
To what extent does a university level English program meet workplace demands

Ali Işık

Kara Harp Okulu, Ankara, Turkey

Email address:

isikal@hotmail.com

To cite this article:

Ali Işık. To What Extent does a University Level English Program Meet Workplace Demands. *Education Journal*. Vol. 2, No. 3, 2013, pp. 98-107. doi: 10.11648/j.edu.20130203.17

Abstract: The aim of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of an English language program offered at the tertiary level in the Turkish EFL context. It specifically aims at evaluating whether the program meets job-related demands and graduates are able to maintain their English proficiency level at work. 122 senior electronics and computer engineering majors and 57 graduates participated in the study. The seniors were given a questionnaire to elicit their ideas about usefulness of the ELT program in their future careers. The questionnaire administered to the graduates aimed at obtaining their ideas about the English program and language skills they need/use at work. Each group was given a questionnaire to elicit their ideas about the English Program with respect to four language skills. To see the match between the ideas and the TOEFL scores of both the seniors and graduates for each skill, TOEFL scores were compared with the data obtained from the questionnaires. Moreover the TOEFL scores of the senior students and graduates were compared to see if graduates were able to keep their English skills at work. The data was analyzed and the responses of senior students and graduates were compared by using one-way ANOVA, and the TOEFL scores by t-test statistics. The results indicated that the English program generally meets the job-related English needs and graduates are able to increase their English proficiency. Finally the role of language program evaluation in language education and how it is to be carried out are discussed.

Keywords: Language Program Evaluation, English Education, Job-Related Language Demands

1. Introduction

A language program, which was designed to target the language learners' needs, is to be evaluated to see how successfully it is implemented and to what degree it meets learner needs. Thus obtaining data to check if the overall goal of a program is realized effectively is of the utmost priority of language program evaluation (Cronbach, 1991; Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005). Obviously a practical sound plan to evaluate learning outcomes and processes/factors that affect them is mandatory for language program evaluation (Patton, 2008; Payne, 1994). Hence language program evaluation aims at making informed, sound decisions about the effectiveness of a language program by employing a wide variety of data collection techniques (Lorena & Julie, 2009; Mackay 1994; Norris et al., 2009). To collect data from various sources is of utmost importance to see the whole picture, thus all stake holders in the teaching/learning process are to be included in the participatory evaluation process (Tribble, 2000; Lynch, 2003). In specific, the data collected from employers who

employ the graduates and education institutions which admit learners after completing a language program are vital to see how relevant a program is to meet the occupational and educational requirements in real life contexts (Long, 2005). Naturally the ideas collected from learners and their families after completing the language program present invaluable information for program evaluators as well. Another facet to be investigated is the teaching/learning context (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005). The length of a program, frequency and density of class hours, class size, availability and quality of materials/equipment, outside class facilities (learning centers, self-access rooms, etc.), opportunities provided to practice what has learned are all needed to be investigated. Besides the educational process which comprises adopted language teaching methodology, the quality and relevance of classroom tasks/activities, the role of teachers and students, the approach of language teaching materials must also be the focus of attention during the evaluation process (Graves, 2000). Another focus of attention in program evaluation is financial issues (Oscar, J. & Topper,

A. M., 2012; Watanabe et al., 2009). A program can achieve its overall goal but it is necessary to see whether it is cost-effective or not. Finally the efficiency of the language program (syllabus) design and its components (overall goals, the process of determining overall goals and objectives, needs and context analysis carried out to determine goals and materials, materials adaptation/development processes, tasks and activities, roles of teachers and learners measurement and evaluation procedures) are to be the major concern of program evaluation (Kiely, 2009; Watanabe et al., 2009). In short, a thorough language program evaluation with a broad-context perspective is of great help for decision makers to assess the efficiency of a language program (Long, 2005).

