



A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON CURRICULAR SATISFACTION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS: THE CASE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENTS

Oya Tunaboğlu¹,

Semin Kazazoğlu²ⁱ

¹Associate Professor Dr.,
Department of English Language Education,
Süleyman Demirel University,
Turkey

²Assistant Professor Dr.,
Department of English Language Education,
Yıldız Technical University,
Turkey

Abstract:

This study was conducted to explore the opinions of English Language and Literature (ELLS) and English Language Teaching (ELTS) undergraduates about the course content and course delivery modalities. Accordingly, this article includes the evaluative and comparative voices of ELLS and ELTS of their undergraduate education. In Turkey, the graduates of both departments can work as English language teachers upon completion of formal training and meeting various criteria. Although these departments adopt language-rich curricula throughout the formal training they offer, there are differences in terms of the courses offered and the delivery modalities followed. The main purpose of this descriptive research was to compare and analyze ELL and ELT departments in terms of course content, requirements, and the course delivery modalities through the eyes of undergraduate students. For data collection, two questionnaires developed by the researchers were used. The questionnaires included questions to elicit opinions about the courses offered, requirements, and the course delivery modalities. It was administered to 462 students enrolled in the mentioned departments at 7 state-run universities across Turkey. The findings suggested that ELLS feel more satisfied with their undergraduate training, that is, the overall curriculum they are offered. It is assumed that the findings drawn from the study will provide valuable insights to the curriculum developers. Given the scarcity of studies conducted on the effectiveness of curriculum, it is hoped that the current study will fill a gap in the related literature.

ⁱ Correspondence: email semink@yildiz.edu.tr

Keywords: EFL, ELL, ELT, undergraduates, self-evaluation, curriculum analysis

1. Introduction

It is believed that curriculum is the backbone of all educational practices at all levels. At the center of any curricular endeavor remain the courses offered to the students throughout their formal training. Up to now, various studies have been carried out to find the most effective way of teaching (Atay, 2006; Brown, 2009; Mayer, 2002). However, the studies conducted on curriculum especially from consumers, that is, students' perspective is relatively limited. In its simplest form, it is the curriculum that shapes the learning outcomes of students. To this end, in educational contexts, two major purposes are prioritized over everything. The first is retention and the other one is meaningful learning. In this respect, Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (Anderson, Krathwohl, et al., 2001) has been a compass for the core analysis of learning and teaching since it involves implications for meaningful teaching and learning. In this taxonomy, complex processes are associated with *understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating* all of which are based on cognitive categories whereas two of the cognitive processes are about *remembering*. Thus, it may be concluded that meaningful learning includes elements beyond rote learning. That is, retention is not enough for meaningful learning. Mayer (2002), states that *"when teachers concentrate solely on rote learning, teaching and assessing focus solely on remembering elements or fragments of knowledge, often in isolation from any context. When teachers focus on meaningful learning, however, remembering knowledge is integrated within the larger task of constructing new knowledge or solving new problems"*. It is crucial to promote meaningful learning within any educational program. Mellati and Khademi (2014), put forward that *"curriculum and course designers are not the only sources of selecting content and method of every course, teachers' and learners' attitudes, concerns, and needs are also magnificent factors in selecting content knowledge as well as features that determine successfulness and failure of a particular course"*.

The courses integrated into any curriculum are of ultimate importance. In Turkey, the ELLS are exposed to a number of literary works of various genres throughout their education and are engaged in intensive reading, critiquing, analyzing, synthesizing activities (tasks, requirements), whereas ELTS, are exposed to discrete courses throughout their undergraduate education. Although the courses are related to language teaching, it is evident that they are not connected to each other as might be evidenced in analytical and synthetic syllabi. Thus, it would not be a hypothetical statement in light of above argument of meaningfulness of learning if we say that ELTS students cannot digest and metabolize the knowledge offered in discrete courses. More specifically, we can say that an ELT student graduates knowing a couple of definitions and a couple of concepts, not fully reaching deeper and meaningful learning level as described by cognitive psychologist Ausubel. As thus, ELLS are assumed to be much more sophisticated and content with their undergraduate education than the ELTS.

