

**ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

**A COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND PREFERRED CLASSROOM LEARNING
ENVIRONMENT AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS AT
YADIM**

RİFAT GÜR

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA/2006

**ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

**A COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND PREFERRED CLASSROOM LEARNING
ENVIRONMENT AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS AT
YADIM**

RİFAT GÜR

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof Zuhall OKAN

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA/2006

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of English Language Teaching.

(Supervisor)

Assoc. Prof Zuhall OKAN

(Member of Examining Committee)

Asst. Prof. Dr Rana YILDIRIM

(Member of Examining Committee)

Asst. Prof. Dr Glden MERSİNLİGİL

Certified that this thesis conforms to be standards of the Institute of Social Sciences and I confirm that these signatures belong to the committee members.

(Director of the Institute)

Prof. Dr Nihat KSAVAŞ

P.S.: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures, and photographs in this dissertation, whether original or quoted for mother sources, is subject to the Law of works of Art and Thought No: 5846.

NOT: Bu tezde kullanılan zgn ve bařka kaynaktan yapılan bildiriflerin, izelge, řekil ve fotoęrafların kaynak gsterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hkmlere tabidir.

ABSTRACT**A COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND PREFERRED CLASSROOM LEARNING
ENVIRONMENT AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS AT
YADIM****Rifat GÜR****Master of Arts, English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Assoc. Prof Zuhall OKAN****September 2006, 93 Pages**

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the literature on classroom learning environment with a specific reference to English Language Teaching contexts. It is designed to evaluate the classroom learning environment from students' and teachers' perspective. Therefore, the study asks both students and teachers working at YADIM (Centre for Foreign Languages) at Çukurova University to indicate their preferred and actual perception of their classroom learning environments. A form of Colleges and Universities Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI) is submitted to ten English teachers and also 277 second and third level students at YADIM. To support the data collected from the questionnaires, ten classroom environments have been observed using a checklist adapted from the questionnaire. The teachers and the students observed are those who were given the questionnaire (CUCEI) before. The data have been analyzed by means of t-test and ANOVA values calculated on the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

Key words: Classroom learning environment, Student perception, Teacher perception, Higher level, Colleges and Universities Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI)

ÖZET**YABANCI DİLLER MERKEZİNDEKİ (YADİM) ÖĞRETMEN VE
ÖĞRENCİLERİN SINIFTAKİ ÖĞRENME ORTAMINI ALGILAMALARININ
KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI****Rifat GÜR****Yüksek Lisans Tezi: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı****Danışman: Doç. Dr Zuhale OKAN****Eylül 2006, 93 Sayfa**

Bu çalışmanın amacı İngiliz dili eğitimine sınıf öğrenme ortamı konusunda çalışma yaparak katkıda bulunmaktır. Çukurova Üniversitesi'ne bağlı Yabancı Diller Merkezinde (YADİM) görev yapan öğretmen ve öğrencilerin sınıf öğrenme ortamı hakkındaki görüşlerine başvuruldu. Bu çalışma için, on İngilizce öğretmenine ve ikinci ve üçüncü seviyede 277 öğrenciye anket uygulandı. Bulguları desteklemek amacıyla, daha önce anket uygulanan öğretmen ve öğrencilerin bulunduğu on sınıfta gözlem yapıldı. Veriler, t-test ve Anova (Analysis of Variance) değerleri yardımıyla SPSS'de (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) analiz edildi.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sınıf öğrenme ortamı, Öğrenci algısı, Öğretmen algısı, Yüksek öğrenim seviyesi, kolej ve üniversiteler için sınıf ortamı anketi (CUCIE)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a real pleasure to thank people who have contributed to this study.

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof Zuhall OKAN for her support, guidance, invaluable remarks and encouragement throughout the preparation of this thesis.

I want to thank both the academic and administrative staff of YADİM who helped me during data collection period. I would like to extend my thanks to the students at YADİM who participated in my study.

I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Mehmet BOYLUĞ for his interest and expert comments and for providing me with the sources I needed.

My thanks also go to Süleyman Sedat ÇAVDAR for his support throughout my study.

I would also like to express my warmest thanks to my family for their support and encouragement throughout the preparation of this thesis.

And, finally, I want to send my very special thanks to my wife İnci GÜR for her marvelous support, patience and understanding from the beginning till the end.

Not: Bu çalışma (F2006YL16) Ç.Ü. Araştırma Fonu Saymanlığınca desteklenmiştir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Research Questions.....	5
1.4 Abbreviations.....	6
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Historical Background to the Field of Classroom Learning Environment..	7
2.3 Methods to Assess Classroom Learning Environment	9
2.4 Instruments to Assess Classroom Learning Environment.....	10
2.4.1 Learning Environment Inventory (LEI).....	13
2.4.2 Classroom Environment Scale (CES).....	13
2.4.3 Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ).....	13
2.4.4 My Class Inventory (MCI).....	14
2.4.5 Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI).....	15
2.4.6 Constructivist Learning Environment Survey (CLES).....	15
2.4.7 What Is Happening In This Class (WIHIC) Questionnaire.....	15
2.4.8 Geography Classroom Environment Inventory (GCEI).....	16
2.5 Instruments used in Higher Education.....	16
2.5.1 The College Classroom Environment Scales (CCES).....	17
2.5.2 The Distance and Open Learning Environment Scale (DOLES)...	19
2.5.3 Student Assessment of Teaching and learning (SATL).....	19
2.5.4 Computer Laboratory Environment Inventory (CLEI).....	19
2.5.5 Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI).....	20
2.6 Research on Classroom Learning Environment.....	20

2.6.1 Associations between Classroom Learning Environments and Student Outcomes; Evaluations of Educational Innovation.....	22
2.6.2 Person-Environment Fit.....	24
2.6.3 Teacher Improvement.....	24
2.6.4 Student-Teacher Differences.....	25
2.6.5 School psychology; Transitions between the Grade Levels; Cross-National Studies.....	26
2.6.6 Teacher Education and Teacher Assessment.....	27
2.6.7 Combining Research Methods; Links between Environments.....	28

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Introduction.....	30
3.2 Participants.....	30
3.3 Instruments.....	32
3.3.1 Questionnaire.....	33
3.3.2 Observation of the Classroom	35
3.4 Data Collection.....	35
3.5 Data Analysis.....	35

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

4.1 Introduction	37
4.2 Findings from the Questionnaire	38
4.3 Paired Samples t-test Results.....	59
4.4 Independent Samples t-test Results.....	61
4.5 ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) Results.....	63

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusions and Implications	65
--	----

5.2 Implications for ELT.....	67
5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research	68
REFERENCES.....	69
APPENDICES	75
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	93

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	PAGE
1. Overview of Classroom Learning Environment Instruments.....	11
2. Dimensions of Classroom Learning Environment Instruments.....	12
3. Overview of Higher Education Instruments.....	18
4. Areas of Past Research in the Field of Classroom Learning Environment	21
5. Students' Class, Gender and Ages.....	31
6. Teachers' Gender and Teaching Experience.....	32
7. Teachers' Age.....	32
8. College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI).....	34
9. Scales and Item Numbers.....	34
10. Personalisation.....	40
11. Innovation.....	43
12. Student Cohesiveness.....	46
13. Task Orientation.....	49
14. Cooperation.....	52
15. Individualisation.....	55
16. Equity.....	58
17. Total Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Teachers.....	59
18. Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Teachers.....	60
19. Total Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Students.....	60
20. Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Students.....	61
21. Total Actual Mean Scores of Students and Teachers.....	61
22. Actual Mean Scores of Teachers and Students.....	62
23. Total Preferred Mean Scores of Teachers and Students.....	62
24. Preferred Mean Scores of Students and Teachers.....	63
25. Actual Mean Scores of Students, Teachers and Observation Checklist....	63
26. ANOVA Scores of Students, Teachers and Observation Checklist.....	64

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	PAGE
Appendix 1: Actual (Student) Version.....	75
Appendix 2: Preferred (Student) Version.....	79
Appendix 3: Actual (Teacher) Version	83
Appendix 4: Preferred (Teacher) Version.....	87
Appendix 5: Classroom Observation Checklist.....	91
Appendix 6: Observation Checklist Results.....	92

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers an introduction to the thesis presenting Background to the Study, Statement of the Problem, Research Question, Definition of Terms, and Abbreviations sections. It aims to give readers a general impression about the study itself.

1.1 Background to the Study

Most educators believe that the classroom is an important locus for student's academic and personal growth, and that classrooms have distinct atmospheres or climates that mediate growth.

Many questions of interest to teachers, researchers, and curriculum developers in language education can be asked about classroom learning environment. Does a classroom's learning environment affect students' learning English and their attitudes? What is the impact of a new curriculum or teaching method on a classroom's learning environment? Can teachers assess and change their own classroom learning environment? Do teachers and students perceive the same classroom learning environments similarly? Is there a discrepancy between actual and preferred classroom learning environment as perceived by students and teachers? These questions represent the thrust of the work on classroom learning environments during the last twenty-five years.

Since the late 1960's, educational researchers have been concerned about different dimensions of classroom learning environment. Adams & Hiddle (cited in Gaies, 1980, 21) cite that in a classroom, there is a complex relationship between physical structure such as arrangement of the room, distribution of the space, light and

order of desks, and psychological one, such as teacher-student interaction. They claim that it is possible to investigate the classroom learning environment from two perspectives: physical and psychological. Rivlin & Weinstein (cited in Gaies, 1980, 23) also argue that classroom learning environments include both physical and psychological features and these two characteristics of a setting can influence both behaviours of the students and also educational programme.

From the view of psychological aspect, Talton and Simpson (indicated in Telli, Rakici, and Cakiroğlu, 1999, 1) define the classroom as a learning environment where interactions occur among students, teachers, and learning takes place. Pace (1963, 73) suggested that classroom learning environment's crucial aspects are its overall atmosphere or characteristics, the kinds of things that are rewarded, encouraged, emphasized, the style of life which is valued in the community and is most visibly expressed and felt, because classroom learning environments are characterized by social interactions both between teacher and the learners and among learners themselves.

Regarding the physical aspect, classroom learning environment is one way to improve the learning environment and to prevent problem behaviours before they occur. Research on the classroom learning environment has shown that the physical arrangement can affect the behaviour of both students and teachers (Savage, 1999; Stewart & Evans, 1997; Weinstein, 1992), and that a well-structured classroom tends to improve student's academic and behavioural outcomes (Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Walker, 1991). In addition, classroom learning environment acts as a symbol to students regarding what teacher values in behaviour and learning (Savage, 1999; Weinstein, 1992). If a classroom learning environment is not properly organized to support the type of schedule and activities a teacher has planned, it can impede the functioning of the day as well as limit what and how students learn. However, a well-arranged classroom learning environment renders instruction more effective because it triggers fewer behaviour problems and establishes a climate conducive to learning.

The research over the last four decades has recognised that students' and teachers' perceptions are important parameters of the social and psychological aspects of the classroom learning environments (Fraser 1986, 1991, 1994, 1998). Fraser (1994) supports the importance of this form of research as follows:

Classroom and the school learning environments in terms of the shared perceptions of the students and teachers in that environment, has the dual advantage of characterising the setting

through the eyes of the actual participants and capturing data that the observer could miss or consider unimportant. Students have a good vantage point to make judgements about classroom learning environments because they have encountered many different classroom learning environments and have enough time in a class to form accurate impressions. (p.49)

The foundation of the study of classroom learning environment based on the perceptions of students and teachers was laid by the pioneering work of Moos and Walberg (1979). Many studies have built upon the works of these two researchers resulting in many useful instruments being developed to measure the perceptions of students and teachers in a variety of environments. A few instruments widely used in the area are presented below.

What Is Happening In This Classroom (WIHIC): The WIHIC questionnaire, perhaps one of the most widely adopted and modified classroom learning environment instruments, focuses on secondary classrooms and is designed to bring economy to the field by combining the most relevant scales from existing questionnaires to meet the contemporary concerns of education today by considering such classroom learning environment dimensions as equity and constructivism. The WIHIC too has a personal version designed to elicit students' perceptions of their individual classroom learning environment roles, and a class version aimed at examining students' perceptions of the classroom learning environment as a whole. The WIHIC comprises of seven scales such as Personalisation, Innovation, Student cohesiveness, Task orientation, Cooperation, Individualisation and Equity. The WIHIC's response choices are Almost never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often, Almost always with no reverse scored items.

Constructivist Learning Environment Survey (CLES): The CLES, aimed toward secondary students, aids teachers and investigators in examining the utilisation of constructivist teaching methods and teachers' epistemological assumptions. The original form of the CLES was based largely on a psychosocial view of constructivist reform that focused on students as co-constructors of knowledge, yet did not consider the cultural context of the classroom under examination. Considering that the very culture in which a class exists has a strong influence on psychosocial environment perceptions and learning, the CLES was redesigned in an attempt to capture this critical element. The redesigned CLES contains the five scales and 30 items. The scales are Personal

Relevance, Uncertainty, Critical Voice, Shared Control, and Student Negotiation. The response alternatives for each item consist of Almost Always, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, and Almost Never. Departing from traditional learning environment instruments and setting a precedent for new instruments, the number of negatively-worded items was reduced to only one to minimize the conceptual complexity of the instrument.

Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): COLT stands for Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching and its aim is to investigate the effects of instructional variables on learning outcomes which required an observation scheme that could systematically describe instructional practices and procedures in different L2 classrooms. Furthermore, one of the main questions was whether instruction which was more or less communicatively oriented contributed differently to L2 development. The COLT is divided into two parts, the first of which describes classroom events at the level of episode and activity and the second part analyses the communicative features of verbal exchange between teachers and students and/or students and students.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Fraser (1994, 1998) reported that research over the last four decades has recognised that students' and teachers' perceptions are crucial parameters of the social and psychological aspects of the classroom learning environments. Considerable work has been done on the assessment and investigation of classroom learning environments in primary and secondary schools with a variety of instruments.

Fraser, Treagust, Williamson, and Tobin (1987) also agree that despite the existence of strong traditional classroom learning environment research at the primary and secondary level, surprisingly little work had been done at higher level because of shortage of suitable instruments.

Another concern with the previous researches in the field is that many of the studies on classroom learning environment have focussed on, to large extent, basic/applied sciences such as biology, mathematics, physics by ignoring social sciences, e.g. second language education. In fact, one of the departure points of this study has been this lack of research in second language education. The study of

language learning environments is rarely done in English language teaching contexts. However, it should be noted that Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) has been widely used in language teaching to measure the extent of the use of the target language in the classrooms. However, for the purpose of the study, COLT has not been found particularly useful since the main concern of this study is to have a look at the overall classroom learning environment, not only language but also the atmosphere, teacher-student interaction, student involvement, innovation and so on. Ideally, for the purpose of this study, the research has to be carried out at ELT Department of Faculty of Education. However, due to varying degrees of learning environments at the above mentioned department, YADİM has been chosen as the focus of the study for a more convenient data collection and sampling.