Currently language program evaluation has been emphasized in education and many approaches have been developed and models have been suggested (Tribble, 2000; Tunç, 2010; Watanabe et al., 2009). The evaluation-related questions such as "What is the nature and the role of evaluation?", "What, how, and when to evaluate?", "Who is responsible for evaluation?", "Who utilizes the findings?", and finally "How are the results used?" have been discussed widely. The answers given to these questions reflect different theoretical and methodological orientations. The traditional approaches focus on the end product (Kiely, 2009). The efficiency of a program is evaluated in terms of cost-effectiveness and "assessment of learning", that is, to what extent learners achieve the program goals. It adopts a top-down approach and outside authorities- local or central government offices of education- prepare, implement, and use the results of evaluation (Lynch, 1996). It uses the objective means of data collection procedures which can be easily and objectively scored. (Brown, 2004). The current approach emphasizes the holistic process in which all stakeholders and all aspects of a language program are stressed (Kiely, 2009). Gaining insight into the language education process and all factors involved in it provides invaluable data for program evaluation (Lynch, 1996). Process-oriented approach aims at getting the whole picture through the use of multiple data/information gathering procedures (Barootchi & Keshavaraz, 2002). Thus it favors a bottom-up approach in terms of stakeholders who plan, implement, and exploit the evaluation results. The aim is provide data to interested stakeholders who may use it in relation to their purposes. The Utilization Focused Evaluation Model sets a good model of current approaches to language evaluation. It aims at providing stakeholders with useful data to meet the desired results from evaluation. The evaluation process is to planned and implemented considering the "evaluation needs" of users involved in the process. The purpose could be to check the suitability of the adopted methodology, quality of language learning materials, cost-effectiveness, accountability, and relevance. The scope and methodology change with the aim of the process and who utilizes the findings (Patton, 2008).

Naturally, language program evaluation is a worldwide concern. Admiraal, Westhoff & de Bot (2006) carried out a longitudinal study to evaluate English-Dutch bilingual programs in secondary education. Fifty-percent of the courses were taught in English and the rest in Dutch. The results obtained from the evaluation indicated that the students scored well on lessons offered in English and Dutch. Hence this longitudinal study suggested that bilingual programs could be utilized in English language teaching. Similarly Walker (2010) evaluated the English medium instruction implemented at the secondary school level in China. She came up with supporting data in favor of English immersion programs. McDonough & Chaikitmongkol (2007) studied the teachers' and learners' ideas about a task-based English course in Thailand. The data collected from both teachers and students showed that the program helped learners become more independent and met their real life academic needs. Likewise, Hur & Suh (2010) focused on an intensive summer English program based on needs analysis. The data collected from students, teachers, and parents revealed that the program contributed a lot to language development and the self-concept of students. Parents, teachers and students found the program satisfactory. Kavaliauskienė & Anusienė (2008) addressed the issue of ESP program evaluation through learner self-assessment and end-course scores of learners on English skills and knowledge. The results indicated that there was a high correlation between students' self-assessment scores and their end-course scores of English skills and knowledge. Hence they suggested that student self-assessment can be used as a reliable means in the language program evaluation process. Altmisdort, Isik & Yamac (2010) evaluated the English program of a university to see if it met the needs of students and work demands of its graduates. They discovered a gap existed between the program and the actual demands of the workplace and which resulted in offering a new English program. In addition, they proposed a comprehensive model for program evaluation. Youssef (2012) also handled the role of learner impression collected on a regular basis in investigating program effectiveness. She indicated that rather than waiting for the end-course data to evaluate a program, obtaining learner impression regularly throughout the course via alternative data collection techniques helps improve the course during the instruction process. Mathews & Mellom (2012) investigated the impact of summer enrichment programs for English-learning secondary students. They found that the program affected the academic achievement and attitudes of students positively. Furthermore, they indicated a strong desire for the subsequent academic program.

The theoretical discussion and research have put forward the unquestionable function of language program evaluation in language education. That it is to be the integral part of any program is unquestionable to obtain data and make informed decisions accordingly. In the same vein, this study, inspired by The Utilization Focused

Evaluation Model, was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of a tertiary level ELT program to meet the English language demands of its graduates and senior students. Namely, the study focused on the following research questions:

1. To what extent does the ELT program satisfy future English needs of senior university students?
2. To what extent does the ELT program satisfy English needs of its graduates?
3. Do the graduates program sustain their English proficiency at the workplace?

