                         |     |    |
| 11 | ELT materials are selected every five years                              |     |    |
| 12 | ELT materials determine the syllabus                                     |     |    |

Please specify additional ideas/practices concerning ELT materials evaluation (if you have any).

### GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

İngilizce yabancı dil eğitiminde temel araç olan ve yabancı dil girdisini, öğrenci güdülenmesini ve öğretim yöntemini doğrudan etkileyen İngilizce ders malzemelerinin yabancı dil eğitimindeki rolü yadsınmayacak kadar önemlidir. Fakat bu konu yabancı dil eğitiminde yeteri kadar vurgulanmamıştır. Bu çalışmada amaç, Türkiye’de lise düzeyinde İngilizce yabancı dil ders malzemelerinin nasıl seçildiklerini araştırmak ve bir yabancı dil malzemesi değerlendirme sistemi önererek bu konuya katkı sağlamaktır.

Araştırmaya 19 özel lise, 10 devlet anadolu lisesi, ve 8 düz devlet lisesi olmak üzere toplam 37 okul katılmıştır. 52 özel lise, 37 Anadolu lisesi, 18 düz devlet lisesi İngilizce öğretmeni araştırmada yer almıştır. Özel liselerde ve devlet Anadolu liselerinde 9. haftada 10 ders saati, 10., 11. ve 12. sınıflarda haftada 4 ders saati İngilizce dersi verilmektedir. Veri toplama aracı olarak sormacadan faydalanılmıştır. Sormacada, İngilizce ders malzemelerinin kimler tarafından seçildiği, seçimde hangi ölçütlerin kullanıldığı, seçimin ne kadar sıklıkla yapıldığı, seçimde öğrencilerin rolünün ne olduğu, malzeme seçimi öncesi gereksinim çözümünün yapıldığı

yapılmadığı ve İngilizce ders malzemeleri ile İngilizce izlencesi arasında nasıl bir ilişki olduğu konularında İngilizce öğretmenlerinden bilgi istenmiştir. Sormacadaki aynı maddeler, İngilizce öğretmenleri ile yapılan görüşmelerde de kullanılarak, öğretmenlerin düşüncelerini daha iyi anlama ve verileri doğrulama amaçlanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler SPSS ile değerlendirilmiştir. Okul türleri ile verilen yanıtlar arasında bir bağlantı olup olmadığı Kruskal Wallis Testi ile araştırılmıştır. Tanımlayıcı istatistik ile veriler tabloluşturulmuştur.

Araştırma bulguları ders malzemelerinin, özel liselerde İngilizce bölüm başkanı (%56) ve okul idaresi (%33) tarafından, devlet anadolu liselerinde İngilizce grup öğretmenlerinin ortak kararıyla (%53), bölüm başkanı (%34) ve idare (%14) tarafından, düz devlet liselerinde ise Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (%100) tarafından seçildiğini ortaya koymuştur. Elde edilen diğer bir bulgu da, özel liselerin İngilizce ders malzemelerini her 2-3 yılda, devlet anadolu liselerinin her yıl değiştirdikleridir. Düz devlet liselerinde ise durum tamamen Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'na dağıtılan kitaplara bağlıdır ve belirli bir süre belirtmek olanaksızdır. İngilizce ders malzeme seçiminde ise, hem özel liselerde hem de devlet anadolu liselerinde, seçim öncesi gereksinim çözümlenmesinin yapılmadığı ortaya konmuştur. Elde edilen diğer bir sonuç da İngilizce ders malzemesi seçiminde liselerde bilimsel bir ölçütün geliştirilmediği ve/veya kullanılmadığıdır. Her üç tür lisede tek ortak nokta olarak dikkati çeken nokta ise, İngilizce ders malzemelerinin aynı zamanda izlence görevi üstelendiğidir. İngilizce dersi izlencesi ve dolayısıyla ders planlarının ders malzemelerindeki ünitelerin, eğitim-öğretim yılındaki hafta sayısına eşit olarak dağıtılması ile oluşturulduğu ortaya konmuştur. Bulguların ortaya koyduğu diğer bir husus da veri toplama araçlarına verilen yanıtlarla, okul türleri arasında anlamlı farkların olmasıdır. Yani okul türü İngilizce ders malzemesi seçiminde belirleyici unsurdur.