It is believed that classroom learning environment plays a vital role in language classrooms and research is needed to conceptualise and assess its determinants and effects. There is no doubt that the result of this study will have some practical application in the classroom. The availability of the classroom learning environment data will make it possible for teachers to obtain convenient, reliable feedback on the climate of their own classes as perceived by their students. This information can be used by teachers as a basis for reflection upon, discussion of, and systematic attempts to improve environments.

1.3 Research Questions

This study primarily aims to find out the differences between teachers' and the students' perceptions of their actual and preferred classroom learning environment at YADİM (Centre for Foreign Languages) at Çukurova University. The following research questions constitute the basis of the study:

1. Are there any differences between students' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment?
2. Are there any differences between teachers' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment?
3. Are there any differences between teachers' and students' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment?

1.4 Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in the study are as follows:

EFL: English as a foreign language

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

CUCEI: Colleges and Universities Classroom Environment Inventory

YADIM: Centre for Foreign Languages

ELT: English Language Teaching

L2: Second level

L3: Third level

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature which is related to classroom learning environment. First, it presents historical background to the field of classroom learning environment (section 2.2). Then, methods used to assess the classroom learning environment are discussed (section 2.3). The chapter also introduces the formulation and background of the various instruments used to assess the classroom learning environment (2.4) including the instruments used to assess the classroom learning environment of higher education (2.5). The last section deals with research on classroom learning environment (2.6).

2.2 Historical Background to the Field of Classroom Learning Environment

The word “environment” has many meanings but, in the classroom context, it can be defined as the “shared perceptions of the students and the teachers in that environment” (Fraser, 1986, 23). Fraser (1994) also claims that there are two types of classroom learning environment; physical environment includes the material setting of the classroom, also furniture, lighting and all the objects in the classroom and the human environment which refers to psychosocial environment of the classroom involving the students and the teachers and their interactions with each others; also they play an important role in providing a positive climate for learning. Brophy and Putnam

(1979) agree that over the past 30 years, remarkable progress has been made in conceptualising, measuring and investigating this aspect of the classroom and there is strong evidence that effective learning is related to a positive classroom learning environment.

When looked at the historical development of the concept of classroom learning environment, it is seen that Lewin (1936) and Murray (1938) have put forward theories about the classroom learning environment and laid foundations of the classroom learning environment research. Lewin formulated his idea in a form of equation, $B=f(P, E)$, indicating that behaviour (B) is a function of the person (P) and his/her environment (E). Murray developed Lewin's theory by proposing a 'needs-press' model in order to explain a student's behaviour within the classroom learning environment by taking into consideration the interaction between his/her needs and the classroom learning environment. In this needs-press model, the student's needs are motivated by the personality features which give a direction to the student's goals; the environmental press, which supports or ignores the expression of personality needs, is a situation external to the student.

Murray also introduced the term 'alpha press' so as to make a difference between an environment as assessed by an external observer and beta press for an environment perceived by a student. Stern, Stein and Bloom (1956) modified Murray's beta press and added each student's view of classroom learning environment (private beta press), and the opinions of all the students in that environment (consensual beta press).

In the early 1960's, Getzel and Thelen developed a theory for the analysis of classroom groups. They claimed that there was a close relationship between group behaviour and personality needs, role expectations and classroom learning environment. Later, Stern's (1970) theory of person-environment relationship investigated how combinations of personal needs and environmental press might enhance student outcome.

Walberg (1981) has put forward 'multi-factor psychological model'. To his theory, classroom learning environment is the one of other factors in student's learning and achievement. The learning is function of the student's age, ability and motivation; quality instruction; classroom learning environment, pair and group work. Of these factors, classroom learning environment is the strongest one for a student's achievement and motivation.

Like Walberg, Moos (1979) asserted that classroom learning environment is one of the most important influences on a student's personal and academic development. For instance, Moos found in his research that the students were satisfied in a classroom that had high student involvement, good student-teacher interaction, and also innovative teaching methods. Supporting Moos's findings, Walberg (1979) reported "the students in a competitive environment were found to perform poorly, be less self-assured and to experience more failure" (p.34).

2.3 Methods to assess classroom learning environment

Especially, the works of Moos and Walberg on perceptions of the classroom learning environment laid the foundation of most research in this field. However, the instruments used to assess the classroom learning environment have been the focal point of discussion. Fraser (1991) made an outline of the methods on classroom learning environment during research; these were direct observation of the events taking place in the classroom by an independent observer and assessing the perceptions of the students and the teachers by using a questionnaire. Mostly, the instrument preferred in studies was questionnaire in that it had low cost and ease of use for large samples.

Fraser and Walberg (1981) outlined some further advantages of using questionnaire when compared with the observation:

- The questionnaire is based on the perceptions of the students and the teachers and their experiences over time but observation is usually restricted to short time spans.
- The questionnaire gets judgement or feedback from the each student and the teacher, however, the observation is up to only the observer.
- In most cases, perceptions of the students and the teachers on the classroom learning environment are more important in terms of explaining the meaning of their behaviours when compared with the observed behaviours.
- The questionnaire helps us find more variance about perceptions of the students and the teachers when compared with the observation.

Rosenshine (1970) agrees with Fraser and Walberg and refers to perceptual measures namely questionnaires as 'high inference' measures and to observation as 'low inference measures'. He asserts that the study of classroom learning environment

is concerned with interpersonal relationships between students, relationships between the student and the teacher and the relationships between students and both subject studied and the method of learning.

In this study, a choice was made to gather information about classroom learning environment by using a questionnaire in order to assess the students' and the teachers' perceptions. Though it has many advantages when compared with the observation technique, observation technique was also used in that a combination of the questionnaire and the observation is more desirable for capturing data and meaningful understanding of perceptions of the students and the teachers.

2.4 Instruments to assess classroom learning environment

This section describes the following instruments: Learning Environment Inventory (LEI); Classroom Environment Scale (CES); Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ); My Class Inventory (MCI); Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI); Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI); Constructivist Learning Environment Survey (CLES); and What Is Happening In This Class (WIHIC) questionnaire.

Table 1 and Table 2 indicate the name of each scale in the eight instruments, the level (primary and secondary) for which each instrument is suited, the number of items included in each scale, and the classification of each scale according to Moos's (in Fraser, 1998) scheme for classifying human environments. It has three basic dimensions:

- Relationship Dimensions which identify the nature and intensity of personal relationships within the environment and assess the extent to which people are involved in the environment and support and help each other.
- Personal Development Dimensions which assess basic directions along which personal growth and self-enhancement tend to occur.
- System Maintenance and System Change Dimensions which involve the extent, to which the environment is orderly, clear in expectations, maintains control and is responsive to change.

Table 1 Overview of Classroom Learning Environment Instruments

Instruments	Level	Items per scales
Learning Environment Inventory (LEI)	Secondary	7
Classroom Environment Scale (CES)	Secondary	10
Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ)	Secondary	10
My Class Inventory (MCI)	Elementary	6
Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI)	Secondary/ Primary	10
Constructivist Learning Environment Inventory (CLES)	Secondary	7
What Is happening In This Classroom (WIHIC)	Secondary	8
Geography Classroom Environment Inventory (GCEI)	Secondary	8

Table 2 Dimensions of Classroom Learning Environment Instruments

Instruments	Relationship dimensions	Personal development dimensions	System maintance and change dimensions
Learning Environment Inventory (LEI)	Cohesiveness Friction Favouritism Cliqueness Satisfaction Apathy	Speed Difficulty Competitiveness	Diversity Formality
Classroom Environment Scale (CES)	Involvement Affiliation Teacher Support	Task Orientation Competition	Order and Organization Rule clarity Teacher control Innovation
Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ)	Personalisation Participation	Independence investigation	Differentiation
My Class Inventory (MCI)	Cohesiveness Fiction Satisfaction	Difficulty Competitiveness	
Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI)	Helpful/friendly Understanding Dissatisfied Admonishing	Open-Endedness Integration	Leadership Student responsibility and freedom Uncertain Strict
Construcitivist Learning Environment Inventory (CLES)	Personal Relevance Uncertainty	Critical Voice Shared Control	Student negotiation
What Is happening In This Classroom (WIHIC)	Student cohesiveness Teacher support Involvement	Investigation Task orientation Cooperation	Equity
Geography Classroom Environment Inventory (GCEI)		Investigation	Innovation Resource Adequacy Gender Equity

2.4.1 Learning Environment Inventory (LEI)

Fraser (1998) states that Harvard Project Physics gave rise to first development and validation of the LEI in the late 1960s. The LEI's main concept is that students, besides teachers, are determinants of classroom learning environment. The final version includes 105 statements (seven per scale) descriptive of typical school classes. The respondent expresses degree of agreement with each statement using the four response alternatives of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree. The scoring direction is reversed for some items. A typical item in the Cohesiveness scale is: 'All students know each other very well' and in the Speed scale is: 'The pace of the class is rushed'.

2.4.2 Classroom Environment Scale (CES)

The CES grew out of a comprehensive program of research involving perceptual measures of human environment varying from psychiatric hospitals, prisons, university residences and work milieus (Moos, in Fraser, 2001). The original version of CES consisted of 242 items representing 13 conceptual dimensions. The final version contains nine scales (Involvement, Affiliation, Teacher support, Task orientation, Competition, Order and Organization, Rule clarity, Teacher control and Innovation) with ten items of True-False response format in each scale. Published materials include a test manual, a questionnaire, an answer sheet and a transparent hand scoring key. Typical items in the CES are: "The teacher takes a personal interest in the students" (Teacher Support) and "There is a clear set of rules for students to follow" (Rule Clarity) (Fraser, 2001).

2.4.3 Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ)

Fraser (2001) explains that LEI and CES paved the way for the development of other classroom learning environment surveys but these instruments did not include dimensions remarkable in individualized classrooms. The ICEQ evaluates these dimensions distinguishing individualised classrooms from conventional ones. The initial development of the ICEQ was guided by: the literature on individualised, open and

inquiry-based education; extensive interviewing of teachers and secondary school students; and reactions to draft versions sought from selected experts, teachers and junior high school students. The final published version of the ICEQ contains 50 items altogether, with an equal number of items belonging to each of the five scales.

Each item is responded to on a five point scale with the alternatives of Almost Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often and Very Often. The scoring direction is reversed for many of the items. Typical items are “The teacher considers students’ feelings” (Personalisation) and “Different students use different books, equipment and materials” (Differentiation). The copyright arrangement gives permission to purchasers to make an unlimited number of copies of the questionnaires and response sheets.

2.4.4 My Class Inventory (MCI)

The LEI was simplified to form the MCI for use among children aged 8– 12 years (Walker, 2004). Walker claims that although the MCI was developed originally for use at the primary school level, it also has been found to be useful with students in the junior high school, especially those with limited reading skills.

Walker (2004) summarizes that the MCI differs from the LEI in four important ways. First, in order to minimise fatigue among younger children, the MCI contains only five of the LEI’s original 15 scales. Second, item wording was simplified to enhance readability. Third, the LEI’s four-point response format was reduced to a two-point (Yes-No) response format. Fourth, students answer on the questionnaire itself instead of on a separate response sheet to avoid errors in transferring responses from one place to another.

The final form of the MCI contains 38 items altogether, although Fraser and O’Brien (in Fraser, 1998) have developed a short 25-item version. Typical items are: “Children are always fighting with each other” (Friction) and “Children seem to like the class” (Satisfaction). Goh et al. (in Fraser, 2001) changed the MCI’s Yes-No response format to a three-point response format (Seldom, Sometimes and Most of the Time) in a modified version of the MCI which includes a Task Orientation scale.

2.4.5 Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI)

The original version of QTI was developed in The Netherlands and focuses on the nature and quality of interpersonal relationships between teachers and students (Wubbels and Brekelmans, 1998; Wubbels and Levy, 1993; in Walker, 2004). The QTI is based on a theoretical model of cooperation and opposition and influences (dominance-submission), and was developed to assess student perceptions of eight behaviour aspects.

Each item has a five-point response scale ranging from Never to Always. Typical items are “She/he gives us a lot of free time” (Student Responsibility and Freedom behaviour) and “She/he gets angry” (Admonishing behaviour). Cross-validation and comparative work with the QTI has been completed at various grade levels in the USA (Wubbels and Levy, in Fraser, 1998) and Singapore (Goh and Brunei, in Fraser, 2001).

2.4.6 Constructivist Learning Environment Survey (CLES)

According to the constructivist view, meaningful learning is a cognitive process in which individuals make sense of the world in relation to the knowledge which they already have constructed, and this sense-making process involves active negotiation and consensus building. The CLES (Taylor et al., 1995; Taylor et al., 1997; cited in Walker, 2004) was developed to assist researchers and teachers to assess the degree to which a particular classroom’s learning environment is consistent with a constructivist epistemology, and to assist teachers to reflect on their epistemological assumptions and reshape their teaching practice. The CLES has 36 items with five response alternatives ranging from Almost Never to Almost Always. Typical items are “I help the teacher to decide what activities I do” (Shared Control) and “Other students ask me to explain my ideas” (Student Negotiation).

2.4.7 What Is Happening In This Class (WIHIC) Questionnaire

The WIHIC questionnaire brings restriction to the field of classroom learning environment and combines modified versions of the most salient scales from a wide

range of existing questionnaires with additional scales that accommodate contemporary educational concerns (e.g. equity and constructivism). The original 90-item nine-scale version was refined by both statistical analysis of data from 355 junior high school science students, and extensive interviewing of students about their views of their classroom learning environment in general, the wording and salience of individual items and their questionnaire responses (Fraser, 1998).

As Fraser (1998) reports, only 54 items in seven scales survived these procedures, although this set of items was expanded to 80 items in eight scales for the field testing of the second version of the WIHIC. Whereas an Australian sample of 1081 students in 50 classes responded to the original English version, a Taiwanese sample of 1879 students in 50 classes responded to a Chinese version that had undergone careful procedures of translation and back translation (Huang et al., in Fraser, 2001). This led to a final form of the WIHIC containing the seven eight-item scales, which also has been used successfully among 2310 high school students in Singapore (Chionh, in Fraser, 1998).

2.4.8 Geography Classroom Environment Inventory (GCEI)

The Geography Classroom Environment Inventory (GCEI) was developed in order to help computer assisted- learning (CAL) environments. The GCEI can be also used for other classes. It has three scales and these scales were adapted from other instruments. It also has Gender Equity Scale which is used to assess gender inequities during using computers. The GCEI has similar features with Classroom Environment Scale (CES), the College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI), the Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ), the Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) and the Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI). The GCEI has 40 items and 10 items in each of four scales. The alternatives are Never, Almost, Sometimes, Often and Very Often (Fraser, 1998).

2.5 Instruments used in Higher Education

Treagust, Williamson, and Tobin (in Walker, 2004) claimed that though many classroom learning environment research were conducted on the primary and secondary

levels; few research were carried out on higher level. They also reported that reason of this phenomenon was shortage of instruments which would be used on higher classes.

The following section will give brief information about some questionnaires which are being used on research at higher level. Table 3 below also introduces six major questionnaires reviewed and organised by Fraser (1998).