2. Methodology

2.1. Aim

The study was planned to investigate the effectiveness of the English language program planned for the senior electronics and computer engineering students in meeting their job-related English language demands at work. Namely the purpose is to see to what extent the English program addresses the English needs of its graduates at work.

2.2. Participants

122 senior electronics and computer engineering majors participated in the study. They were advanced level students and took 6 hours of English in the first year of their university education, 6 hours in the second year, 4 hours in the third and fourth year. 57 graduates took part in the study. Eighty seven-percent of the graduates who participated in the study had work experience between two to five years, and the rest over five years. They were employed in the same government company in which they were required to use English for comprehending technical documents, job-related oral and written correspondence with other nationals. English proficiency, which is mainly tested by TOEFL, plays a significant role in their assignments and positions in the company. It determines whether they are assigned abroad or other tasks requiring English in Turkey. 63% of the graduates stated that they either had been abroad and/or been in contexts in which English was used as the medium of communication to conduct job-related tasks. None of them received any formal English instruction after graduation.

2.3. The ELT Program

Upon acceptance to the university, the students were grouped as elementary, intermediate and advanced depending on the results of the Oxford Placement Test. Consequently each group followed a different ELT program. The participants in the advanced group followed Interchange 2 and 3 as the main coursebooks in the first and second year. In the third and the fourth year North Star books were used to foster students' academic English skills. In addition, in the fourth year they received technical

English one hour a week. In the academic program, six hours of English per week were planned for the freshmen and sophomore students, and four hours of English per week for the junior and senior students. Each academic year lasted 30 weeks.

2.4. Data Collection

Two different questionnaires, one for the students, one for the graduates, were used to collect data (see Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). In the graduate questionnaire, the items about the frequency of use of each skill, importance attached to each skill, and difficulty level experienced with each skill are handled. The statistical analysis showed that the questionnaires have high reliability (Cronbach's alpha: 0.91 and 0.89) and validity (Cronbach's alpha: 0.93, 0.90).

Since the local and international assignments of the graduates are carried out in relation to their TOEFL scores, TOEFL was used to test English proficiency of both the students and graduates.

2.5. Data Analyses

SPSS was used to analyze the data obtained in this study. A one-way ANOVA test was used to compare the data elicited from the senior students and the graduates with their TOEFL scores. T-test was used to compare the TOEFL scores of the senior students and the graduates.

3. Results

3.1. Comparison of the frequency of use of each language skills and TOEFL scores

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively show the comparison between the frequency of use of each language skill mentioned by the graduates and their TOEFL scores.

Table 1. Reading frequency of use and TOEFL comparison

Reading Frequency of Use	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	538,81	21	37,190
2	539,70	20	34,011
3	554,23	30	30,684
4	517,47	15	59,846
5	541,00	22	27,004
6	513,91	11	43,136
7	510,00	3	45,826
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 1 shows that there is a significance difference between the frequency of use of reading skill and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=2.693$, $\text{sig}=.018$).

Table 2. Writing frequency of use and TOEFL comparison

Writing Frequency of Use	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	528,75	4	32,129
2	538,77	13	41,592
3	548,41	27	32,396
4	530,00	29	46,891
5	530,86	22	47,084
6	539,15	20	28,004
7	546,43	7	35,364
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 2 indicates a significant difference is not found between the frequency of use of writing skills and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=0.712$, $\text{sig}=.640$).

Table 3. Speaking frequency of use and TOEFL comparison

Speaking Frequency of Use	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	534,75	4	43,146
2	533,59	17	45,602
3	546,19	16	34,782
4	538,76	21	52,625
5	538,24	25	29,971
6	531,96	23	38,030
7	539,31	16	36,829
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 3 indicates that there is no significant difference between the frequency of use of speaking skills and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=0.237$, $\text{sig}=.963$).