To date, there are rather few studies that compare ELL and ELT departments in terms of foreign language teacher education (Mirici & Çağlar, 2017; Köksal & Genç, 2019; Drakulić, 2020; Kazazoğlu, 2020). Some studies compared ELL and ELT departments in terms of effective teacher behaviors. Yalçın (2014), for instance, investigated the perceptions of ELT and ELL graduate pre-service teachers both qualitatively and quantitatively and found a little difference between the cohorts. Glava and Glava (2015) on the other hand, carried out a qualitative study on 47 freshmen student teachers' initial beliefs on main pedagogical topics, education, teaching, and role of teacher. The researchers found out that first-year students identified their present teaching process as inadequate (14 answers) and difficult (5 answers) that may be taken as a critical analysis to be developed.

The study in hand therefore will contribute to the limited data pool in terms of ELL and ELT students' opinions regarding their training with an emphasis on the courses offered, requirements, and course delivery modalities.

2. Curriculum Development in Language Teaching: Linear vs Spiral (Cyclical)

As Richards (2001) states, syllabus constructors face the task of "*deciding the approaches to the sequencing of content, namely a linear, cyclical or spiral gradation*" (p. 159). Namaghi and Glohami (2018), put forward that the linear syllabus extends learners' knowledge through adding new blocks of information (p. 61).

In linear development, each lesson depends on the previous lesson. Nation and Macalister (2010) lay out that "*most language courses involve linear development, beginning with simple frequent items that prepare for later more complex items. Such a development has the disadvantages of not easily taking account of absenteeism, learners with different styles and speeds of learning, and the need for recycling material*" (p. 82).

The academic talk of the 21st century underlines the key part the curriculum has in planning and providing a viable instructive program. In the heart of this program there lie various alternatives for common teaching methods. Among these, the spiral curriculum sparkles. Today, the use of spiral curriculum is seen not merely the repetition of a topic but a deepening force for the linkage and reinforcement of the lessons. In this respect, Namaghi and Glohami (2018), assert that "*spiral curriculum is one in which the learners are challenged with the repetitive revisiting of topics, subjects, or themes all over the development*" (p. 60).

Some research on the effects of curriculum found that when compared with traditional curriculum, spiral curriculum is the best choice for language education (Namaghi & Gholami; Veladat and Mohammadi, 2011; Veselinovska, Gudeva, & Djokic, 2011; Skehan, 1996; Dowding, 1993; Howatt, 1974; Kabara, 1972; Howatt, 1974; Bruner, 1960). Bruner (1960), defines spiral curriculum as "*deciding on the major items to cover, and then covering them several times over a period of time at increasing levels of detail*". To put simply, Bruner's spiral curriculum operates on the premise that whatever is taught in the classroom needs to be revisited regularly. In so doing, knowledge is better internalized by the recipients.

In a similar vein, Nation and Macalister (2010), set forth that *“the advantages of a spiral model are that it provides easily monitored recycling of material, it allows for learners who were left behind to catch up at the next cycle, and it makes sure that the full value of the most important aspects of the language is dealt with”* (p. 83).

1.3 Brief Outlook at ELL and ELT Curricula in Turkey

According to the language education policy profile, the ELT program is composed of 48% content knowledge, 34% pedagogical knowledge, and 18% general culture which are presented to teacher candidates (YÖK, 2018).

Table 1: The distribution of English undergraduate programs (OSYM, 2018)

Program	State University	Private University	Total
English Language Teaching	47	16	63
English Language and Literature	44	17	61

As seen in Table 1, two departments are represented by quite a good number of programs. Thus, the number of undergraduates constitutes a large proportion in this case. Both programs have intensive content and ECTS requirements. In the ELL program, students should obtain 165 ECTS credits annually, 75 ECTS for elective courses, and 240 for the sum of ECTS credits for graduation. On the other hand, in the ELT program, students should obtain 240 for the sum of ECTS credits for graduation as well.