Ortaya çıkan bulgular, İngilizce yabancı dil ders malzemelerinin, yabancı dil eğitiminin başarısına doğrudan ve çok büyük etki eden unsurlar olmasına rağmen, bu konuda yeterli akademik ve bilimsel yaklaşımın olmadığını göstermiştir. İngilizce yabancı dil eğitimine Türkiye'de verilen özel öneme, İngilizce eğitimi için ayrılan ders saati, harcanan emek ve maddi kaynaklara rağmen, bu eğitim için temel olacak İngilizce ders malzemesi seçimine gerekli hassasiyetin gösterilmesi düşündürücüdür.

Bu bulguların ortaya koyduğu önemli sorunun çözümü için, araştırmanın sonunda İngilizce yabancı dil malzemelerinin nasıl değerlendirilebileceğini açıklayan bir model yabancı dil malzemesi sistemi önerilmiştir. Önerilen sistemde süreç ön plana çıkmaktadır, düzlemsel değil döngüsel ve sürerlilik gösteren bir sistemdir ve İngilizce yabancı dil eğitiminde rolü olan herkesin katkısı önemsenmektedir. Önerilen sistemde ön değerlendirme, uygulamalı değerlendirme, genel değerlendirme ve uyarlama ana unsurlardır. Sistem şu şekilde özetlenebilir: Değerlendirme için ön hazırlık çalışmalarını ve gerekli alt yapı bilgilerinin toplandığı ön değerlendirme ilk aşamayı oluşturur. Ön değerlendirmede, değerlendirmeyi yürütecek takımın oluşturulması, öğrencileri daha iyi tanımak amacıyla öğrenciler hakkında bilgilerin toplanması, öğretmenlerin hangi kuramsal ve uygulamalı bilgilere sahip olduklarının ortaya konması, öğrenme ve öğrenmenin gerçekleştiği sosyal ortamın özelliklerinin bilinmesi, yabancı dil eğitim amacının tam olarak ortaya konması, değerlendirme ölçütünün geliştirilmesi veya seçilmesi, yabancı dil malzemelerinin dış değerlendirmesinin yapılması, dil malzemelerinin iç değerlendirmesinin yapılması işlemleri yapılır. Uygulamalı değerlendirmede ise, pilot çalışma ile, asıl uygulamadan önce yabancı dil malzemeleri ile ilgili uygulamalı çalışma yapılır. Ayrıca yabancı dil malzemelerindeki bazı bölümlerin ders ortamında ya da deneysel ortamda işlenerek bilimsel araştırmanın yapıldığı mikro değerlendirme ve aynı şekilde ders malzemelerinin tamamının kullanılması ile makro değerlendirme yapılır. Bu şekilde uygulamalı ve bilimsel veriler ışığında yabancı dil malzemelerinin uygunluğu ve etkinliği araştırılır. Genel değerlendirme boyutunda ise, ön değerlendirme ve uygulamalı değerlendirmeden elde edilen bulgular harmanlanarak en uygun yabancı dil malzemesi seçimi yapılır. Her ortam özgün olduğu için, başkaları tarafından geliştirilen malzemelerin her ortama uyması olanaksızdır. Bu nedenle, değerlendirme sürecinde elde edilen veriler değerlendirilerek, yabancı dil malzemesinin kullanılacağı ortam için en uygun şekilde sokulması için uyarlama çalışması ile süreç tamamlanır. Fakat bu süreç, yukarıda anlatılan unsurların aşamalı ve sıralı olarak yürütüldüğü, bir kere yapılan ve biten bir özellikte değildir. Her öğrenci grubu özgündür ve bir grupta işleyen bir etkinlik diğer bir grupta çalışmayabilir. Ayrıca, en iyi değerlendirme gerçek ortamda, gerçek uygulama ile yapılan değerlendirmedir ve elde edilecek bulgular, yapılan gözlemler çok önemlidir. Bu nedenle, değerlendirme işlemi yabancı dil öğrenme sürecinin her aşamasında, bütününde yürütülen ve sürerlilik gösteren bir nitelik taşır.

#### **Citation Information:**

Işık, A. (2013). How are ELT materials chosen in high schools? Some suggestions. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 28(1), 165-176.