Table 4. Listening frequency of use and TOEFL comparison

Listening Frequency of Use	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	527,45	11	25,994
2	545,94	16	37,499
3	533,65	23	47,635
4	541,29	21	39,087
5	544,14	28	38,355
6	532,95	21	38,097
7	488,50	2	44,548
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 4 indicates a significant difference is not found between the frequency of use of listening skills and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=1.002$, $\text{sig}=.427$).

Tables 1, 2, 3, 4 reveal that significant difference was observed between the frequency use of reading skills and the TOEFL score. In other skills no significant difference was observed with respect to the TOEFL score.

3.2. The level of difficulty

In Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 the most challenging language skills mentioned by the graduates and TOEFL score were given.

Table 5. Reading level of difficulty and TOEFL comparison

Reading Level of Difficulty	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	510,25	4	61,700
2	559,00	5	17,349
3	532,00	4	30,430
4	542,31	13	42,684
5	534,81	16	32,192
6	530,73	41	33,281
7	544,92	39	46,299
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 5 indicates that there is no significant difference between the difficulty level of reading skill and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=1.057$, $\text{sig}=.393$).

Table 6. Writing level of difficulty and TOEFL comparison

Writing Level of Difficulty	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	517,00	3	73,736
2	543,00	9	29,724
3	539,25	16	49,994
4	525,00	21	40,047
5	534,10	21	23,043
6	539,70	30	43,268
7	549,32	22	36,301
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 6 shows that there is no significant difference between the difficulty level of writing skills and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=0.886$, $\text{sig}=.508$).

Table 7. Speaking level of difficulty and TOEFL comparison

Speaking Level of Difficulty	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	516,29	14	40,767
2	536,18	22	31,667
3	529,08	13	50,858
4	538,42	19	42,836
5	543,95	22	26,052
6	541,35	20	43,385
7	554,75	12	42,223
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 7 indicates a significant difference is not found between the difficulty level of speaking skills and TOEFL scores of the graduates ($F=1.311$, $\text{sig}=.258$).

Table 8. Listening level of difficulty and TOEFL comparison

Listening Level of Difficulty	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	491,50	4	92,874
2	514,86	7	52,091
3	531,13	16	33,870
4	540,86	21	30,322
5	539,50	24	40,007
6	538,81	31	34,971
7	552,95	19	32,949
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 8 shows that there is a significant difference between the difficulty level of listening skill and TOEFL

scores of the graduates ($F=1.978$, $\text{sig}=.074$)

Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 indicate that the skills which the graduates experience difficulty at work that match with their TOEFL scores, except their listening skills ($F=1.978$, $\text{sig}=.074$). The ones who stated that they experienced less difficulty scored between 540,86 – 552,81 on TOEFL, lower than those who experienced more difficulty.

3.3. Degree of Importance

Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 present the comparison between the importance attached to each skill by the graduates and TOEFL scores.

Table 9. Reading level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Reading Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	543,30	20	32,275
2	542,55	20	34,983
3	534,90	21	26,385
4	535,89	27	51,054
5	537,94	17	30,803
6	541,00	11	43,158
7	511,33	6	69,618
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 9 indicates that there is no significant difference between the degree of importance given to reading skills and TOEFL scores ($F=0.591$, $\text{sig}=.737$).

Table 10. Writing level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Writing Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	552,60	5	18,756
2	527,33	12	42,374
3	540,43	28	39,483
4	535,69	35	40,196
5	534,13	16	45,987
6	546,65	17	39,876
7	531,38	8	34,138
Total	537,70	121	39,596

Table 10 indicates that there is no significant difference between the degree of importance given to writing skills and TOEFL scores ($F=0.480$, $\text{sig}=.822$).

Table 11. Listening level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Listening Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	544,67	12	38,125
2	519,53	19	37,098
3	543,54	13	24,825
4	547,58	26	44,922
5	540,47	17	38,838
6	541,74	19	46,500
7	524,50	16	30,215
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 11 indicates that there is no significant difference between the degree of importance given to the speaking skills and TOEFL scores ($F=1.428$, $\text{sig}=.210$).