2.5.1 The College Classroom Environment Scales (CCES)

The College Classroom Environment Scales (CCES) was designed for higher education and developed in the USA (Vahala and Winston, in Walker, 2004). The instrument has six scales and 62 items. The scales are Learning Climate, Professional Concern, Inimical Ambiance, Academic Rigour, Affiliation and Structure.

Table 3 Overview of Higher Education Instruments

Instrument	Items per Scale	Scales
College Classroom Environment Scales (CCES)	6	Cathetic Learning climate, Professional Concern, Inimical Ambiance, Academic Rigour, Affiliation and Structure.
Distance and Open Learning Environment Scales (DOLES)	7	Interactivity, Institutional Support, Teacher Support, Negotiations, Flexibility, Task Orientation, Technological Support and Ergonomics
Student Assessment of Teaching and Learning (SATL)	4	Preparation and Classroom Management, Interpersonal Skills Enhancement of Learning, Student Evaluation Practices
Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI)	7	Student Cohesiveness, Open Endedness, Rule Clarity, Integration, Material Environment
Computer Laboratory Environment Inventory (CLEI)	5	Student Cohesiveness, Open Endedness, Integration, Education Technology Adequacy, Material Environment
College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI)	7	Personalisation Involvement Student Cohesiveness Satisfaction Task Orientation Innovation Individualisation

2.5.2 The Distance and Open Learning Environment Scale (DOLES)

The aim of this instrument is to evaluate students' perceptions while taking courses via distance education. The Distance and Open Learning Environment Scale (Doles) was developed by Fraser for the university students. It consists of eight scales: Interactivity, Institutional Support, Teacher Support, Negotiation, Flexibility, Task Orientation, Technological Support and Ergonomics (Fraser, 2001).

2.5.3 Student Assessment of Teaching and Learning (SATL)

The Student Assessment of Teaching and Learning (SATL) were designed to assess the elements of interactive nature of classroom teaching and classroom learning environment in higher education (Evans, in Fraser, 1998). The instrument has 55 items, with 11 items in Preparation and Classroom Management, 10 items in Interpersonal Skills Domain, 24 items with Enhancement of Learning Domain, 10 items with Student Evaluation Practices. Evans et al. (1994) claims that the instrument is very effective in measuring students' perceptions, characteristics of teaching and classroom learning environment in higher education, especially for part time and older students.

2.5.4 Computer Laboratory Environment Inventory (CLEI)

The Computer Laboratory Environment Inventory (CLEI) has similar features with the Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI) (Fisher, in Walker, 2004). The instrument has 35 items in five scales: Student Cohesiveness, Open Endedness, Integration, Rule Clarity, and Material Environment. The dimension of Techonology Adequacy, which measures the extent to which hardware and software is enough for the tasks required for the laboratory classs, is the only different measure of this instrument (Walker, 2004).

2.5.5 Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI)

Because of the importance of laboratory settings in science education, an instrument specifically suited to assessing the learning environment of science laboratory classes at the senior high school or higher education levels was developed (Fraser, 1998). Fraser explains that the SLEI has five scales (each with seven items) and the five response alternatives are Almost Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often and Very Often. Typical items are “I use the theory from my regular science class sessions during laboratory activities” (Integration) and “We know the results that we are supposed to get before we commence a laboratory activity” (Open-Endedness).

The SLEI was field tested and validated simultaneously with a sample of 5447 students in 269 classes in six different countries (the USA, Canada, England, Israel, Australia and Nigeria), and cross-validated with 1594 Australian students in 92 classes, 489 senior high school biology students in Australia and 1592 Grade 10 chemistry students in Singapore (Fraser, 2001).

2.6 Research on Classroom Learning Environment

To Fraser (1998), Walberg and Moos laid the foundations for work on educational environment. Classroom learning environment research has since become a different field of study. The extensiveness of recent classroom learning environment research and popularity of the field is being reflected in many literature reviews (e.g. Chavez, 1994; Wubbles, 1995; in Fraser, 1998). Table 4 below introduces 12 major lines of past classroom learning environment research reviewed and organised by Fraser (1998).

Table 4 Areas of Past Research in the Field of Classroom Learning Environment

Research Areas	Main Emphasis of Research
Associations between Student Outcomes and Environment	Investigation of relationship between perceptions of a classroom learning environment and students' cognitive affective outcomes
Evaluations of Educational Innovations	With the help of the classroom learning environment instruments, innovations in education are obtained
Student-Teacher Differences	Investigation of perceived differences between the students and the teacher in a classroom situation. Differences could be actual and preferred classroom learning environment
Person-Environment Fit	Research into if student achievement depends on the similarity between preferred and actual classroom learning environment
Teacher Improvement	Instruments provide feedback information for reflecting, discussing and attempting to improve classroom learning environment
Combining Research Methods	The research including the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods
School Psychology	Investigation upon the mental and emotional mood of the students
Links between Environments	Attempts to identify influences of multiple environments involved in the education process
Cross-national Studies	Investigation of similarities and differences between the various countries
Transitions between the Grade Levels	Research on the effect of the students moving one level of education to another
Teacher Education	Preparation and training of the educators
Teacher Assessment	Relationship between classroom learning environment and the teaching methods

2.6.1 Associations between Classroom Learning Environment and Student Outcomes; Evaluations of Educational Innovations

In past classroom learning environment research, associations between classroom learning environment and the student outcomes have been investigated extensively. For instance, Fraser (1998) made an order of 40 past studies; he classified the studies such as developed and developing countries, grade levels and the classroom learning environments used. These studies show that there was a close relationship between the student's perception of his/her classroom learning environment and students' success.

In 2000, Dorman conducted a research with the following aims:

- To validate scales in the What is Happening In This Classroom (WIHIC) and Constructivist Learning Environment Survey (CLES) questionnaires in mathematics classes in Australia;
- To examine associations between students' perceptions of mathematics classroom learning environment and their perceptions of academic efficacy at mathematical tasks;
- To establish whether scales of the What is Happening In This Classroom and the Constructivist Learning Environment Survey account for unique variance in the Academic Efficacy Scale.

The sample employed in this study consisted of 1055 students drawn from nine Australian secondary schools. Students from Grades 8, 10 and 12 participated in the study. Students in each school were grouped according to year level. The sample consisted of 27 school year groups. Results showed that classroom learning environment relates positively with academic efficacy. A commonality analysis showed that the three scales from the Constructivist Learning Environment Survey scales did not contribute greatly to explaining variance in academic efficacy beyond that attributed to the seven scales in the What Is Happening In This Classroom?

Dart et al.(1999) investigated the relationships between students' perceptions of their classroom learning environment and their approaches to learning, the differences in students' perceptions of their classroom when students with Deep and Surface approaches are compared, the differences in students' self concepts, their approaches to learning and their perceptions of the actual classroom learning environment in relation

to their gender and level of schooling and the differences between students' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment.

For this study, three different questionnaires were used: Learning Process Questionnaire (LPQ), the Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ), and also the Learner Self Concept Scale (LSCS). Four hundred and eighty-four students from 24 classes in two metropolitan secondary schools in Brisbane, Australia, participated in this study. The students completed questionnaires relating to their learning approaches, perceptions of the classroom learning environment and self-concepts of themselves as learners. The students were asked to answer the questions within the context of a particular subject. These subjects ranged over those typically offered in secondary schools – Mathematics, Science, English, History, Languages, Art, and Legal Studies. Of the 484 students in the study, 52% were female and 48% were male. The students were of mixed ability from all levels in the secondary school, Years 8 to 12.

The results showed that Deep Approaches to learning were significantly related to classroom learning environments which were perceived to be highly personalised and to be encouraging active participation in the learning process and the use of investigative skills in learning activities. High learner self concept was positively associated with Deep Approaches to learning and with classrooms perceived as high in Personalisation. It was negatively associated with Surface Approaches to learning. Differences in perceptions of classroom learning environment and approaches to learning in relation to gender and level of schooling were small. The implications of these findings are discussed and strategies for facilitating Deep Approaches to learning are referred to.

In the light of the findings above via the instruments used as a measure, also, it can be reached a conclusion that classroom learning environment instruments can be used in order to find out to what extent new methods and techniques work in the classroom. For example, Spinner and Fraser (2002) administrated the Constructivist Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ) to assess the classroom learning environment during using a new mathematics program; Lightburn and Fraser (2002) made use of Science Laboratory Environment Inventory (SLEI) and What Is Happening in This Classroom (WIHIC) to examine the classroom learning environment and the student outcomes. Raaflaub and Fraser (2002) used the WIHIC in order to investigate the science and mathematics classroom learning environment the computers were used.

2.6.2 Person-Environment Fit

These kinds of studies have made use of actual and preferred forms of classroom learning environment questionnaires in order to investigate if there is any relationship between the perception of actual and preferred classroom learning environment by the students.

An extensive study carried out in this field is the one by Fisher and Fraser (1983) in which they studied of whether students achieve better when there is a higher similarity between the actual classroom learning environment and the environment preferred by students. For this study, Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ) was preferred and the number of the subjects was 116. They applied pre-test and post-test on the participants, and tried to predict the participants' post-test achievement via pre-test performance. On the whole, the findings suggested that changing the actual classroom learning environment in ways that make it more suitable with that preferred by the class is likely to enhance the student outcomes.

2.6.3 Teacher Improvement

Because the aim of the improvement of the classroom learning environment is to enhance the students' outcome and to provide an agreeable classroom learning environment for them, some attempts are expected by the teachers. This field of classroom learning environment is concerned with the techniques, innovations and also ideas about how the teachers improve their classroom.

So as to make easy the teachers' application of these techniques and ideas, Fraser and Fisher (1986) developed some short questionnaire, including approximately 25 items, involving actual and preferred forms of the Classroom Environment Scale (CES), Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ) and My Classroom Environment (MCI) and they include approximately 25 items.

In a study applied on higher level, Yarrow and Millwater (in Dorman, 2000) investigated the teachers' attempts to improve the classroom learning environment by taking into the consideration the students' expectations. First, the students answered the preferred form of a classroom learning environment instrument. About a week later; actual form was also given to the participants (assessment). Second, the teacher got

feedback information derived from the students' scores of actual and preferred forms (feedback). This situation gave rise to changes reducing the differences between the actual and preferred classroom learning environment. Third, the teacher engaged in private reflection and discussion in order to make a decision whether it should be necessary to make changes in classroom learning environment (reflection and discussion).

Yarrow et al. (in Dart et al., 1999) conducted the same study with the 117 preservice education teachers. They were introduced to the field of classroom learning environment via action research aimed at improving their university teacher education classes and their 117 primary classes during teaching practice. The CUCEI was applied at higher level and MCI at primary level. Innovations in classroom learning environment observed. As a result, the preservice teachers usually valued not only the inclusion of the topic of classroom learning environment in their programs but also the opportunity to be involved in action research which aims at improving the classroom learning environment.

2.6.4 Student-Teacher Differences

Research conducted by Fisher (in Fraser, 1998) focused on the differences between students and teachers in their perceptions of the same actual and preferred classroom learning environment. Individualised Classroom Environment Questionnaire (ICEQ) was used. The number of the participants involved in this study was 116 classes for the comparisons of the student actual with the student preferred scores and a sub sample of 56 teachers of these classes for contrasting teachers' and students' scores. Ultimately, students preferred a more positive classroom learning environment than was actually present for all five dimensions. Also, teachers perceived a more positive classroom learning environment than did their students in the same classrooms on four of the dimensions.

Nair and Fisher (in Dart et al., 1999) carried out a study on modifying and validating a new form of the Colleges and Universities Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI). They used it to compare students' and teachers' actual and preferred perceptions of their science classroom learning environments at the higher level of education. The modifications to the CUCEI included personalising the items before it

was used to assess the perceptions of students and adding two new scales, namely, Cooperation and Equity. The reliabilities of the scales of the modified CUCEI ranged from 0.73 to 0.94. A total of 504 students participated in the study which covered a variety of science subjects. 205 participants were from Canadian institutions and the remaining, 299 students Australian institutions. Twenty four teachers took part in this study. Both students and teachers completed both forms of the instrument, the preferred and actual. Students' perceptions of their classrooms at the higher level indicated a preference for a more favourable classroom learning environment in all areas measured by the seven scales in the CUCEI. Female and male students perceived their classroom learning environment similarly. Mature students in the classes perceived their classroom more positively on two scales, Task Orientation and Equity. Teachers in all the science classes generally perceived their classroom learning environment more favourably than their students.

2.6.5 School psychology; Transitions between the Grade Levels; Cross-National Studies

The field of classroom learning environment research is also interested in school psychology and has developed new concepts, theories and techniques. Burden and Fraser (1993) argue that

Traditionally, school psychologists have tended to concentrate heavily and sometimes exclusively on their roles in assessing and enhancing academic achievement and other valued learning outcomes. The field of classroom learning environment provides an opportunity for school psychologists and teachers to become sensitised to subtle but important aspects of classroom life, and to use discrepancies between students' perceptions of actual and preferred classroom learning environment as a basis to guide improvements in classrooms. (p.7)

Transition between the grade levels, in other words, from the primary school to the high school, has affected the students to some extent. Therefore, the field of classroom learning environment is interested in this transition and its effects on the

students. Ferguson and Fraser (1996) investigated the relationship between the students' perceptions of the classroom learning environment and the transitions between the grade levels. 1040 students were selected from 47 primary schools and 17 high schools in Australia. The result was that students from high school perceived classroom learning environment less favourably than their primary school classroom learning environment. Similarly, Midgley et al. (1991) claims "a deterioration in the classroom learning environment when students moved from generally smaller primary schools to larger, departmentally-organised lower secondary schools, perhaps because of less positive student relations with teachers and reduced student opportunities for decision making in the classroom"(p.45).

Educational research has also examined the students' and the teachers' perceptions on the classroom learning environment from different countries. When the results were compared, some differences appeared. For example; Huang et al. (1998) carried out a cross-national study on the classroom learning environment. What Is Happening In This Classroom (WIHIC) was applied to 50 high schools, 1879 students in Taiwan and 1081 students in Australia. The differences were remarkable on two scales, Involvement and Equity. Australian students perceive each scale more positively when compared with the students from Taiwan.

2.6.6 Teacher Education and Teacher Assessment

Field of classroom learning environment provides little ideas and techniques in teacher education program. Moreover, little progress and effort has occurred in order to apply these new ideas into the teacher education. Some studies Fraser (1993) carried out attempted to investigate about how the classroom learning environment could be helpful to the teacher education:

- To make the teachers aware of the crucial aspect of the classroom learning environment. Besides the teaching methods and activities, to help them understand the usefulness of classroom learning environment assessment
- To show them how the assessment of the classroom learning environment will be helpful to apply the current and new teaching methods easily
- And also, to provide a feedback for the teaching performance

In addition, Pickett and Fraser (2002) investigated the effectiveness of the mentoring program for preservice teachers. WIHIC was used as a measure over the 600 students so as to get their perceptions of classroom learning environment. The result was that the mentoring program had been successful in view of improving classroom learning environment. The Louisiana STAR (System for Teaching and Learning Assessment and Review) is a teacher assessment system including classroom learning environment dimensions (Ellett et al., 1989). The other three performance dimensions are Preparation, Planning and Evaluation (e.g. teaching methods, homework, and assessment), Classroom and Behaviour Management (e.g. student engagement, monitoring student behaviour) and Enhancement of Learning (e.g. content accuracy, thinking skills, pace, feedback). With the STAR, many observers complete an assessment in 45 minutes by focusing on preparation and planning in addition to in-class performance, on student learning as well as teaching behaviour, on higher-level as well as lower-level student learning. Teachers who were effective in terms of the psychosocial classroom learning environment dimension were found to encourage positive interpersonal relationships within a classroom learning environment in which students feel comfortable, accepted and courageous.