The main objectives of the ELL undergraduate program include English language skills, enabling students to read with understanding and thus, to form intelligent responses to works of literature. Because the medium of instruction is English, students who are admitted to the department are required to sit for the English proficiency exam prepared by the school of foreign languages at the beginning of the academic year. Students who fail the exam undergo a one-year preparatory program to improve their command of English. In the first year of the program of the department, students take courses such as English, translation, survey of English literature, textual analysis, and practice the art of close reading on a wide range of texts. The second year of the program offers courses that focus on various periods of English literature, emphasizing analysis of literary texts within various social, cultural, historical and political contexts. The courses in year two include medieval literature, 16th and 17th century English literature, 18th century English prose and fiction and social history of Britain. Students in this year also take an introduction to poetry course. In the first two years of their study, students are required to take courses such as literature of antiquity, mythology and Latin. In the third and fourth years, representative works of major 19th and 20th-century British poets, prose writers, novelists, and playwrights are studied. In years three and four, there are also courses on translation, writing, critical, and literary theories in order to hone students' language and analytical skills.

In the frame of English language teaching, the Foreign Language Teaching department executes ELT program to train teachers, instructors, academicians within the field of English language teaching. The program includes compulsory lessons related to

teaching foreign languages, linguistics, literature, and culture. Besides, the curriculum of the ELT department includes elective courses. In 2018, The Council of Higher Education re-designed the curricula and the content of the courses. According to the new program, the freshman students take reading skills, writing skills, listening and pronunciation, oral communication skills, and structure of English courses both in the first and the second term. The sophomores take English literature, linguistics, critical reading and writing, approaches in teaching English in the first semester. However, in the second semester, students take English literature 2, linguistics 2, language acquisition, and English language programs. Junior students take teaching English to young learners, teaching language skills, language and literature teaching in both terms. As for the final year, senior students take school practicum, translation, developing course content in English language teaching in the first term. On the other hand, they take school practicum 2, test preparation and assessment in English language teaching for the second semester. Besides, the senior students take a six-hour practice and a two-hour-theory course called Teaching Practice (YÖK, 2018).

3. Material and Methods

3.1 Research questions

This study aims to answer the following research questions:

- 1) To what extent are ELL and ELT students satisfied with their undergraduate education?
- 2) What are ELL and ELT students' opinions on course delivery and course requirements?
- 3) Is there a difference in satisfaction level between ELLS and ELTS in terms of the variables department, gender, and class?

3.2 Method

The questionnaire was distributed to undergraduates of 7 state-run universities in Turkey. Responses of all participants were entered and analyzed by using SPSS 22. Firstly, descriptive statistical analyses were performed to find out the percentage and general response of every item associated with the scales. In addition, an independent samples t-test was employed to find out the variation in satisfaction levels of the participants. Additionally, a qualitative research design was adopted. While coding the data, the content of the responses in the interviews was scanned and evaluated considering the frequency of themes. The question directed to the respondents were as follows, 'How do you define your education?', 'What are the pearls and pitfalls of your education?'. In order to triangulate the data, an open-ended question was included at the end of the questionnaire. The answers were analyzed through the NVivo program and the content analysis was employed to find out the frequent themes. Onwuegbuzie & Leech (2007), suggest that utilizing NVivo (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2008), can increase the rigor of a qualitative study, especially those with large data sets.

3.3 Participants

The participants of this study are 462 undergraduates enrolled in ELL and ELT departments at various state universities in Turkey. Junior and senior undergraduates were included in the study as they were thought to have spent considerable time studying to evaluate their program. Of the participants, 52.2% (n=242) are ELT, while 47.8% (n= 222) are ELL students. In terms of class; 51.5% (n=239) are seniors while 48.5% are (n=225) juniors. Besides, 69.8% (n=324) of the students are female while 30.2% (N=140) are male.