Table 12. Speaking level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Speaking Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	535,58	19	33,759
2	536,62	13	28,500
3	539,45	22	52,574
4	531,55	31	45,142
5	540,14	14	44,103
6	550,31	16	19,989
7	531,14	7	23,913
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 12 reveals that no significant difference is found between the degree of importance attached to the listening skills and TOEFL scores. ($F=0.444$, $\text{sig}=.848$).

As can be seen in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 there is a match between the importance the graduates attached to specific language skills and TOEFL scores.

3.4. Student anticipation about the importance of language skills at workplace

Tables 13, 14, 15, and 16 present the comparison between the importance attached to each skill by the senior students and TOEFL scores.

Table 13. Reading level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Reading Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	539,60	53	40,985
2	537,14	22	35,089
3	539,30	23	30,736
4	543,30	10	40,423
5	503,75	4	81,892
6	527,25	4	19,328
7	534,33	6	50,599
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 13 shows that there is no significant difference between the students' anticipation of the importance of reading skills at work and their TOEFL scores ($F=0.596$, $\text{sig}=.733$).

Table 14. Writing level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Writing Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	533,76	41	42,926
2	547,38	16	24,019
3	542,75	24	31,047
4	538,24	21	50,482
5	532,14	7	42,014
6	520,33	6	21,229
7	540,67	6	54,713
Total	537,70	121	39,596

Table 14 shows that there is no significant difference between the students' anticipation of the importance of writing skills at work and their TOEFL scores ($F=0.501$,

sig= .807).

Table 15. Speaking level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Speaking Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	536,07	87	40,802
2	536,31	16	32,771
3	554,57	7	28,947
4	546,50	4	42,304
5	585,00	1	.
6	505,00	1	.
7	534,33	6	50,599
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 15 shows that there is no significant difference between the students' anticipation of the importance of speaking skills at work and their TOEFL scores ($F=0.624$, sig= .711).

Table 16. Listening level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Listening Level of Importance	TOEFL Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	533,66	68	43,392
2	547,35	26	32,692
3	538,64	14	26,164
4	541,00	6	40,895
5	565,00	1	.
6	520,00	2	21,213
7	534,20	5	56,570
Total	537,57	122	39,461

Table 16 shows that there is no significant difference between the students' anticipation of the importance of listening skills at work and their TOEFL scores ($F=0.526$, sig= .787).

Tables 13, 14, 15, and 16 show that the students' anticipation about the importance of language skills were supported by their TOEFL scores. In other words there is a match between the skills which they thought would be useful in their careers and their TOEFL results.

Table 17. Listening level of importance and TOEFL comparison

Groups	Statistic	Bootstrap ^a			
		Bias	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
TOEFL Score	N	122			
	Mean	537,57	-,09	3,76	530,03
	Std. Deviation	39,461	-,217	3,410	32,703
	Std. Error	3,573			
	Mean	57			
	Mean	577,44	-,15	16,00	545,74
	Std. Deviation	47,695	-3,836	9,630	21,772
	Std. Error	15,898			
	Mean				

a. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 1000 bootstrap samples

3.5. Student Anticipation about the Importance of Language Skills at Workplace

This table summarizes the comparison of the TOEFL scores of the graduates and the senior students.

Table 17 indicates that there is a significant difference between the TOEFL scores of the students and the graduates ($t=-2,885$, sig=0,005). The results indicate that the graduates improved their English language skills at work.

4. Discussion

The results related with the senior students' anticipation about work-related English needs indicate that the English program is effective enough to meet the future needs of the senior students. When the future job-related degree of importance they attached to different English skills are compared with their TOEFL scores, it can be concluded that the senior students are aware of what English skills they need at work and that they are able to develop/improve their English skills accordingly. In other words the students thought that the ELT program was relevant to their future job demands and met their anticipated needs.