2.6.7 Combining Research Methods; Links between Environments

Many studies on the classroom learning environment include both qualitative (interview, observation) and quantitative (questionnaire) measures in order to enhance the reliability (Fraser and Tobin, 1991).

For instance, in a study which focused on the goal of higher-level cognitive learning, six researchers studied the Grade 10 science classes of two teachers over a ten-week period (Tobin et al., 1990). Each class was observed by several researchers, interviewing of students and teachers, and the students' written work was examined. The study also involved quantitative information from questionnaires assessing student perceptions of psychosocial classroom learning environment. Students' perceptions of the classroom learning environment within each class were consistent with the observers' records of the patterns of learning activities and engagement in each classroom.

Like the study above, Aldridge and Fraser (2000) conducted a similar study by combining qualitative and quantitative measures to investigate the perceptions of students about the classroom learning environment with a well-design technology.

In field of classroom learning environment, though most studies have focussed on a single environment, few studies combined more than one environment. Zandviliet and Fraser (1999), in a single study, examined both physical and psychological classroom learning environment. Although the researchers have paid more attention to classroom learning environment research than to school environment research, few studies have included the school environment; for example, a study by Dorman et al. (1997) focussed on associations between school and classroom learning environment. Marjoribanks (1991) shows how the learning environments of the home and school affect school achievement, and Moos (1991) illustrates the links between school, home and parents' work environments.

In the light of the literature review presented in the preceding pages, now the study at hand can be introduced.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter presents the research design of the study and gives information on participants, instruments, and data collection procedures.

3.1 Introduction

This descriptive study aims to investigate if there is a significant difference between the teachers' and the students' preferred and actual perception of their classroom learning environments. Ekmekçi (1997) points out that descriptive research designs include data collection concerning the present status of the subjects of the study rather than explaining relationship or making implications. Therefore, second and third level students and teachers working with these students at YADİM at Çukurova University were given a questionnaire. To support the data, a classroom observation checklist was used.

In line with the design of the study, both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection were used. Creswell (2003) suggests that qualitative approach is different from the traditional quantitative approaches since it depends on the collection of data, analysis of text, or personal interpretation of the findings. Similarly, this study provides data on the perceptions of teachers and the students by analyzing their responses to questions in the questionnaire. The data collected from the questionnaires were supported by observations so that the validity of the research could be enhanced.

3.2 Participants

As presented in table 5 below, out of 1100 students at YADİM, all the students (N=277) at L2 and L3 attending YADİM (Centre for Foreign Languages) at Çukurova University participated in the study. There were more males than females in the study

(158 versus 119, respectively). Students ranged in age from 17 to 32. The participants have been taking compulsory English classes 25 hours a week in homogenous classes, which means that they are placed in classes by means of a placement test at the beginning of the academic year. The participants comprise of second and third level students as determined by placement test of YADIM. Each class is taught by two teachers. There are approximately 10-20 students in each class.

Table 5 Students' Class, Gender and Ages

Class	f / %	Gender		Age					
		male	female	17-19	20-22	23-25	26-28	29-32	Total
203	N	25	3	21	6	1	0	0	28
	%	89	11	75	21	4	0	0	100
205	N	16	11	0	4	21	1	1	27
	%	59	41	0	14	78	4	4	100
206	N	7	21	0	1	26	1	0	28
	%	25	75	0	4	92	4	0	100
207	N	16	12	22	6	0	0	0	28
	%	57	43	79	21	0	0	0	100
209	N	14	13	22	5	0	0	0	27
	%	52	48	81	19	0	0	0	100
210	N	15	13	22	6	0	0	0	28
	%	54	46	79	21	0	0	0	100
212	N	16	11	0	0	20	5	2	27
	%	59	41	0	0	74	19	7	100
302	N	16	12	22	6	0	0	0	28
	%	57	43	79	21	0	0	0	100
303	N	17	10	0	15	11	1	0	27
	%	63	37	0	56	40	4	0	100
304	N	16	13	22	6	1	0	0	29
	%	55	45	76	21	3	0	0	100

The second group consists of ten teachers, eight female and two male. The reason why these ten teachers were selected as the participants is that they are the ones who are teaching L2 and L3 students at YADIM. The following table presents their teaching experience. It is seen that two of 10 teachers (20 %) did not mark the item related to their teaching experiences. There is only one male teacher answering the question concerning their teaching experience while the number of the female teachers

answering the same question is 7. Four of the participants were found to have been teaching English for six to ten years while two of them have been teaching for 16 to 20 years.

Table 6 Teachers' Gender and Teaching Experience

Gender	f / %	Teaching experience				
		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Total
male	N	0	1	0	0	1
	%	0	100	0	0	100
female	N	1	3	1	2	7
	%	14	43	14	29	100
Total	N	1	4	1	2	8
	%	12,5	50	12,5	25	100

n:8

As is seen in Table 7, only two teachers are 41 years old or more. Most of the teachers (55 %) are younger than 35.

Table 7 Teachers' Age

Gender	f / %	Age					Total
		25-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46 +	
male	N	0	1	0	1	0	2
	%	0	50	0	50	0	100
female	N	3	1	2	0	1	7
	%	43	14	29	0	14	100
Total	N	3	2	2	1	1	9
	%	33	22	22	11	11	100

n:9

3.3. Instruments

Frankel & Wallen (1993) point out that if a conclusion is supported by data collected from a number of different instruments, its validity is thereby enhanced. In order to collect reliable data, a questionnaire and observation checklists (see Appendices) were used as data collection tools in this study.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

In qualitative approaches, the researcher tries to find out the gist of a phenomenon from the views of participants (Creswell, 2003). Therefore, in order to identify the teachers' and the students' perceptions about their actual and preferred classroom learning environment, College and University Classroom Environment Inventory was administered as the initial step of the data collection.

The College and University Environment Inventory (CUCEI) was developed in 1986 by Fraser. The CUCEI was designed for small class sizes of about 30 students for every level. The seven-scales, each of which includes 49 items in the CUCEI, are Personalisation, Innovation, Student cohesiveness, Task orientation, Cooperation, Individualisation and Equity. The CUCEI is available in the actual and preferred versions. The actual version measures the participants' actual perception of their classroom learning environment whereas the preferred form measures perception of the classroom learning environment preferred by the participants. The questionnaires contain similar items with slight changes in the wording. For example, the item "the teacher goes out of his/her way to help students", appearing in the actual form is reworded in the preferred version to read as "the teacher would go out of his/her way to help student."

In the questionnaire, there are five responses provided for each item, namely, Almost never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often, Almost always. Examples of items are "Activities in this class are clearly and carefully planned" (Task Orientation), and "Teaching approaches allow students to proceed at their own pace" (Individualisation).

Validation of the CUCEI, conducted by Fraser et al. (1987), yielded scale alpha reliabilities ranging from 0.70 to 0.90. The descriptions for each scale and sample items in the CUCEI are shown in Table 8.

Recently, the instrument has been utilised by Fraser (1994) in order to assess student perceptions of their actual and preferred classroom learning environment and identify actual-preferred discrepancies. It has also been used to guide improvements in a second year university education program in Australia. The following table presents scales, their description, and sample item from the CUCEI.

Table 8 College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI)

Scale Name	Description	Sample Items
Personalisation	Extent of opportunities for individual students to interact with the teacher and of concern for student's personal welfare.	The teacher goes out of his/her way to help me.
Innovation	Extent to which the teacher plans new, unusual activities, teaching techniques and assignments.	The teacher often thinks of unusual activities.
Student cohesiveness	Extent to which students know, help and are friendly towards each other.	I make friends easily in this class.
Task orientation	Extent to which class activities are clear and well organised.	Class assignments are clear and I know what I am doing.
Cooperation	Extent to which students cooperate rather than compete with one another on learning tasks.	I work with other students in this class.
Individualisation	Extent to which students are allowed to make decisions and are treated differently according to ability, interests and rate of working.	I am allowed to choose activities and how I will work.
Equity	Extent to which students are treated equally by the teacher.	I am treated the same as other students in this class.

As shown below, items included in each scale are presented in the form of a table for a better data analysis procedure in this thesis.

Table 9 Scales and Item Numbers

Scale Name	Item no.
Personalisation	1-7
Innovation	8-14
Student cohesiveness	15-21
Task orientation	22-28
Cooperation	29-35
Individualisation	36-42
Equity	43-49

3.3.2 Observation of the Classroom

To support the data collected from the questionnaires, ten classroom learning environments were observed by the researcher. The teachers and the students observed were those who were given the questionnaire (CUCEI) before. The teachers were asked for permission to be observed.

The observation checklist used in this study includes 17 items from the College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI) developed by Fraser (1994). While adapting the CUCEI to observation checklist, attention was paid to the items which would lend themselves to observation. It has also been made certain that each scale has been represented in the checklist equally.

3.4 Data Collection

The data was collected on the 6th of December, 2005 at the Centre for Foreign Languages (YADİM) at Çukurova University with the permission of school administration. The teachers' questionnaires were given before class and the ones prepared for students were submitted by the teacher who taught them in that class. In order to prevent misunderstanding, each item in the questionnaire was explained to the participants. The questionnaires were collected by the teachers themselves.

A week later, the researcher visited YADİM (Centre for Foreign Languages) at Çukurova University and asked the teachers for their permission to observe their classes. Between the dates of 26.12.2005 and 29.12.2005 the classroom learning environments were observed. During the observation, the researcher placed himself at one of the back rows in the class in order to take notes. The researcher stepped into and left the class with the teacher and did not interfere with anything.

3.5. Data Analysis

Data analysis of qualitative approaches includes creating codes and themes qualitatively, then counting the number of times they occur in the text data (Creswell, 2003). In this study, the data analysis was carried out in order to find out if there is a

significant difference between the teachers' and the students' preferred and actual perception of their classroom learning environments.

In the analysis of the questionnaire and the observation checklist, the means, frequencies and percentages of responses falling to each category were collected; then, t-test and ANOVA values of each item were computed on the SPSS, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, in order to understand the significance of the differences appearing between both students' and teachers' perceptions of actual and preferred classroom learning environment. The data will be displayed in tabular form in following Chapter.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

This chapter of the study presents the results of the findings obtained from the questionnaires and observation checklists.

4.1 Introduction

This study aims to identify if there is any significant difference between the students' and the teachers' perceptions of actual and preferred classroom learning environment at YADIM (Centre for Foreign Languages) at Çukurova University. In line with this purpose, 277 students and ten teachers of English were administered a questionnaire. To support the data collected from the questionnaires, ten classroom learning environments were observed to get more insights into classroom learning environment at YADİM.

In the analysis of the data, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to determine t-test values for each item in order to detect any differences between the students' and the teachers' perception of actual and preferred classroom learning environment. While detecting and comparing the students' and the teachers' actual and preferred classroom learning environment, paired and independent sample t-tests were used. Hatch & Lazaraton (1991) suggest that t-test can be used to compare the means occurring in different categories or the categories may be groups, so that the t-test is comparing groups with respect to the means of occurrence of different events.

In addition to t-test, ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) has been utilized in order to find out if there is any significant differences among results obtained from the observation checklist and the students' and the teachers' perceptions of actual classroom learning environment. As Hatch & Lazaraton (1991) suggest, the ANOVA procedure is preferred in order to compare more than two groups. The level of significance was selected as $p < .05$.

4.2 Findings from Questionnaire and Observation

This section presents the frequencies and percentages concerning students' and teachers' perceptions of actual and preferred classroom learning environment.

Table 10 shows the students' and the teachers' views about the scale 'personalisation' which is concerned with students' interaction with their teachers and the students' personal welfare. The scale 'personalisation' has seven items: the teacher's giving value to students' feelings (item 1), the teacher's being friendly to the students (item 2), the teacher's going out of his/her way to help the students (item 3), the teachers' help when the students are in trouble with their works (item 4), the teacher's moving around the classroom to talk with the students (item 5), the teacher's interest with the students' problem (item 6), The teacher's being unfriendly and inconsiderate towards the students (item7).

For item1, of 277 students, 155 students think that the teachers always consider their feelings. Similarly, 90 % of the teachers support the students' views. When looked at the observation results (see appendix 6), it is clearly seen that most of the teachers consider students' feelings. Both students (93 %) and teachers (100 %) prefer a classroom learning environment where students' feelings are taken into consideration.

Item 2, which refers to teacher's being friendly to students, reveals similar results; 98 % of the students feel that their teachers are friendly towards them. The teachers (100 %) share the same views with the students. Observation results present evidence that 60 % of the teachers are friendly to the students. When the students' and the teachers' views of preferred classroom learning environment for item 2 are examined, the students and the teachers think that positive interactions between student and teacher are crucial.

As for item 3, of 277 students, 194 students indicate that the teachers go out of their ways to help them; nevertheless, some students (4 %) think that their teachers never help them by departing from their class plans. On the other hand, 60 % of the teachers believe that the main goal is to help the students. Thus, if necessary, they can go out of their ways. When compared the teachers' and the students' preferred classroom learning environment, it is clearly seen that 76 % of the students and 90 % of the teachers agree that it is indispensable to help the students when they are in a trouble.

Item 4 investigates the teachers' help when the students are in trouble with their works. About this item, there is an agreement between the teachers', the students' and

the observer's views in that they think that the teachers help the students when they are in a difficulty. Also, the teachers and the students prefer a classroom learning environment where the teachers help their students whenever they have a problem.

Item 5, the teacher's moving around the classroom to talk with the students, presents that while 38 % of the students claim that the teachers often move around the classroom to talk them, 1 % of the students think opposite. 70 % of the teachers explain that they sometimes move around. According to the observation results, 40 % of the teachers sometimes move around the classroom. When looked into the preferred side, it is seen that % 74 of the students and all the teachers prefer a classroom learning environment in which the teachers move around in order to talk to the students.

There is an agreement between the students' and the teachers' views for item 6 in that of 277 students, 176 students and think that the teachers are interested in their problems and like the students, 100 % of the teachers explain that they give importance to their students' problems. While 178 students are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the teachers are interested in their problems, only four students say never. All the teachers want to be interested in their students' problems.

Item 7 shows that the students do not think that their teachers are unfriendly and inconsiderate towards them. Similarly, the teachers do not find themselves unfriendly and inconsiderate. They want a classroom learning environment where the teachers are understanding and friendly to the students.