Table 2: Distribution of the participants

		n	%
Gender	Female	324	69,8
	Male	140	30,2
Department	ELL	222	47,8
	ELT	242	52,2
Class	Juniors	225	48,5
	Seniors	239	51,5

4.4 Data analysis

All data was recorded on the computer in SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for Windows 22 and analyzed. In the analysis of the data, assumptions that must be met were tested to decide which tests (parametric/nonparametric tests) to apply first. To decide the normality of the distribution, Kolmogorov-Smirnov made use of the other assumptions of the normal distribution, the kurtosis and skewness values, and the histogram graph. The normal distribution of the values was assumed to be between ± 2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010). Independent sample t-test validity of the scale was looked at with exploratory factor analysis (AFA). 0.05 was used as a measure of significance in the interpretation of the results.

4.5 Reliability and factor analysis

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were calculated in order to determine the reliability of the scale. In factor analysis, factor load values are looked at in the process of assigning scale items to factors or removing them from the scale. The factor load value is a coefficient that describes the relationship of substances to factors. In factor analysis, high correlation between variables is also expected to be an association. The correlation between the two variables is very strong and the correlation between them is in the same factor. Therefore, these variables will have a strong relationship with the factor they are in (Nakip, 2003, p. 408). High correlation means that the clusters of substances that have been associated together measure that size or factor.

KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) test that demonstrates the validity of factor analysis (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) was used to test sampling adequacy. KMO is a ratio that is asked to be above 60% (Nakip 2003, p. 409). As a result of the test, the KMO sample adequacy ratio for the first scale was found to be 97% and 85% for the second scale ($p < 0.05$). This

ratio indicates that we have sufficient sample size to continue the factor analysis. To test scale reliability, the alpha reliability coefficient was determined to be 0.97 for the first scale and 0.80 for the second scale. This value is among the limits of high reliability (Kim and Jogaratnam, 2002, p. 72).

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Results

Table 3: Undergraduates' Opinions Regarding Their Education and Course Contents

Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
13,399	55,829	55,829	13,399	55,829	55,829
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy					0,965
Bartlett's Test of Spheric	Approx. Chi-Square				8689,169
	Sig.				0,001
Cronbach's Alpha					0,964
Item	Item load	Item	Item load	Item	Item load
Item1	0,75	Item9	0,67	Item17	0,64
Item2	0,40	Item10	0,78	Item18	0,83
Item3	0,76	Item11	0,79	Item19	0,83
Item4	0,81	Item12	0,84	Item20	0,76
Item5	0,77	Item13	0,83	Item21	0,68
Item6	0,76	Item14	0,80	Item22	0,65
Item7	0,79	Item15	0,80	Item23	0,67
Item8	0,51	Item16	0,85	Item24	0,79

The validity of the 24-question course attitude levels was examined by explanatory factor analysis (AFA). KMO analysis, in which the number of samples was sufficient, was tested and found sufficient ($p < 0.05$).

Looking at the load of items found on the scale, it is seen that it varies between 0.40-0.85 and 55.82% of the variance in which it is collected under one dimension is explained. When looking at the scale reliability of Cronbach's Alpha, it seems that the scale has a very high level of reliability (Cronbach's Alpha: 0.96).

The validity of attitude levels of the 10-question scale was examined using an exploratory factor analysis (AFA). KMO analysis, in which the number of samples was sufficient, tested and found sufficient ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4: Undergraduates' Opinions on Course Delivery & Requirements

Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
3,993	39,934	39,934	3,993	39,934	39,934
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy					0,84
Bartlett's Test of Spheric	Approx. Chi-Square				1699,2
	Sig.				0,001
Cronbach's Alpha					0,801
Item	Item load	Item	Item load		
Item1	0,48	Item6	0,53		
Item2	0,53	Item 7	0,84		
Item3	0,34	Item 8	0,73		
Item4	0,71	Item 9	0,79		
Item5	0,85	Item 10	0,53		

Looking at the load of each item found on the scale, it is observed that they range from 0.34 to 0.85 and explain 39.93% of the variance in which they are collected under one dimension. In terms of scale reliability of Cronbach's Alpha value, it seems that the scale has a high level of reliability (Cronbach's Alpha: 0.80).