The data about the English skills that the graduates frequently need at work provide valuable insight into the effectiveness of the ELT program. When the graduates were asked to order the frequency of use of different English skills at work, TOEFL scores and frequency of English skills which are frequently used at work support each other, except for the reading skill. It can be said that the English program they followed at school helped them improve their English skills they needed at work. In that sense the ELT program is said to be effective enough to meet skill-based English needs of graduates. Likewise the results summarizing the degree of importance the graduates attached to each English skill at work, points to the effectiveness of the program. Although it is possible that graduates might improve their English skills after graduation, the ELT program is likely to provide the basis on which they could carry out tasks in English. When the graduate responses related with the difficulty they experienced at work are evaluated with respect to TOEFL scores, it can be claimed the scores reflect the difficulty level stated by the graduates. Although their scores were not low, they relatively found some skill-based tasks more demanding, and except for listening skills, the results obtained from the questionnaire suggest their TOEFL scores. In short, the results suggest that the ELT program is successful in satisfying the job-related English demands of the graduates.

In order to see if graduates could maintain their English proficiency after graduation, TOEFL scores of both the senior students and the graduates were compared. It was observed that the graduates improved their English proficiency. This result indicates that the graduates kept using English at work and engaged in different tasks which foster their English. That is, their workplace gave them

enough opportunity to use English for real purposes and helped their English improve.

5. Conclusion

The use of TOEFL, which is a general test, to test the effectiveness of the ELT program can be criticized since it is not context-specific and cannot exactly test the job-related issues. However, the graduates are assigned abroad or to international tasks depending on their TOEFL scores, thus it is reasonable to use the TOEFL exam for this specific context. Moreover it is an international standard exam, and the doubts about the validity and reliability of the data obtained from TOEFL can be minimized. In addition, developing an assessment procedure for a specific context is extremely difficult and hard to manage its validity and reliability. In short, Using TOEFL as the criterion for evaluating the program seems to be a logical choice.

The results are promising about the effectiveness of the ELT program. It generally meets the job-related needs of the senior students and the graduates. The program appears to satisfy the frequency of the skills the senior students think they will need, and the graduates use. Since the frequency of use directly reflects to what degree those skills will be or are needed, the positive relationship between TOEFL scores and frequency shows that the program addresses the language needs well enough. Similarly the data about the rating of importance attached to skills also demonstrate that the ELT activities carried out at school is relevant to language demands at work. Finally one-hour technical English offered to senior students is said to be useful because graduates' performance at work is good, and it is possible that technical English provides them with enough terminology to fulfill their tasks at work efficiently.

The results can also be interpreted that both the senior students and the graduates are aware of their language needs. Especially such awareness for the senior students is of utmost importance since their perceiving the relevance between the ELT program and work place demands fosters their academic and affective involvement in the classroom activities. Likewise, the graduates realize the necessity of English for their career as well as continually improving their English knowledge and skills in the work place. Thus the perception of relevance determines how learners value the ELT program, time and effort they put into it, and consequently their performance.

This study also intends to shine another light on the value of any language program. Unfortunately, it does miss a major point; it is either neglected or generally limited to test the performance of students. It aims at the testing of learning, not testing for learning, in other words, the general aim here is to express statistically the language performance of the individuals and institutions and rank or certify them to be eligible for certain posts or education rather than using the data to better the language teaching/learning process. Program evaluation is to be considered as a part of the teaching/learning process and the data obtained is to be

utilized to identify strengths and weaknesses in language programs and to improve the quality of language education (Norris, 2006; Watanabe et al., 2009). Moreover all stake holders; teachers, students, employers, school administration, and families act as the active participants of the language program evaluation process and they form the whole to contribute in the program's comprehensive evaluation. The variety and amount of information coming from different sources help complete and see the whole picture (Morris, 2006). Consequently a language program should have a carefully designed, unique evaluation plan stemmed from the language program itself. Then it can turn in to a complementary part of a language education program, not the result of it. (Norris et al., 2009; Watanabe et al., 2009).