Table 10 Personalisation

			student						teacher					
			almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total	almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total
actual	item 1	N	0	1	23	98	155	277	0	0	1	4	5	10
		%	0	0	8	35	56	100	0	0	10	40	50	100
	item 2	N	0	0	6	93	178	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	0	0	2	34	64	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
	item 3	N	12	50	21	107	87	277	0	1	3	6	0	10
		%	4	18	8	39	31	100	0	10	30	60	0	100
	item 4	N	0	32	65	98	82	277	0	0	0	3	7	10
		%	0	12	23	35	30	100	0	0	0	30	70	100
	item 5	N	3	40	47	105	82	277	3	5	2	0	0	10
		%	1	14	17	38	30	100	30	50	20	0	0	100
	item 6	N	6	32	63	101	75	277	0	0	0	5	5	10
		%	2	12	23	36	27	100	0	0	0	50	50	100
	item 7	N	153	66	48	10	0	277	7	2	1	0	0	10
		%	55	24	17	4	0	100	70	20	10	0	0	100
preferred	Total	N	174	221	273	612	659	1939	10	8	7	20	25	70
		%	63	80	99	221	238	700	14	11	10	29	36	100
	item 1	N	0	0	19	94	164	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	0	0	7	34	59	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
	item 2	N	0	1	8	96	172	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	0	0	3	35	62	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
	item 3	N	11	42	15	105	104	277	0	1	0	6	3	10
		%	4	15	5	38	38	100	0	10	0	60	30	100
	item 4	N	0	27	57	98	95	277	0	0	0	1	9	10
		%	0	10	21	35	34	100	0	0	0	10	90	100
	item 5	N	2	31	39	111	94	277	0	0	0	3	7	10
		%	1	11	14	40	34	100	0	0	0	30	70	100
	item 6	N	4	30	65	105	73	277	0	0	0	3	7	10
		%	1	11	23	38	26	100	0	0	0	30	70	100
	item 7	N	179	64	30	4	0	277	10	0	0	0	0	10
		%	65	23	11	1	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Total	N	196	195	233	613	702	1939	10	1	0	17	42	70
		%	71	70	84	221	253	700	14	1	0	24	60	100

Table 11 shows the students' and the teachers' responses to the scale 'innovation' referring to teacher's planning new, unusual activities, teaching techniques and assignments. The scale 'innovation' has seven items: implementation of new ideas in the classroom (item 8), teacher's using new and different ways of teaching in the classroom (item 9), the teacher's thinking up innovative activities (item 10), being used of various and innovative teaching approaches by the teacher (item 11), the seating arrangement in the classroom (item 12), the teacher's using unusual activities (item 13), the types of activities used in the classroom (item 14).

For item 8, while 50 students think that new ideas are never applied in this classroom, 54 students say the opposite. When looked at the teachers' thoughts, 70 % of the teachers claim that new ideas are tried out in the classroom. Both students and teachers agree on the idea that new ideas should be applied in the classroom.

Item 9 presents that though 79 students believe that the teachers never use new and different ways of teaching in the classroom, 4 % of them prefer 'always'. However, a majority of the students (62 %) think that the teachers sometimes use new and different ways of teaching in the classroom. On the other hand, 50 % of the teachers claim they often use new ways of teaching. Observation results are in favour of the teachers' views because 4 out of ten teachers were observed to use new teaching methods. The teachers (90 %) and the students (77 %) would rather a classroom in which the teachers apply new ways of teaching.

Item 10 examines whether the teachers think up innovative activities or not. 66 % of the students prefer the alternative 'sometimes' but 50 % of the teachers claim that they often think up innovative activities. Observation results show that 40 % of the teachers design innovative activities such as brainstorming technique, keyword activity, jigsaw strategy and English questions strategy. Both the students and the teachers are in favour of using innovative activities in the classroom. Another striking point is that there seems to be no difference between the teachers' actual and preferred views of in terms of new activities. On the other hand, there is a remarkable difference among the views of the students.

Item 11 reveals that the views of the students (63 %) about the teachers' using innovative and various teaching approaches are that the teachers are sometimes using innovative teaching approaches in the classroom. However, the teachers (60 %) claim that they are often using various teaching methods. The findings from the observation

checklist share similar results with the teachers' views. The teachers (90 %) and the students (73 %) prefer a classroom where the new teaching approaches are being used.

As for item 12, 50 % of the teachers and 63 % of the students claim that seating in the classrooms is arranged in the same way each week. On the other hand, 4 % of the students and 20 % of the teachers think that seating arrangement in the classrooms changes constantly. The students' expectations about the seating arrangement show that of 277 students, 106 students want the seating arrangement being changeable. When the teachers' expectations are compared with the students', it is seen clearly that the teachers are not in favour of changing the seating arrangement in the classroom. One of the reasons may be that, as Fisher and Fraser (1983) claimed, the teachers perceive their classroom learning environment in favourable terms and are reluctant to make changes.

When looked into the item 13, while 34 % of the students think that the teachers never think of unusual activities, 32 % of the students choose the alternative 'seldom'. As for the teachers' views, the teachers (60 %) say that they sometimes think of unusual activities. Both students and the teachers are in favour of implementing unusual activities in the classrooms.

Item 14 illustrates that while 209 students claim that they always seem to do the same type of activities in every class, seven teachers prefer the alternative 'sometimes' on this issue. The students (82 %) and the teachers (60 %) prefer a classroom learning environment where the different types of activities are practised.

Table 11 Innovation

			student						teacher					
			almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total	almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total
actual	item 8	N	50	57	116	44	10	277	0	1	2	6	1	10
		%	18	21	42	16	4	100	0	10	20	60	10	100
	item 9	N	79	84	89	21	4	277	0	2	3	5	0	10
		%	29	30	32	8	1	100	0	20	30	50	0	100
	item 10	N	50	74	109	37	7	277	0	0	3	5	2	10
		%	18	27	39	13	3	100	0	0	30	50	20	100
	item 11	N	72	78	96	27	4	277	0	0	3	6	1	10
		%	26	28	35	10	1	100	0	0	30	60	10	100
	item 12	N	8	29	64	86	90	277	2	0	5	1	2	10
		%	4	10	23	31	32	100	20	0	50	10	20	100
	item 13	N	94	89	71	22	1	277	0	2	6	2	0	10
		%	34	32	26	8	0	100	0	20	60	20	0	100
	item 14	N	0	23	45	96	113	277	2	4	3	1	0	10
		%	0	8	16	35	41	100	20	40	30	10	0	100
	Total	N	353	434	590	333	229	1939	4	9	25	26	6	70
		%	127	157	213	120	83	700	6	13	36	37	9	100
preferred	item 8	N	2	23	52	109	91	277	0	0	0	1	9	10
		%	1	8	19	39	33	100	0	0	0	10	90	100
	item 9	N	3	22	40	113	99	277	0	0	1	5	4	10
		%	1	8	14	41	36	100	0	0	10	50	40	100
	item 10	N	0	12	29	86	150	277	0	0	1	2	7	10
		%	0	4	10	31	54	100	0	0	10	20	70	100
	item 11	N	3	22	51	107	94	277	0	0	1	2	7	10
		%	1	8	18	39	34	100	0	0	10	20	70	100
	item 12	N	106	84	68	18	1	277	2	1	4	1	2	10
		%	38	30	25	6	0	100	20	10	40	10	20	100
	item 13	N	9	30	73	93	72	277	0	1	3	4	2	10
		%	3	11	26	34	26	100	0	10	30	40	20	100
	item 14	N	161	67	40	9	0	277	2	4	4	0	0	10
		%	58	24	14	3	0	100	20	40	40	0	0	100
	Total	N	284	260	353	535	507	1939	4	6	14	15	31	70
		%	103	94	127	193	183	700	6	9	20	21	44	100

Table 12 deals with the students' actual and preferred responses to the scale 'student cohesiveness' which deals with the interaction among the students. This scale has also seven items; students' knowing each other (item 15), the students' knowing each other by their first name (item 16), the students' making friends easily in the classroom (item 17), the students' having a chance to know their classmates (item 18), time duration for the students to know each other by their first name (item 19), the students' having a chance to know their classmates well (item 20), the students' interest to know their classmates in the classroom (item 21).

There seems to be an agreement between the students' and the teachers' views concerning the students' knowing each other. 45 % of the students and 60 % of the teachers think that the students know each other. For item 15, the students' and the teachers' point of views are almost identical since, 97 % of the students and 80 % of the teachers are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the students know each other.

Item 16 presents that 56 % of the students and all the teachers claim that the students know their friends by their first names. Only 3 % of the students say that they do not know their friends' names. Similar results are obtained for the preferred classroom learning environments. While 56 % of the students and all the teachers expect that the students know their friends by their first names, only three students think the opposite. Observation results support these findings as well.

As for item 17, it is clearly seen that 169 out of 277 students explain that they make friends easily in the classroom. Correspondingly, nine out of ten teachers share the same views with the students. 82 % of the students and all the teachers prefer a classroom learning environment friendship is valued and supported.

Results of item 18 and 20 illustrate that both students and the teachers think that the students have a chance to know their classmates. Observation results also demonstrate that classroom atmosphere is warm and open to make friends and know each other. When looked at the expectations of the students and the teachers, it was understood that not only the students but also the teachers are in a favour of a classroom learning environment which provides an opportunity for students to know their classmates.

Regarding item 19, 79 % of the students think that it never takes them a long time to get to know everybody by his/her first name in the class and 60 % of the teachers agree with the students. However, only seven students think opposite. Similar

findings appear in the preferred side of the item; 77 % of the students and % 60 of the teachers would rather not take a long time for the students to know each other.

For item 21, it is obvious that while 123 out of 277 students are interested in getting to know other students in the classroom, only two students do not care about that. While nine teachers think that their students are interested in getting to know the other students, only one teacher claims the opposite. 71 % of the students are in favour of getting to know the others and 70 % of the teachers support the students' ideas.

Table 13 shows the students' actual and preferred responses to the scale 'task orientation' including class activities and their organisation. This scale has seven items: the students' having an idea about activities or works in the classroom (item 22), the importance of getting a certain amount of work done in the classroom (item 23), participation in activities (item 24), organisation of the classroom (item 25), class assignments (item 26), starting time of the class (item 27), planning of the activities (item 28).

For item 22, there seems to be highly significant differences between the students' and the teachers' point of views. While 126 students claim that they are not aware of the works done in the classroom, only a few students (17) say that they have an idea about what is happening in the classroom. On the other hand, 90 % of the teachers emphasize that their students know exactly what has to be done in the classroom. When compared the students' and the teachers' views for the preferred classroom learning environment, it is seen clearly that the students (72 %) and the teachers (90 %) prefer students' having an idea about the works in the classroom.

Item 23 illustrates that 35 % of the students finds getting a work done in the classroom unimportant and choose the alternative 'never' but 59 % of them say that they sometimes find it important. However, 90 % of the teachers think that their students find it necessary. A majority of the students (72 %) and the teachers (90 %) prefer a classroom learning environment where the students participate in the works willingly and comprehend their importance.

As for item 24, it is understood that the students (34 %) think that they often get sidetracked in the classroom. One possible reason may be that the students might not have a clear idea about what will be done in the classroom. However most of the teachers (70 %) believe that the students stick to the point. These responses reveal a conflict between the students' and the teachers' views. When looked into the views about the students' and the teachers' preferred classroom learning environment for item 24, there is a general agreement between the views in that both sides want the students participate in the activities or works.

For item 25, it is seen an agreement between the students' and the teachers' views. 124 students and five teachers think that the classes are never disorganised. There is a similarity between the students' and the teachers' comments on the preferred classroom learning environment in that 74% of the students and 70 % of the teachers do not want a disorganised classroom.

The results of item 26 show that while 28 % of the students claim that class assignments are never clear and they do not know what to do, 3 % of them do not share these views. On the other hand, all the teachers believe that class assignments are clear and their students know what to do. The results of the observation support the views of the teachers since class assignments are seen to be clear enough for the students to understand. Regarding preferred responses, the teachers (100 %) and the students (81 %) are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the assignments are clear.

Item 27 shows that there is a close relationship between the teachers' and the students' ideas about the starting time of the class; 49 % of the students and 100 % of the teachers say that the class begins on time. The researcher has also observed that classes start on time. An overwhelming majority of the students (83 %) and the teachers (100 %) prefer that the class starts on time.

For item 28, the teachers and the students seem to hold different views. While the students (32 %) think that activities are never planned clearly and carefully, the rest of students think the opposite. On the other hand, the results of the observation are in favour of the teachers' views because during the observation sessions, the researcher has found that activities are carefully and clearly planned in all classrooms. If looked at the preferred classroom environment by the students and the teachers, it is seen that both the students and the teachers would rather the activities being clearly and carefully planned.

Table 13 Task Orientation

			student						teacher					
			almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total	almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total
actual	item 22	N	126	77	57	16	1	277	0	0	1	4	5	10
		%	45	28	21	6	0	100	0	0	10	40	50	100
	item 23	N	98	72	92	14	1	277	0	0	1	4	5	10
		%	35	26	33	5	0	100	0	0	10	40	50	100
	item 24	N	2	35	71	95	74	277	3	4	2	1	0	10
		%	1	13	26	34	27	100	30	40	20	10	0	100
	item 25	N	124	80	55	17	1	277	5	4	1	0	0	10
		%	45	29	20	6	0	100	50	40	10	0	0	100
	item 26	N	81	88	82	19	7	277	0	0	0	4	6	10
		%	28	32	30	7	3	100	0	0	0	40	60	100
	item 27	N	8	41	91	89	48	277	0	0	0	4	6	10
		%	3	15	33	32	17	100	0	0	0	40	60	100
	item 28	N	88	83	82	17	7	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	32	30	30	6	3	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
preferred	Total	N	527	476	530	267	139	1939	8	8	5	19	30	70
		%	190	172	191	96	50	700	11	11	7	27	43	100
	item 22	N	0	16	68	113	80	277	0	0	2	3	5	10
		%	0	6	25	41	29	100	0	0	20	30	50	100
	item 23	N	0	15	63	118	81	277	0	0	1	2	7	10
		%	0	5	23	43	29	100	0	0	10	20	70	100
	item 24	N	171	72	30	4	0	277	3	3	2	1	1	10
		%	62	26	11	1	0	100	30	30	20	10	10	100
	item 25	N	204	60	13	0	0	277	7	2	0	1	0	10
		%	74	22	5	0	0	100	70	20	0	10	0	100
	item 26	N	0	16	37	110	114	277	0	1	0	2	7	10
		%	0	6	13	40	41	100	0	10	0	20	70	100
	item 27	N	0	7	41	111	118	277	0	0	0	4	6	10
		%	0	3	15	40	43	100	0	0	0	40	60	100
	item 28	N	0	6	15	105	151	277	0	1	1	1	7	10
		%	0	2	5	38	55	100	0	10	10	10	70	100
	Total	N	375	192	267	561	544	1939	10	7	6	14	33	70
		%	135	69	96	203	196	700	14	10	9	20	47	100

Table 14 presents the students' and teachers' actual and preferred responses to the scale 'cooperation', referring students' cooperation rather than competition with one another on learning tasks. This scale has seven items: the students' cooperation with each other while doing their assignments (item 29), the students' sharing their books and resources while doing their assignments (item 30), the students' working with each other on the projects (item 31), the students' learning from each other (item 32), the students' working with each other in the classroom (item 33), the students' cooperation with each other on class activities (item 34) and the students' working with each other to achieve goals (item 35).