Table 5: 1st and 2nd Scale Scores of Gender

		n	Mean±Sd	t	df	P	
Gender	First Scale	Female	324	94,62±17,14	3,72	462	0,01
		Male	140	87,89±19,61			
	Second Scale	Female	324	26,46±6,78	-4,13	462	0,01
		Male	140	29,34±7,14			

The first and second scale scores are statistically significant according to the gender of the students ($p < 0.05$). The 1st scale scores of female students (94.62 ± 17.14) are higher than those of males (87.89 ± 19.61). On the second scale, the scores of female students (26.46 ± 6.78) are lower than those of males (29.34 ± 7.14). Accordingly, it may be concluded that female participants are more satisfied with their courses than males.

Table 6: 1st and 2nd Scale Scores of Department

		n	Mean±Sd	t	df	P	
Department	1st Scale	ELL	324	99,46±15,05	8,36	462	0,01
		ELT	140	86,29±18,52			
	2nd Scale	ELL	324	25,95±7,13	-4,15	462	0,01
		ELT	140	28,60±6,66			

The first and second scale scores differ statistically significantly according to the students' departments ($p < 0.05$) when looking at average values, 1st scale scores of ELL department students (99.46 ± 15.05) are higher than those of ELT department students (86.29 ± 18.52). On the second scale, the levels of ELL students (25.95 ± 7.13) are lower than those of ELT department students (28.60 ± 6.66). When ELT and ELL students are compared, it may be

concluded that ELT students are not in favor of their education in general and they have negative attitudes towards content, course delivery, and requirements of their education.

In this frame, it is suggested that ELT curriculum should be reexamined and reshaped. This finding is compatible with the finding of a study conducted by Alagözlü (2012). In this study, highlighting the curriculum-related problems that exist in the ELT departments as stated by the respondents, Alagözlü drew attention to the need for a revision on the account of incomprehensible and incoherent content of the curricula.

Table 7: 1st and 2nd Scale Scores of Class (Junior & Senior)

				n	Mean±Sd	t	df	P
Class	ELL	1st Scale	Juniors	76,00	95,95±15,39	-2,536	220	0,012
			Seniors	146,00	101,28±14,59			
		2nd Scale	Juniors	76,00	26,42±6,81	0,715	220	0,475
			Seniors	146,00	25,70±7,31			
Class	ELT	1st Scale	Juniors	149,00	84,89±17,66	-1,493	240	0,137
			Seniors	93,00	88,54±19,71			
		2nd Scale	Juniors	149,00	29,33±6,35	2,162	240	0,032
			Seniors	93,00	27,44±7,00			

The first scale scores among ELL department students show a statistically significant difference between classes ($p < 0.05$). When looking at averages; 1st scale scores of juniors (95.95 ± 15.39) are lower than (95.95 ± 15.39) seniors. Thus, it may be concluded that, senior students of ELL have positive opinions on their education.

The second scale scores of ELL students do not show a statistically significant difference between classes ($p > 0.05$).

The first scale scores among ELT students do not show a statistically significant difference between classes ($p > 0.05$).

The second scale scores of ELT students show a statistically significant difference between classes ($p < 0.05$). The 1st scale scores of juniors (29.33 ± 6.35) are lower (27.44 ± 7.00) than seniors. That is, ELT junior students have more positive opinions on course delivery and requirements.

Table 8: ELL Students' Codes and Themes on their Education

Codes	Themes	n	%
"The courses are challenging, difficult, tiring, and needs a lot of effort and time."	Difficulty	65	4
"I learnt the target culture itself fully, literature is culture."	Cultural Training	62	49,6
"I feel different than before, like privileged, lucky, and happy."	Feeling privileged	4	3,2
"I felt intellectual for the first time."	Intellectuality	22	17,6
"I developed critical thinking, different perspective, and self-discovery."	Critical Thinking	7	5,6
"The courses are useful and realistic."	Reality	6	4,8
"Course content should be more attractive"	Need of different	5	4

and different teaching methods are needed.”	teaching methods		
“There are some teachers who do not use learning methods at all!”	Lecturer’s inefficiency	6	4,8

After the analysis of the qualitative data obtained through the ELL participants’ self-evaluation journals, seven main categories were identified. These categories can be seen in Table 8. The ELL participants (%49,6) put forward that their courses are challenging whereas useful at the same time. Besides, they are on the idea that the courses enhanced their intellectuality (%17,6).