6. Appendix

Appendix 1: Student Questionnaire for the Evaluation of ELT

Dear students, the information you will provide help to get real data and see the real picture about English Education. Thanks a lot.

PERSONAL DATA:

1. Class:
2. Major:
3. TOEFL score :
4. Your English level (lower, intermediate, advanced):
5. The high school you graduated from:
6. Which of the following language skills do you think will be useful when you graduate? "1" symbolizes the most important, "7" the least important.

	the mostthe least						
Listening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Writing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix 2: Graduate Questionnaire for the Evaluation of ELT

Dear participants, the information you will provide help to get real data and see the real picture about English Education. Thanks a lot.

Please mark the appropriate option.

	Yes	No
1. Have you ever been to an English speaking- country or in another country in which you use English as a medium of communication?	()	()
2. If "YES", did your English level determine your being there?	()	()
3. Have you ever been assigned abroad?	()	()
4. If "YES", did your English level determine your assignment?	()	()

5. Have your English level provided any privileges in your job?	()	()
6. Do you believe that your English level will provide you extra benefits in your career?	()	()
6. Did you receive any special English education before you start your current job?	()	()
7. If "YES" please indicate the length of education. ---- month ---- year		

a. Required language skills and difficulties experienced
Please mark the appropriate option for each skill.

1.How frequently do you use your English Skills?

	Always.....				Never		
Reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Writing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. What is the difficulty level you experience for each skill when doing your job?

	Always.....				Never		
Reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Writing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. What is the importance of each skill at work?

	Very.....Not at all						
Listening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Writing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please mark the appropriate option for each item

	Always..	Never				
1. Experiencing difficulty in oral presentations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Not being quick enough to express my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Anxiety related with making mistakes while speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Inability to formulate how to say something in English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Inability to speak appropriately in English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Pronunciation problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Inability to discuss my ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please mark the appropriate option for each item.

	Always.....	Never
1. Difficulty in comprehension	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Difficulty in not taking	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Difficulty in following presentations	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Difficulty in understanding instructions	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Difficulty in understanding daily talk	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Difficulty in understanding the gist of the conversation	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
I have experienced difficulty in understanding native speakers because		
7. they speak very fast	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
8. their pronunciation and accent are different	1	2 3 4 5 6 7
9. the noise in the context is too much	1	2 3 4 5 6 7

Please mark the appropriate option for each item.

Degree of importance										Frequency of experienced problems								
Always					Never						Very.				Not at all			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1. Punctuation and spelling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				2. Sentence structure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				3. Appropriate vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				4. Paragraph organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				5. Cohesion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				6. Appropriate style	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				7. Developing ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	8. Intelligibility	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	9. Coherence	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	10. Developing appropriate writing strategies	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	11. Obeying instructions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	12. Revising what I write	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

f. Reading

A. At work which reading materials do you utilize?

Examine the following items if your answer is “Yes”, please mark the frequency of difficulty you experience with each one.

Frequency of Difficulty		Always.....Never						
1. Articles	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Newspaper	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Short story/novel	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Technical job-related documents	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Sections from academic books	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Photocopied documents/projects	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Manuals or lab materials	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Soft copies of documents/projects	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Ads, brochures, posters in real life	Yes/No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. Please mark the appropriate option for each item.

Frequency of Difficulty		Always.....Never						
10. Getting the main idea	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
11. Skimming	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
12. Detailed reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
13. Scanning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
14. Guessing meaning from the context	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
15. Grasping the type of a text	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
16. Grasping the jargon in a text	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
17. Critical reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
18. Grasping the attitude of an author	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

6.2. The skills you want to improve

Please indicate which English skills/abilities you want to improve.