The results of item 29 show clearly that while 38 % of the students think that they never cooperate with each other while doing assignments, only 7 % of the students say 'often'. Unlike students' responses, 70 % of the teachers claim that their students cooperate with each other while they are working on their assignments. During classroom observation session, cooperation among the students while studying on the assignments has been seen only in five out of ten classes. When looked at the preferences of the students and the teachers, it is understood that 53 % of the students and 60 % of the teachers think that it will be useful for the students to cooperate with each other while doing their assignments.

As for item 30, the students' and the teachers' views on sharing the books and the resources seem to differ. While 43 % of the students claim that they never share their books and the resources with other students, 50 % of the teachers think the opposite. Another point is that although 50 % of the students are in favour of a classroom learning environment in which they will share their books and resources with each other, 26 % of the students prefer 'almost never' and 'seldom'. The reason is most probably that the students do not know each other well. But all of the teachers want their students to share their resources with each other.

When asked if they work together on projects, 66 % of the students almost never or seldom do so (item 31). On the other hand, 34 % say they often or sometimes work on project together. The percentage of the teachers who believe that their students work together on the projects is 80 %. Nevertheless, the students and the teachers agree with the idea that a classroom learning environment should be created where the students can share their views on the projects.

A majority of the students (66 %) claim that they never or seldom learn from the other students. On the other hand, most of the teachers (70 %) think opposite and claim

that their students learn from each other. When asked their preferred classroom learning environment, the teachers and the students share the similar views and they say they would prefer a classroom learning environment students learn from each other (item 32).

Concerning item 33, 67 % of the students claim that they never or seldom work together in the classroom. As for the teachers, 90 % of them believe that their students sometimes or often work together. Interesting point, however, is that not a single teacher has chosen almost always option. 197 out of 277 (71 %) students prefer working together in the classroom. Similarly, 90 % of the teachers share the same view with their students (item 33).

When asked if they cooperate with each other on classroom activities, 35 % say 'never' while 63 % say 'sometimes' (item 34). However, the teachers think more positively and claim that their students cooperate during the activities used in the classroom. A great number of the students and the teachers prefer a classroom learning environment where the students cooperate and help each other on class activities.

A similar picture appears for item 35. A majority of the students (67 %) think that they never or seldom work together to achieve class goal. On the other hand, the teachers (50 %) indicate that their students often work together in order to accomplish a goal. The teachers and the students prefer a classroom learning environment in which the students cooperate with each other for the class goals.

Table 14 Cooperation

			student						teacher					
			almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total	almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total
actual	item 29	N	104	77	75	20	1	277	0	0	1	7	2	10
		%	38	28	27	7	0	100	0	0	10	70	20	100
	item 30	N	118	92	49	18	0	277	0	0	2	5	3	10
		%	43	33	18	6	0	100	0	0	20	50	30	100
	item 31	N	104	78	72	23	0	277	0	0	2	4	4	10
		%	38	28	26	8	0	100	0	0	20	40	40	100
	item 32	N	106	81	75	15	0	277	0	0	3	5	2	10
		%	38	29	27	5	0	100	0	0	30	50	20	100
	item 33	N	98	86	78	15	0	277	0	0	5	4	1	10
		%	36	31	28	5	0	100	0	0	50	40	0	100
	item 34	N	97	86	90	4	0	277	0	0	0	6	4	10
		%	35	31	32	1	0	100	0	0	0	60	40	100
	item 35	N	97	88	79	13	0	277	0	0	1	5	4	10
		%	35	32	29	5	0	100	0	0	10	50	40	100
	Total	N	724	588	518	108	1	1939	0	0	14	36	20	70
		%	261	212	187	39	0	700	0	0	20	51	29	100
preferred	item 29	N	0	8	15	106	148	277	0	0	1	3	6	10
		%	0	3	5	38	53	100	0	0	10	30	60	100
	item 30	N	17	55	66	89	50	277	0	0	0	5	5	10
		%	6	20	24	32	18	100	0	0	0	50	50	100
	item 31	N	17	61	59	94	46	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	6	22	21	34	17	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
	item 32	N	4	40	106	99	28	277	0	0	1	3	6	10
		%	1	14	38	36	10	100	0	0	10	30	60	100
	item 33	N	0	31	49	95	102	277	0	0	1	4	5	10
		%	0	11	18	34	37	100	0	0	10	40	50	100
	item 34	N	0	20	71	84	102	277	0	0	0	5	5	10
		%	0	7	26	30	37	100	0	0	0	50	50	100
	item 35	N	4	27	47	83	116	277	0	0	0	6	4	10
		%	1	10	17	30	42	100	0	0	0	60	40	100
	Total	N	42	242	413	650	592	1939	0	0	3	28	39	70
		%	15	87	149	235	214	700	0	0	4	40	56	100

Table 15 presents the students' and the teachers' actual and preferred responses to the scale 'Individualisation' referring students making decisions and being treated differently according to ability, interests and rate of working. This scale has also seven items; students' doing the same works as all the students in the class, in the same way and time (item 36), students' being allowed to work at their own pace in the class (item 37), the students' views on how class time is spent (item 38), students' being allowed to choose the activities and about how to work (item 39), teaching approaches allowing the students to proceed at their own pace (item 40), students' having opportunity to pursue their particular interest in the class (item 41) and the teacher's deciding on what the students will do in the class (item 42).

For item 36, while 64 % of the students think that they are often or almost always expected to do the same works as all the students in the class, in the same way and time, only 2 % of them say 'never'. When compared the students' views with the teachers', it is clearly seen that 40 % of the teachers, in other words, four out of ten teachers expect their students to do same works in the same way and in the same time. 71 % of the students prefer a classroom learning environment where the students are sometimes or seldom expected to do the same works in the classroom, in the same way and time. On the other hand, the teachers prefer 'often'. One possible reason may be that the teachers might seem to be more willingly on the students' working on the same works at same time and way.

Regarding item 37, while 133 out of 277 (41 %) students claim that they are almost never allowed at their own pace, 70 % of the teachers say 'sometimes'. The results of observation checklist, similar to the teachers' views, say that in five out of ten classrooms, there appears the teachers' allowing their students to work at their own pace by giving time to finish the activities. 75 % of the students would prefer a classroom learning environment where the teachers always allow them to work at their own pace.

As for item 38, it is seen that 37 % of the students claim that they have never have a say about how class time is spent; on the other hand, 2 % say that they often have a say about what should be done. The teachers (60 %) think that the students sometimes have a say. 80 % of the students and 60 % of the teachers are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the students can explain their views about the activities practised in the classroom.

Item 39, referring students' choosing their activities and decisions about how to work, illustrates that while 42 % of the students think that the teachers never allow them

to choose activities and how they will work, only 8 % say 'often'. On the other hand, eight teachers out of ten reveal that they sometimes give permission their students to choose their activities and works. 84 % of the students want their teachers to give them more chances to choose the activities and the works in the classroom, while 80 % of the teachers prefer the alternative 'sometimes'. It is clear that the teachers, to great extent, want to keep the students under control.

As for the item 40, it reveals that 43 % of the students think that the teaching approaches never allow them to proceed at their own pace; on the other hand, the teachers (40 %) claim that the teaching approaches they have used often allow the students to proceed at their own pace, however, 30 % say 'almost never' or 'seldom'. 76 % of the students and 70 % of the teachers would prefer that teaching approaches allow the students proceed at their own pace.

The results of the students' responses to the item 41 seem to differ. 47 % of the students think that they always have opportunity to pursue their particular interest in the classroom; on the other hand, 30 % say 'almost never' or 'seldom'. The teachers think that classroom learning environment provides the students to pursue their interests. 81 % of the students and all teachers emphasize that classroom learning environment should give the students opportunity to follow their particular interests.

Item 42 presents that the teachers and the students share the similar views concerning the teacher's deciding on what the students will do in the class. Since, 194 students out of 277 and eight teachers out of ten claim that the teachers always decide what the students will do in the classroom. On the contrary, the teachers' and the students' responses for the preferred classroom learning environment show that 65 % of the students want to decide about what they will do in the classroom where as, 60 % of the teachers are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the teachers decide what the students will do.

Table 15 Individualisation

			student						teacher					
			almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total	almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total
actual	item 36	N	6	33	62	107	69	277	2	3	1	4	0	10
		%	2	12	22	39	25	100	20	30	10	40	0	100
	item 37	N	113	80	65	19	0	277	0	2	5	3	0	10
		%	41	29	23	7	0	100	0	20	50	30	0	100
	item 38	N	102	86	83	6	0	277	0	2	4	4	0	10
		%	37	31	30	2	0	100	0	20	40	40	0	100
	item 39	N	116	88	52	21	0	277	0	2	6	2	0	10
		%	42	32	19	8	0	100	0	20	60	20	0	100
	item 40	N	120	78	60	19	0	277	1	2	3	4	0	10
		%	43	28	22	7	0	100	10	20	30	40	0	100
	item 41	N	38	44	65	74	56	277	0	0	1	5	4	10
		%	14	16	23	27	20	100	0	0	10	50	40	100
	item 42	N	10	32	41	108	86	277	0	0	2	8	0	10
		%	4	12	15	39	31	100	0	0	20	80	0	100
preferred	Total	N	505	441	428	354	211	1939	3	11	22	30	4	70
		%	182	159	155	128	76	700	4	16	31	43	6	100
	item 36	N	43	78	118	21	17	277	3	2	1	4	0	10
		%	16	28	43	8	6	100	30	20	10	40	0	100
	item 37	N	0	14	57	107	99	277	0	2	3	5	0	10
		%	0	5	21	39	36	100	0	20	30	50	0	100
	item 38	N	0	10	26	102	139	277	0	0	4	4	2	10
		%	0	4	9	37	50	100	0	0	40	40	20	100
	item 39	N	0	11	34	108	124	277	1	0	6	3	0	10
		%	0	4	12	39	45	100	10	0	60	30	0	100
	item 40	N	3	28	37	105	104	277	0	0	3	5	2	10
		%	1	10	13	38	38	100	0	0	30	50	20	100
	item 41	N	0	18	35	106	118	277	0	0	0	4	6	10
		%	0	6	13	38	43	100	0	0	0	40	60	100
	item 42	N	98	83	80	12	4	277	0	0	4	6	0	10
		%	35	30	29	4	1	100	0	0	40	60	0	100
	Total	N	144	242	387	561	605	1939	4	4	21	31	10	70
		%	52	87	140	203	218	700	6	6	30	44	14	100

Table 16 illustrates the students' actual and preferred views about the scale 'Equity' which refers to if students are treated equally by their teachers. The scale 'Equity' has also seven items; the teachers' giving equal attention to the students' questions (item 43), the teachers' helping to the students equally (item 44), the students' being treated in the same way by the teachers (item 45), the students' receiving equal encouragement from the teachers (item 46), the students' getting same opportunity to answer the questions (item 47), the students' receiving equal praise by the teachers (item 48) and the students' having the same amount of say in the classroom (item 49).

Item 43 explains that 70 % of the students think that the teachers always give as much attention to their questions as to other students' questions. Similarly, 90 % of the teachers claim that they give equal attention to their students' questions. Correspondingly, the results of the observation checklist show that in nine classes out of ten, there seems to be the teachers' equal interest to students' questions. Both students (83 %) and all the teachers are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the students' questions get same attention by the teachers.

Item 44 shows that a great number of the students (184) claim that they always get the same amount of the help from the teachers. Similarly, eight out of ten teachers think that they take the students' problems into the consideration equally. When asked the students' and the teachers' expectations, it is seen that 80 % of the students and all the teachers would prefer a classroom learning environment where the students' problems being evaluated equally by the teachers.

Concerning item 45, while 70 % of the students think that they are treated the same by their teachers in the classroom, only % 2 say 'never'. On the other hand, 90 % of the teachers think that they treat all the students in the classroom equally. Both the students (92 %) and the teachers (90 %) are in favour of the teachers' treating all students equally.

As for item 46, while 69 % of the students think that they always receive same encouragement from the teachers as other students do, % 29 choose the alternative 'sometimes'. On the other hand, while only one teacher says that s/he sometimes gives same encouragement to their students, nine teachers prefer 'always'. When looked at students' and the teachers' views concerning preferred classroom learning environment, it is obvious that the students and the teachers would prefer a classroom learning environment where the teachers encourage their students equally.

For item 47, the students (70 %) claim that they always get the same opportunity to answer the questions. Similarly, nine teachers claim that all the students get the same opportunity to answer the questions. When looked at students' and the teachers' views concerning preferred classroom learning environment, the results show that 94 % of the students and 90 % of the teachers would prefer a classroom learning environment where the students get the same opportunity to answer the questions.

Item 48 explains that there seems to be a similarity between the students' and the teachers' views concerning the students' receiving equal praise by the teachers. Namely, 70 % of the students and all the teachers think that the students' works receive as much praise as other students. On the other hand, the results of observation checklist reveal that while the teachers sometimes give equal praise to the students' works in six classes, they often praise in three classes. The students (98 %) and the teachers (90 %) are in favour of a classroom learning environment where the students receive equal praise.

Item 49, presents that 66 % of the students think that they always have the same amount of say in the classroom. Similarly, all the teachers claim that their students have a right to speak equally in the classroom. When asked the students' and the teachers' point of views concerning the preferred classroom learning environment, it is clearly seen that both of them think that the students should have the same amount of say in the classroom.

Table 16 Equity

			student						teacher					
			almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total	almost never	seldom	sometimes	often	almost always	Total
actual	item 43	N	6	32	45	101	93	277	0	0	1	2	7	10
		%	2	12	16	36	34	100	0	0	10	20	70	100
	item 44	N	6	34	53	99	85	277	0	0	2	2	6	10
		%	2	12	19	36	31	100	0	0	20	20	60	100
	item 45	N	6	32	45	105	89	277	0	0	1	4	5	10
		%	2	12	16	38	32	100	0	0	10	40	50	100
	item 46	N	6	34	47	104	86	277	0	0	1	1	8	10
		%	2	12	17	38	31	100	0	0	10	10	80	100
	item 47	N	6	32	47	104	88	277	0	0	1	2	7	10
		%	1	12	17	38	32	100	0	0	10	20	70	100
	item 48	N	6	33	45	102	91	277	0	0	0	1	9	10
		%	2	12	16	37	33	100	0	0	0	10	90	100
	item 49	N	6	34	52	98	87	277	0	0	0	1	9	10
		%	2	12	19	35	31	100	0	0	0	10	90	100
preferred	Total	N	42	231	334	713	619	1939	0	0	6	13	51	70
		%	15	83	121	257	223	700	0	0	9	19	73	100
	item 43	N	1	24	21	112	119	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	0	9	8	40	43	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
	item 44	N	2	20	33	105	117	277	0	0	0	2	8	10
		%	1	7	12	38	42	100	0	0	0	20	80	100
	item 45	N	0	3	18	87	169	277	0	0	1	2	7	10
		%	0	1	6	31	61	100	0	0	10	20	70	100
	item 46	N	0	12	17	98	150	277	0	0	1	1	8	10
		%	0	4	6	35	54	100	0	0	10	10	80	100
	item 47	N	0	6	8	90	173	277	0	0	1	1	8	10
		%	0	2	3	32	62	100	0	0	10	10	80	100
	item 48	N	0	2	2	87	186	277	0	0	1	1	8	10
		%	0	1	1	31	67	100	0	0	10	10	80	100
	item 49	N	0	6	1	90	180	277	0	0	2	1	7	10
		%	0	2	0	32	65	100	0	0	20	10	70	100
	Total	N	3	73	100	669	1094	1939	0	0	6	10	54	70
		%	1	26	36	242	395	700	0	0	9	14	77	100

4.3 Paired Sample t-test Results

The following section looks into total actual and preferred mean scores of the teachers and the students obtained from each scale of the questionnaire. First, paired samples t-test results are presented.