Table 9: ELT Students’ Codes and Themes on their Education

Codes	Themes	n	%
“I contributed to myself a lot, I learned new things and I saw my inefficiencies.”	Usefulness	30	28,57
“Some courses are time-consuming, hard, challenging, and annoying.”	Hardships	22	20,95
“Lucky for us, I’m glad that I am in this department, I felt like I was ahead of other people.”	Satisfaction	7	6,67
“I learned to develop point of view and critical thinking skills.”	Critical thinking	12	11,43
“There is a lot of memorization, it wears out, the state of memorization is bad, the memorization is dominated in all lessons.”	Memorization	22	20,95
“Lecturers have to improve themselves; some are too old-fashioned and monotonous.”	Lecturers’ inefficiency	12	11,43

After the analysis of the qualitative data obtained through the ELT participants’ self-evaluation journals, six main categories were identified. These categories can be seen in Table 9. The participants (%28,57) put forward that their courses are constructive. The second most repeated code was tiring and difficult. The participants (%20,95) asserted that their education is tiring and difficult. Another negative point was made on the memorization (%20,95).

In the overall comparison of the findings, it can be concluded that the ELT and ELL students have negative attitudes for the common concepts as follows; *hardships of the lessons* and *lecturer’s inefficiency* whereas ELT students have stated another negative theme as *memorization*. Besides, both groups of students have *critical thinking* as a positive common theme. When the positive themes are compared, it is seen that ELL participants are way ahead of the ELT participants. Accordingly, ELL participants’ positive themes include *cultural training*, *feeling privileged*, *intellectuality*, and *critical thinking* whereas ELT participants’ positive themes involve *usefulness*, *satisfaction*, and *critical thinking*.

7. Discussion

In Turkey, both ELL and ELT departments produce English Language teachers. When the core & elective courses integrated into the centralized curriculum of ELL and ELT are

examined it is seen that the ELL curriculum includes an immense number of literary readings and in-depth analysis of the language itself. On the contrary, the ELT courses mainly depend on the methodology, theory, and pedagogy of language teaching. Although there are some common courses by name, there is a considerable stylistic difference in realizing theory and practice in both departments. Typically, an ELLS graduates after reading at least 25 literary pieces and they read for the sake of reading whereas ELTS are generally supposed to read so as to learn and memorize the names of various concepts and definitions. The courses offered in the ELT programs are so-called consecutive whereas in the ELL departments students internalize the course content by revisiting the same or similar topics in consecutive courses throughout their training. As mentioned earlier, Bruner's (1960) spiral curriculum is in line with the premises of Ausubel's meaningful learning and it is what is generally practiced in the ELL departments.

Pervasive idea is that reading as a receptive mental activity and literature as a very rich source of input help human beings' personal and mental growth (Jung, 1960). As mentioned earlier, throughout their formal education, ELLS are exposed to intriguing comparisons, analyses, and synthesizes of any type of mentally challenging tasks. In neurological terms, it is said that learning occurs through networking established across neurons in our brain. That is, new learning occurs through neuron synapses and by building neuron pools. To this end, we can say that as the ELLS are exposed to a challenging curriculum in which they are expected to analyze, synthesize, criticize, and process some other higher-order thinking skills throughout their training, they are more satisfied with their undergraduate studies. Although they are challenged by their rigorous education, they feel satisfied in the end. As we mentioned earlier, an average ELLS graduates after reading, analyzing, critiquing an average of 25 pieces of the literary world. We will leave to the reader's imagination how fulfilling, horizon widening, and mind-stretching such an intense reading journey might offer for each ELLS.

8. Recommendations for further research

The same study might be replicated with novice teachers of both departments. The current study was conducted on junior and senior students enrolled in ELT and ELL departments. In the replication study on novice teachers, the potential benefits of each program can be investigated with respect to teacher competency, readiness to teach, self-efficacy. More specifically, researchers might conduct a comparative study on the potential benefits of the departments in question on being an English language teacher.