	Very.....Not at all
1. Developing the pronunciation and prosodic features of American English	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Not taking while listening	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Listening for general meaning	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Effective discussion skills	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Effective interpersonal communication skills	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Effective communication with native speakers	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Effective presentation skills	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Effective data gathering skills	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Writing a well-formed composition	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Preparing efficient report, tasks, projects	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Free writing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Writing a descriptive essay	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Quoting and giving references	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Synthesizing information from different sources	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Analyzing written documents	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Improving lexical knowledge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Developing speed reading	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Reading from an author's perspective	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Summarizing a written document orally	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Reading for general meaning	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

References

- [1] Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G. & de Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12 (1): 75 – 93.
- [2] Altmisdort, G., Isik, A., Yamac, A. (2010). Yeni bir Program Değerlendirme Modeline Göre bir Yabancı Dil Programının Değerlendirilmesi (Evaluation of a Foreign Language Education Program through a New Program Evaluation Model) . *Kara Harp Okulu Bilim Dergisi (Science Journal of Army Academy)*, 20 (2): 108-141.
- [3] Barootchi, N. & Keshavaraz, M. H. (2002). Assessment of achievement through portfolios and teacher-made tests. *Educational Research*, 44 (3): 279–288.
- [4] Brown, H.D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom practices*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- [5] Cronbach, L.J. (1991). Course improvement through evaluation. *Teachers' College Record*, 64: 672-683.
- [6] Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Hur, J. W. & Suh, S. (2010). The development, implementation, and evaluation of a summer school for English language learners. *The Professional Educator*, 34 (2).
- [8] Kavaliauskienė, G. & Anusienė L. (2008). Issues of quality in teaching/learning English at tertiary level. *Filologija. Edukologija*, 16(2): 124–132.
- [9] Kiely, R. (2009). Small answers to the big question: Learning from language programme evaluation. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1): 99-116.
- [10] Kiely, R. & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program Evaluation in Language Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [11] Long, M. H. (Ed.) (2005). *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Lorena, L. & Julie, S. (2009). Using program evaluation to inform and improve the education of young English language learners in US schools. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1): 35-54.
- [13] Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Lynch, B. K. (2003). *Language assessment and programme evaluation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [15] Mackay, R. (1994). Undertaking ESL/EFL programme review for accountability and improvement. *ELT Journal*, 48(2): 142-149.
- [16] Matthews, P. H. & Mellom, P.J. (2012). Shaping Aspirations, Awareness, Academics, and Action: Outcomes of Summer Enrichment Programs for English-Learning Secondary Students. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 23(2): 105–124.
- [17] McDonough, K. & Chaikitmongkol, W. (2007). Thailand teachers' and learners' reactions to a task-based EFL Course in Thailand. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41 (1): 107-132.
- [18] Morris, M. (2006). Addressing the challenges of program evaluation: One department's experience after two years. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4): 599-602.
- [19] Norris, J. M. (2006). The why (and how) of student learning outcomes assessment in college FL education. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4): 590-597.
- [20] Norris, J. M., Davis, J.M., Sinicrope, C. & Watanabe, Y. (2009). *Toward Useful Program Evaluation in College Foreign Language Education*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- [21] Oscar, J. & Topper, A. M. (2012). The cost of providing an adequate education to English language learners: a review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 82 (2): 179-232.
- [22] Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation (4th ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [23] Payne, A. (1994). *Designing educational project and program evaluations*. London: Norwell.
- [24] Tribble, C. (2000). Designing evaluation into educational change process. *ELT Journal*, 54(4): 319-327.
- [25] Tunç, F. (2010). *Evaluation of an English language teaching program at a public university using CIPP model*. Unpublished MA thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- [26] Youssef, L. S. (2012). Using student reflections in the formative evaluation of instruction: a course-integrated approach. *Reflective Practice*, 13(2): 237–254.
- [27] Walker, E. (2010). Evaluation of a support intervention for senior secondary school English immersion. *System*, 38 (1): 50-62.
- [28] Watanabe, Y., Norris, J. M., & González-Lloret, M. (2009). Identifying and responding to evaluation needs in college foreign language programs. In J.M. Norris, J.M. Davis, C. Sinicrope, & Y. Watanabe (Eds.), *Toward useful program evaluation in college foreign language education* (pp. 5–56). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.