Table 17 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the teachers' actual and preferred mean scores. t value was found as 3.34 $p < .05$. This might imply that what the teachers consider as their preferred classroom learning environment does not match with the environment they work in. First reason may be that the students' level can not meet the teachers' expectations. Second one can be the students' negative attitudes to the teacher and class.

Table 17 Total Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Teachers

Form	X	sd	t
Preferred	188,80	8,91	3,34*
Actual	178,90	5,32	

n:10
df:9

* $p < .05$

In order to find out exactly where the difference lies, paired samples t-test has been implemented to all the scales. Table 18 displays the related results:

No significant difference was found for the scales 'equity', 'task orientation', 'student cohesiveness' and 'innovation' which might indicate that teachers are quite content with their working environment in terms of three scales at the time of the study. However, other three scales, namely, personalization, cooperation and individualization seem to pose some problems for teachers. 'Personalisation' scale, in particular, requires consideration on the part of both teachers and YADİM administration.

Table 18 Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Teachers

Scale	Form	X	sd	t
Personalisation	Actual	25,20	0,78	5,72*
	Preferred	29,00	1,88	
Innovation	Actual	23,10	2,55	0,27
	Preferred	23,25	2,89	
Student cohesiveness	Actual	19,90	3,21	0,85
	Preferred	21,10	2,28	
Task orientation	Actual	26,50	1,35	0,34
	Preferred	26,30	1,49	
Cooperation	Actual	28,60	2,59	3,50*
	Preferred	31,60	2,87	
Individualisation	Actual	23,10	2,47	2,42*
	Preferred	24,90	0,73	
Equity	Actual	32,50	3,34	0,38
	Preferred	32,80	4,15	

n:10

* p<.05

df:9

As table 19 below shows, there is a statistically significant difference between the students' actual and preferred scores. t value was found as 41,69 p<.05. This result indicates students' dissatisfaction with actual classroom learning environment at YADIM. The remarkable difference between the mean scores also supports this discontent.

Table 19 Total Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Students

Form	df	X	sd	t
Preferred		165,41	6,76	41,69*
Actual		141,73	10,03	

n: 277

* p<.05

df: 276

In order to find out where this difference stems from paired samples t-test has been applied to the scales one by one. The results gathered are given below.

As seen in table 20, of the seven scales, only the scale 'personalisation' does not reveal statistically significant difference. t value for this scale was found as 1,30 p>.05. Contrary to teachers' actual and preferred mean scores, students seem to be discontent with what is going on in their classroom since the difference between their actual and preferred scores is significantly high.

Table 20 Actual and Preferred Mean Scores of Students

Scale	Form	X	sd	t
Personalisation	Actual	25,91	2,48	1,30
	Preferred	26,16	2,29	
Innovation	Actual	19,74	2,55	41,34*
	Preferred	29,74	3,00	
Student cohesiveness	Actual	19,11	2,79	35,23*
	Preferred	27,24	7,77	
Task orientation	Actual	17,44	2,36	18,74*
	Preferred	23,44	2,36	
Cooperation	Actual	14,04	2,53	51,72*
	Preferred	26,44	2,92	
Individualisation	Actual	18,56	2,66	31,76*
	Preferred	25,48	2,44	
Equity	Actual	26,90	7,34	9,30*
	Preferred	31,02	2,01	

n: 277

* p<.05

df: 276

4.4 Independent sample t-test results

In the following section, the actual and preferred mean scores of the students and the teachers are compared. First, the actual scores are presented.

Table 21 presents a significant difference between the beliefs of the teachers and students related to what is actually happening in the classroom. The difference between the mean scores highlights this discrepancy (178, 90 – 141, 73) and also t value was found as 20, 79 p<.05.

This difference might be because the students are not well-aware of the kinds of the activities being implemented in the classroom. The following table shows the exact place of the difference.

Table 21 Total Actual Mean Scores of Students and Teachers

Type	N	X	sd	t
Student	277	141,73	10,03	20,79*
Teacher	10	178,90	5,32	

df: 285

* p<.05

Table 22 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference on the scale 'student cohesiveness'. Since, t value was found for this scale as 0, 86 p>.05. The other scales indicate statistically significant differences.

One reason for these differences might be that the teachers are not open enough in introducing the activities to the students during the application, or that they fail in implementing them in the classroom.

Table 22 Actual Mean Scores of Teachers and Students

Scale	Type	N	X	Sd	t
Personalisation	Student	277	25,91	2,48	2,45*
	Teacher	10	25,20	0,78	
Innovation	Student	277	19,74	2,55	4,07*
	Teacher	10	23,10	2,55	
Student cohesiveness	Student	277	19,11	2,79	0,86
	Teacher	10	19,90	3,21	
Task orientation	Student	277	17,44	2,36	12,00*
	Teacher	10	26,50	1,35	
Cooperation	Student	277	14,04	2,53	17,84*
	Teacher	10	28,60	2,59	
Individualisation	Student	277	18,56	2,66	5,29*
	Teacher	10	23,10	2,47	
Equity	Student	277	26,90	7,34	4,88*
	Teacher	10	32,50	3,34	

df: 285

* $p < .05$

Table 23 presents that there is a significant difference between the students' and the teachers' views concerning preferred classroom learning environment since t value was found as 6, 20 $p < .05$.

Table 23 Total Preferred Mean Scores of Teachers and Students

Type	N	X	sd	t
Student	277	173,86	6,22	6,20
Teacher	10	193,00	9,68	

df: 285

* $p < .05$

Table 24 illustrates that all the scales, except for the scale 'equity', incorporate significant differences. T value for scale 'equity' was found as 1, 34 $p > .05$. The high mean scores of the students show the great expectations of the students. Most probably, the students are not aware of the difficulties the teachers sometimes encounter during the application of some in-class activities.

Table 24 Preferred Mean Scores of Students and Teachers

Scale	Type	N	X	sd	t
Personalisation	Student	277	26,16	2,29	3,86*
	Teacher	10	29,00	1,88	
Innovation	Student	277	23,60	2,56	4,50*
	Teacher	10	27,30	2,11	
Student cohesiveness	Student	277	17,59	1,88	5,73*
	Teacher	10	21,10	2,28	
Task orientation	Student	277	23,55	1,99	4,31*
	Teacher	10	26,30	1,49	
Cooperation	Student	277	26,44	2,92	5,48*
	Teacher	10	31,60	2,87	
Individualisation	Student	277	25,48	2,44	2,10*
	Teacher	10	24,90	0,73	
Equity	Student	277	31,02	2,01	1,34
	Teacher	10	32,80	4,15	

df: 285

* p<.05

4.5 ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) Results

In the following section, the actual mean scores of the students, the teachers and observation checklist are compared via ANOVA. First, frequencies and percentages concerning the students', the teachers' and observation checklist actual means are presented.

Table 25 shows that the mean values of the students, teachers' and the observation checklist indicate a difference for the teachers and the observer (54, 62; 70, 20; and 66, 10). This difference between the teachers and the observer is not so high. This shows that the teachers and the observer, to great extent, see the actual classroom learning environment more favorably than do the students.

Table 25 Actual Mean Scores of Students, Teachers and Observation Checklist

	N	X	sd
Student	277	54,62	4,79
Teacher	10	70,20	2,15
Observation checklist	10	66,10	9,39
Total	297	55,53	6,00

The findings presented in Table 26 show that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups: $F= 71.53$ (2,294), $p<.05$. The main reason for these

results might be that as professionals, the teachers and the observer were well-aware of what was going on in the classroom while the students either were unaware of the facts or preferred ignoring the facts.

Table 26 ANOVA Scores of Students, Teachers and Observation Checklist

	SS	df	MS	F	Significant difference
Between Groups	3496,42	2	1748,21	71,53*	student<teacher student<observation checklist
Within Groups	7185,45	294	24,44		

SS: Sum of squares

*p<.05

MS: Mean square

In Chapter 4, the results obtained from the questionnaire (CUCEI) and observation checklist were presented and discussed. First of all, the frequencies and percentages concerning students' and teachers' perceptions of actual and preferred classroom learning environment were presented. Next step was to detect any differences between students' and teachers' perception of actual and preferred classroom learning environment and investigate where the differences lie by making use of independent and paired samples t-test values. The last stage was to compare the results obtained from the questionnaire and observation checklist via ANOVA.

The following chapter will deal with the conclusions and implications of the study.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter of the study presents the conclusions and implications obtained by results of the questionnaires and observations conducted in this study.

5.1 Conclusions and Implications

The purpose of this study was to find out differences, if there is any, between teachers' and students' perception of their actual and preferred classroom learning environment at YADIM (Centre for Foreign Languages) at Çukurova University. Thus, the study aimed to find answers to the following questions:

1. Are there any differences between students' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment?
2. Are there any differences between teachers' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment?
3. Are there any differences between teachers' and students' perceptions of their preferred and actual classroom learning environment?

The participants of this study were 277 students, 158 male and 119 female and ten teachers, eight female and two male. In order to collect appropriate data, a questionnaire (CUC EI) and an observation checklist were used as data collection tools.

The questionnaire and the observation checklist show that there is a statistically significant difference between the students' actual and preferred classroom learning environment. When examined the scales, except for the scale 'personalisation', other scales have significant differences. The results reveal that the students are not content with teaching techniques and relationship with each other. Furthermore, they claim that they are not treated equally by their teachers and not allowed to make decisions.

The results also show that there is a statistically significant difference between the teachers' actual and preferred classroom learning environment. But, when a comparison was made between the teachers and the students, the teachers still perceive their classroom favourably since, of the seven scales, only three had statistically significant differences; 'personalisation', 'cooperation' and 'individualisation'.

The results obtained from the data collection tools show that both the students and the teachers prefer a more positive environment. However, teachers tended to perceive their classes more favourably on several of the scales than did their students. When scores of the students' and the teachers' actual and preferred classroom learning environment are compared, it is clear that the teachers' responses incorporate significant differences for three scales such as 'personalisation', 'cooperation' and 'individualisation' whereas the students' ones show differences for six scales except for the scale 'personalisation'. The previous research carried out by Fisher and Fraser (1983) reached similar findings and explained that teachers usually perceive the classroom learning environment in favourable terms than do their students because teachers are unwilling to make changes they feel as irrelevant to academic goals they are trying to accomplish.

Findings of the study make it clear that though teachers' actual and preferred scores were more positive than their students. However, actual classroom learning environment results fell short of the preferred ones for not only students but also teachers. This replicates prior research by Fraser (1986) in which he found that the teachers and the students were not content of current classroom learning environment and in favour of changing it.

Another point is that there is a statistically significant difference between the results of students', teachers' actual classroom learning environment and the observation checklist. Nevertheless, this difference is not so high between the teachers and the observer. The main reason can be the observer and the teachers were well-aware of what was going on in the classroom while the students either were unaware of the facts or preferred ignoring the facts.

5.2 Implications for ELT

This study presents the instrument, CUCEI, as an important contribution to measuring the classroom learning environment perceptions of the students and the teachers. The study preferred using the 49-item version of the College and Universities Classroom environment Inventory (CUCEI) for use in learning about the classroom learning environment at higher level. The teachers can make use of the CUCEI because it is a valuable source of information, especially for comparisons between their own and their students' perceptions. Besides, the study also explained that the teacher could gain an insight to the perceptions of their colleagues and use the information to aid teaching and learning in their classrooms. The instrument is also sensitive to the teaching approaches the teachers have used in their classroom. The studies have demonstrated that the students' and the teachers' perceptions of their own classroom learning environments are reliable indicators that can be used for improving teaching and learning (Fraser, 1986, 1991, 1994, 1998). The existence of the preferred form of the instrument also provides another help for the teacher in improving classroom and teaching. Consequently, this study provides valuable insights into the study of learning environments in the following aspects:

First, previous classroom learning environment studies have shown the importance of student and teacher perceptions as a key point of achievement, behaviour and attitudes. This study also makes a contribution to the learning environment research in that it investigated not only the students' but also English language teachers' perception of classroom learning environment simultaneously.

Second, previous research has shown that the teachers' perceptions of classroom learning environments are mostly different from their students' perceptions (Fraser, 1994). This study replicated the previous studies in that both students and the teachers have different point of views of their classroom learning environment.

Third, in the past, the research used only one instrument as a measurement tool. Nowadays, there has been a move to using multiple instruments to collect data. In line with this move, to support the data collected from the questionnaire and to enhance reliability of the study, observation technique was also used.

Fourth one is that although there have been many research on classroom learning environment at the primary and secondary level, little work had been done at the higher

education level. The study contributes not only to fill this gap but also provides the basis for further classroom learning environment research at the higher level.

5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Though this study was successful in showing the perceptual differences between students' and teachers' actual and preferred classroom learning environments, it was limited in following ways:

First, the number of the teachers who participated in this study was small limiting the applicability of their views to the general teacher population.

Another limitation of this study may be the instrumentation. In order to achieve the aim of our study, a questionnaire (CUCET) and an observation checklist was preferred. Nevertheless, a multiple qualitative procedure including interviews, diary keeping and tape recording could have been useful to broaden the perspective of the study.

First suggestion for further research would be to investigate whether the students achieve better, cognitively and affectively, when there is a better match between their actual and preferred classroom learning environment.

Second one would be to find out ways of improving a classroom learning environment that can meet the teachers' and the students' expectations.

REFERENCES

- Aldridge, J.M., Fraser, B.J. (2000). *A cross cultural study of classroom learning environments in Australia and Taiwan*. Learning Environments Research, 3,101-134.
- Brophy, J.,& Putnam, J.G. (1979). *Classroom management*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dart,B., Burnett,P., Lewis,G., Campbell,J., Smith,D., McCrindle,A. (1999). Classroom learning environments and students' approaches to learning. *Kluwer Academic Publisher*, 2, 137-156.
- Dorman,J.P.(2000). Associations between classroom environment and academic efficacy. *Kluwer Academic Publishers*,4,243-257.
- Dorman, J.P., Fraser, B.J. & McRobbie, C.J. (1997). Relationship between schoollevel and classroom-level environments in secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35, 74–91.
- Ekmekçi, F.Ö. (1997). *Research manual for social sciences*. (Vol:1). Istanbul: Sürat English Language Teaching.
- Ellett, C.D., Loup, K.S. & Chauvin, S.W. (1989). *System for Teaching and Learning Assessment and Review (STAR): Annotated guide to teaching and learning*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University.