In addition, it is obvious that ELT students' curriculum needs to be redesigned. There needs to be a smooth, meaningful transition between the courses. If the courses are taught in an interconnected manner the students can have an opportunity to get deeper into the meaning-making process.

8.1 Limitations

We limited our inquiry to bachelor degrees and 7 state-run universities in Turkey.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Authors

Dr. Oya Tunaboğlu is working as an associate professor in the English Language Teaching Department housed in the School of Education at Süleyman Demirel University, Turkey. She received MA and PhD degrees in TESOL from The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA. Professor Tunaboğlu holds another MA in British theater. She has published articles and book chapters and attended various national and international conferences. Her research interests are teacher preparation, professional development, curriculum design, multidisciplinary perspectives, and cognitivist approaches to language learning and teaching.

Dr. Semin Kazazoğlu is an assistant professor of Applied Linguistics and TEFL in the Department of Foreign languages Education, at Yıldız Technical University, Turkey. Her research areas are applied linguistics, teacher training, teaching literature, materials development, and psycholinguistics. She has been teaching Undergraduate and Postgraduate classes in English Language Education. She published in various journals and attended national and international conferences.

References

- Alagözülü, N. (2012). English as a Foreign Language cul-de-sac in Turkey, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1757 – 1761.
- Anderson, L. W. (Ed.), Krathwohl, D. R. (Ed.), Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (Complete edition)*. New York: Longman.
- Atay, D. (2006). Teachers' professional development: Partnership in research. *TESL EJ*, 10(1), 1–14.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.
- Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Complete edition)*. New York: Longman.
- Brown. A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The modern language journal*, 93, 46-60.
- Dowding, T. J. (1993). The application of a spiral curriculum model to technical training curricula. *Educational Technology*, 33(7), 18-28.

- Drakulić, M. (2020). Foreign language teacher competences as perceived by English language and literature students. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 4(1), 158-165.
- Glava, A., Glava, C. (2015). Beliefs of first year future teacher students on education and teaching: An exploratory study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 209, 67 – 72.
- George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*, 17.0 update (Ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Howatt, A. (1974). The background to course design. *The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics*, 3, 1-23.
- Jung, C. G. (1990). *Psychology and literature* (Trans. by W. S. Dell & C. F. Baynes). From *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. London: Routledge.
- Kabara, J. J. (1972). Spiral curriculum. *Journal of Medical Education*, 47, 314-316. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-197204000-00019>
- Kazazoğlu, S. (2020). What if an English philologist becomes a teacher? A case study on foreign language anxiety (FLTA). *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (19), 701-712.
- Köksal, D. Genç, G. (2019). Learning while teaching: Student teachers' reflections on their teaching practicum. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 895-913.
- Kim, K. Y., & Jogaratnam, G. (2002). Travel motivations: A comparative study of Asian international and domestic American college students. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 13(4), 61-82.
- Mayer, R. E. (2002). *Teaching for meaningful learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mellati, M., & Khademi, M. (2014). ELT learners' preferences and teachers' attitudes: Determinant factors in curriculum design, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(3), 258-273.
- Mirici, İ., & Ölmez-Çağlar, F. (2017). Reflections on practicum experiences of non-ELT student teachers in Turkey. *ELT Research Journal*, 6(3), 276-292.
- Namaghi, S. A. O., & Gholami, M. (2018). Exploring language teachers' perceptions of cyclical presentation of materials in an EFL context: A grounded theory, *English Language Teaching*; 11(3).
- Nation, I. S. P. & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Nakip, M. (2003). *Pazarlama araştırmaları teknikler ve (SPSS destekli) uygulamalar*, Seçkin Yayıncılık, 1. Baskı, Ankara.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Validity and qualitative research: An oxymoron? Quality & Quantity: *International Journal of Methodology*, 41, 233–249. doi:10.1007/s11135-006 – 9000-3.
- QSR International Pty Ltd. (2008). *NVIVO: Version 8th reference guide*. Doncaster Victoria, Australia: Author.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Skehan, P. (1996). *Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction*. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 17-30). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Veladat, F., & Mohammadi, F. (2011). Spiral learning teaching method: Stair stepped to promote learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1115-1122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.345>
- Veselinovska, S. S., Gudeva, L. K., & Djokic, M. (2011). The effect of teaching methods on cognitive achievement in biology studying. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2521-2527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.138>
- Yalçın, A. F. (2014). A comparison between ELT and ELL graduates with regard to their perceptions of effective teacher behaviours, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(3), 8-16.
- YÖK (2018). *İngilizce öğretmenliği lisans programı*. Retrieved from http://www.yok.gov.tr/documents/10279/418005112/Ingilizce_Ogretmenligi_Lisans_Programi.pdf.

Appendix: ELL and ELT Undergraduates' Opinions Regarding Their Education

Dear Participant,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data regarding your opinions about your undergraduate education. The responses that you will provide will be used for empirical research only. Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

1. 1. Gender *

Male /Female

2. Department *

ELL (English Language & Literature) /ELT (English Language Teaching)

3. University *

4. Year of Education *

Junior (3rd Year) /Senior (4th Year)

Part A: The Scale of Opinions about Undergraduate Education Read each item and circle the number that corresponds with your agreement with the statement.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

1. Overall, my undergraduate education is satisfactory.

1 2 3 4 5

2. My education is scientifically challenging.

1 2 3 4 5

3. My education makes me think critically.

1 2 3 4 5

4. My education makes me learn beyond the courses.

1 2 3 4 5

5. My undergraduate education contributes to my mental growth.

1 2 3 4 5

6. My undergraduate education helps me digest the knowledge I have obtained throughout my education.

1 2 3 4 5

7. My undergraduate education motivates me to do research and learn more.

1 2 3 4 5

8. The course contents are recycled (reiterated) throughout our education.

1	2	3	4	5
9.	The courses are connected to each other and this makes us understand the obtained knowledge.			
1	2	3	4	5
10.	The course contents encourage us to become creative students.			
1	2	3	4	5
11.	Our education helps us improve questioning skills.			
1	2	3	4	5
12.	Our education helps us synthesize and analyze (higher-order thinking skills) what is being taught.			
1	2	3	4	5
13.	Our education helped me obtain knowledge beyond the conceptual level (concepts, definitions, etc.).			
1	2	3	4	5
14.	Taken as a whole, I have been broadening my horizon throughout my undergraduate education.			
1	2	3	4	5
15.	I feel that I have been growing intellectually throughout my education.			
1	2	3	4	5
16.	I think that my education has helped me grow intellectually.			
1	2	3	4	5
17.	I think that our undergraduate education is intellectually challenging.			
1	2	3	4	5
18.	My education helps me think out of the box.			
1	2	3	4	5
19.	My education helps me think analytically.			
1	2	3	4	5
20.	In my education the curriculum has been designed in a way that helps me gain general knowledge along with departmental knowledge.			
1	2	3	4	5
21.	My education helps me retrieve previous knowledge.			
1	2	3	4	5
22.	I can synthesize knowledge I have obtained in separate courses.			
1	2	3	4	5
23.	In my education, I can learn permanently as the course contents are delivered by building upon previous or parallel knowledge.			
1	2	3	4	5
24.	My education forces me to think in different perspectives.			
1	2	3	4	5

Part B: Opinions on Course Delivery & Course Requirements

1. My education is providing us a judicious blend of theory and practice.

1 2 3 4 5

2. The course requirements (homework, presentations, micro-teaching, reports, etc.) match logically with our learning needs.

1 2 3 4 5

3. The course requirements are intellectually challenging.

1 2 3 4 5

4. The course requirements are nothing but an extra burden.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I don't think the course requirements make us learn more.

1 2 3 4 5

6. The course requirements force me to memorize something.

1 2 3 4 5

7. The course requirements do not contribute to meaningful learning.

1 2 3 4 5

8. The courses are delivered in a monotonous way.

1 2 3 4 5

9. The course requirements are not serving their purposes.

1 2 3 4 5

10. The courses are delivered in an interactive manner.

1 2 3 4 5

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).