- Evans, J., Ellett, C., Culross, R., & Loup, K. (1994). *Development of a student perceptions instrument to assess contributions of the learning environment to the enhancement of student learning in higher education setting*. Perth: Curtin University of Technology.
- Ferguson, P.D., Fraser, B.J. (1996). *The role of school size and gender in students' perceptions of science during the transition from elementary to high school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, D.L., Fraser, B.J. (1983). A comparison of actual and preferred classroom environment as perceived science teachers and students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 20, 55-61.
- Frankel, J. R., & Wallen, N.E. (1993). *Introduction to research*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Fraser, B.J. (1986). Classroom environment. In B.Dart, P. Burnett, G. Bolton -Lewis, J. Campbell, D. Smith & A. McCrindle (Eds.), *Classroom learning environments and students' Approaches to learning*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. 4, 243–257.
- Fraser, B.J. (1991). *Two Decades of Classroom Environment Research*. In Chenicheri Sid. Nair and Darrell L. Fisher (Eds.), *A learning environment study of tertiary classrooms*. (p.3). National Key Centre for School Science and Mathematics: Curtin University of Technology.
- Fraser, B.J. (1993). *Incorporating classroom and school environment ideas into teacher education programs*. In T.A. Simpson (Ed.), *Teacher educators' annual handbook* (pp.135–152). Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology.
- Fraser, B.J. (1994). *Classroom and School Climate*. In Chenicheri Sid. Nair and Darrell L. Fisher (Eds.), *A learning environment study of tertiary classrooms*. (p.1). National Key Centre for School Science and Mathematics: Curtin University of Technology.

- Fraser, B.J. (1998). *Science learning environments: Assessment, effects and determinants*. In Chenicheri Sid. Nair and Darrell L. Fisher (Eds.), *A learning environment study of tertiary classrooms*. (p.5). National Key Centre for School Science and Mathematics: Curtin University of Technology.
- Fraser, B.J. (2001). *Learning environment research: yesterday, today, tomorrow*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 9, 95-134.
- Fraser, B.J., Walberg, H.J. (1981). *Psychosocial learning environment in science classrooms. A review of research*. Studies in Science Education, 8, 67-92.
- Fraser, B.J., Fisher, D.L. (1986). Using short forms of classroom climate instruments to assess and improve classroom psychosocial environment. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 23, 387-413.
- Fraser, B.J., Treagust, D.F., Williamson, J.C., & Tobin, K.G. (1987). *Validation and application of the College & University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI)*. In Chenicheri Sid. Nair and Darrell L. Fisher (Eds.), *A learning environment study of tertiary classrooms*. (p.1). National Key Centre for School Science and Mathematics: Curtin University of Technology.
- Fraser, B.J., Tobin, K. (1991). *Combining qualitative and quantitative methods in classroom environment research*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Gaies, S.J. (1980). *Focus on the language classroom: an introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Getzels, J.W., & Thelen, H.A. (1960). *The classroom as a unique social system*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hatch, E., Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Los Angeles: Newbury House Publishers.

- Huang, T.-C.I., Fraser, B.J. & Aldridge, J.M. (1998). *Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches in studying classroom climate in Taiwan and Australia*. San Diego: CA.
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: Mc Graw.
- Language Classroom Observation Form.(n.d.). Retrieved December 2,2005,from <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/pedagog/evaluation/evaluate.html>
- Marjoribanks, K. (1991). *Families, schools, and students' educational outcomes*. In B.J. Fraser & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments: evaluation, antecedents and consequences* (pp. 75–91). London: Pergamon.
- Midgley, C., Eccles, J.S. & Feldlaufer, H. (1991). *Classroom environment and the transition to junior high school*. In B.J. Fraser & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments: evaluation, antecedents and consequences* (pp. 113–139). London: Pergamon.
- Moos, R.H. (1991). *Connections between school, work, and family settings*. In B.J. Fraser & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments: evaluation, antecedents and consequences* (pp. 29–53). London: Pergamon.
- Moos,R.H., Walberg,H.J. (1979) Investigation of tertiary classroom learning environment in Singapore. Retrieved May15,2005, from www.aare.au/01pap/myi01168.htm.
- Murray, H.A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pace,C.R. (1963) Classroom environment research: Progress and possibility. Retrieved April 13,2005, from <http://education.curtin.edu.au/ier/qjer/qjer18/dorman.html>.
- Pickett, L.H., Fraser, B.J. (2002). The role of learning environment, achievement, and student and teacher attitudes in a science mentoring program for beginning elementary school teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 27-45.

- Rosenshine, B. (1970). Evaluation of classroom instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 40, 279-300.
- Savage, T. V. (1999). *Teaching self-control through management and discipline*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stern, G.G. (1970). *People in context. Measuring person-environment congruence in education and industry*. New York: Willey.
- Stern, G.G., Stein, M.I. & Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Methods in personality assessment*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Stewart, S. C. & Evans, W. H. (1997). *Setting the stage for success: Assessing the instructional environment*. Preventing School Failure, 41(2), 53-56.
- Telli, S., Rakici, N., Cakiroğlu, J. (1999) Learning environment and students' attitudes towards Biology. Retrieved May 21, 2005, from www.aare.au/02pap/myi01179.htm.
- Tobin, K., Kahle, J.B. & Fraser, B.J. (Eds.). (1990). *Windows into science classes: problems associated with higher-level cognitive learning*. London: Falmer Press.
- Walberg, H.J. (1981). *A psychological theory of educational productivity*. In F. Farley & N.J. Gordon (Eds.), *Psychology and education: the state of the union* (pp. 81–108). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Walker, H. M. (1991). *Coping with noncompliance in the classroom: A positive approach for teachers*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Walker, H. M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

- Walker,S.(2004). Learning environment research: A review of literature. Retrieved October 14, 2005, from <http://library.curtin.edu.au/theses/>
- Weinstein, C. S. (1992). Designing the instructional environment: Focus on seating. Retrieved October 17,2005, from <http://www.teachervision.fen.com/classroom-management/decorative-arts/6506.html>
- Zandviliet, D., Fraser, B.J. (1999). *A model of educational productivity for high school internet classrooms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX 1**Actual (Student) Version****Directions**

This questionnaire contains statements about practices which would take place in the class. You will be asked how often each practice takes place. There are no right and wrong answer. Your opinion is what is wanted. Think about how well each statement describes what this class is like for you.

Please write;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

Be sure to give an answer for all the questions. If you change your mind about an answer just cross it out and circle another. Some statements in this questionnaire are fairly similar to other statements. Do not worry about this. Simply give your opinion about all statements.

All opinions and information supplied will be treated in strict confidence. No particulars will be released for any reason. All information is to be used for research only.

Student's sex : Male (1).....

Female (2).....

Age :

Class :

Please write ;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

	Remember that you are describing your actual classroom	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	The teacher considers my feelings	1	2	3	4	5
2	The teacher is friendly and talks to me	1	2	3	4	5
3	The teacher goes out of his/her way to help me	1	2	3	4	5
4	The teacher helps me when I am having trouble with my work	1	2	3	4	5
5	The teacher moves around the classroom to talk with me	1	2	3	4	5
6	The teacher is interested in my problems	1	2	3	4	5
7	The teacher is unfriendly and inconsiderate towards me	1	2	3	4	5
8	New ideas are tried out in this class	1	2	3	4	5
9	The teacher uses new and different ways of teaching in this class	1	2	3	4	5
10	The teacher thinks up innovative activities for me to do	1	2	3	4	5
11	The teaching approaches used in this class are characterized by innovation and variety	1	2	3	4	5
12	Seating in this class is arranged in the same way each week	1	2	3	4	5
13	The teacher often thinks of unusual activities	1	2	3	4	5
14	I seem to do the same type of activities in every class	1	2	3	4	5
15	My class is made up of individuals who do not know each other well	1	2	3	4	5
16	I know most students in this class by their first name	1	2	3	4	5
17	I make friends easily in this class	1	2	3	4	5

18	I do not get much of a chance to know my classmate	1	2	3	4	5
19	It takes me a long time to get to know everybody by his/her first name in the class	1	2	3	4	5
20	I have the chance to know my classmates well	1	2	3	4	5
21	I am not very interested in getting to know other students in this class	1	2	3	4	5
22	I know exactly what has to be done in this class	1	2	3	4	5
23	I find getting a certain amount of work done is important in this class	1	2	3	4	5
24	I often get sidetracked in this class instead of sticking to the point	1	2	3	4	5
25	This class is always disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
26	Class assignments are clear and I know what to do	1	2	3	4	5
27	This class starts on time	1	2	3	4	5
28	Activities in this class are clearly & carefully planned	1	2	3	4	5
29	I cooperate with other students when doing assignment work	1	2	3	4	5
30	I share my books and resources with other students when doing assignments	1	2	3	4	5
31	I work with other students on projects in this class	1	2	3	4	5
32	I learn from other students in this class	1	2	3	4	5
33	I work with other students in this class	1	2	3	4	5
34	I cooperate with other students on class activities	1	2	3	4	5
35	Students work with me to achieve class goals	1	2	3	4	5
36	I am expected to do the same work as all the students in the class, in the same way and time	1	2	3	4	5
37	I am generally allowed to work at my own pace in this class	1	2	3	4	5
38	I have a say in how class time is spent	1	2	3	4	5
39	I am allowed to choose activities and how I will work	1	2	3	4	5

40	Teaching approaches in this class allow me to proceed at my own pace	1	2	3	4	5
41	I have opportunity to pursue my particular interests in this class	1	2	3	4	5
42	The teacher decides what I will do in this class	1	2	3	4	5
43	The teacher gives as much attention to my questions as to other students' questions	1	2	3	4	5
44	I get the same amount of help from the teacher as do other students	1	2	3	4	5
45	I am treated the same as other students in this class	1	2	3	4	5
46	I receive the same encouragement from the teacher as other students do	1	2	3	4	5
47	I get the same opportunity to answer questions as other students	1	2	3	4	5
48	My work receives as much praise as other students do	1	2	3	4	5
49	I have the same amount of say in this class as other students	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 2

Preferred (Student) Version

Directions

This questionnaire contains statements about practices which would take place in the class. You will be asked how well each statement describes what you would **like** or **prefer** your class like to be. There is no right and wrong answer. Your opinion is what is wanted. Think about how well each statement describes what you would prefer this class to be like.

Please write;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

Be sure to give an answer for all the questions. If you change your mind about an answer just cross it out and circle another. Some statements in this questionnaire are fairly similar to other statements. Do not worry about this. Simply give your opinion about all statements.

All opinions and information supplied will be treated in strict confidence. No particulars will be released for any reason. All information is to be used for research only.

Student's sex : Male (1).....

Female (2).....

Age :

Class :

Please write ;

- 1 if the practice takes place **almost never**
 2 if the practice takes place **seldom**
 3 if the practice takes place **sometimes**
 4 if the practice takes place **often**
 5 if the practice takes place **almost always**

	Remember that you are describing your ideal classroom	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	The teacher would consider my feelings	1	2	3	4	5
2	The teacher would be friendly and would talk to me	1	2	3	4	5
3	The teacher would go out of his/her way to help me	1	2	3	4	5
4	The teacher would help me when I am having trouble with my work	1	2	3	4	5
5	The teacher would move around the classroom to talk with me	1	2	3	4	5
6	The teacher would be interested in my problems	1	2	3	4	5
7	The teacher would be unfriendly and inconsiderate towards me	1	2	3	4	5
8	New ideas would be tried out in the class	1	2	3	4	5
9	The teacher would use new and different ways of teaching in this class	1	2	3	4	5
10	The teacher would think up innovative activities for me to do	1	2	3	4	5
11	The teaching approaches used in this class would be characterized by innovation and variety	1	2	3	4	5
12	Seating in the class would be arranged in the same way each week	1	2	3	4	5
13	The teacher would often think of unusual activities	1	2	3	4	5
14	I would do the same type of activities in every class	1	2	3	4	5
15	My class would be made up of individuals who do not know each other well	1	2	3	4	5

16	I would know most students in the class by their first name	1	2	3	4	5
17	I would make friends easily in the class	1	2	3	4	5
18	I would not get much of a chance to know my classmate	1	2	3	4	5
19	It would take me a long time to get to know everybody by his/her first name in the class	1	2	3	4	5
20	I would have the chance to know my classmates well	1	2	3	4	5
21	I would not be very interested in getting to know other students in the class	1	2	3	4	5
22	I would know exactly what had to be done in the class	1	2	3	4	5
23	Getting a certain amount of work done would be important in the class	1	2	3	4	5
24	I would often get sidetracked in the class instead of sticking to the point	1	2	3	4	5
25	The class would be always disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
26	Class assignments would be clear and I would know what to do	1	2	3	4	5
27	The class would start on time	1	2	3	4	5
28	Activities in the class would be clearly & carefully planned	1	2	3	4	5
29	I would cooperate with other students in my class when doing assignment work	1	2	3	4	5
30	I would share my books and resources with other students when doing assignments	1	2	3	4	5
31	I would work with other students on projects in the class	1	2	3	4	5
32	I would learn from other students in the class	1	2	3	4	5
33	I would work with other students in the class	1	2	3	4	5
34	I would cooperate with other students in my class on class activities	1	2	3	4	5
35	Students would work with me to achieve class goals	1	2	3	4	5
36	I would be expected to do the same work as all the students in the class, in the same way and in the same time	1	2	3	4	5

37	I would be generally allowed to work at my own pace in this class	1	2	3	4	5
38	I would have a say in how class time is spent	1	2	3	4	5
39	I would be allowed to choose activities and how I would work	1	2	3	4	5
40	Teaching approaches in this class would allow me to proceed at my own pace	1	2	3	4	5
41	I would have opportunity to pursue my particular interests in the class	1	2	3	4	5
42	The teacher would decide what I will do in this class	1	2	3	4	5
43	The teacher would give as much attention to my questions as to other students' questions	1	2	3	4	5
44	I would get the same amount of help from the teacher as do other students	1	2	3	4	5
45	I would be treated the same as other students in the class	1	2	3	4	5
46	I would receive the same encouragement from the teacher as other students do	1	2	3	4	5
47	I would get the same opportunity to answer questions as other students do	1	2	3	4	5
48	My work would receive as much praise as other students do	1	2	3	4	5
49	I would have the same amount of say in the class as other students	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 3

Actual (Teacher) Version

Directions

This questionnaire contains statements about practices which would take place in the class. You will be asked how often each practice takes place. There is no right and wrong answer. Your opinion is what is wanted. Think about how well each statement describes what this class is like for you.

Please write;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

Be sure to give an answer for all the questions. If you change your mind about an answer just cross it out and circle another. Some statements in this questionnaire are fairly similar to other statements. Do not worry about this. Simply give your opinion about all statements.

All opinions and information supplied will be treated in strict confidence. No particulars will be released for any reason. All information is to be used for research only.

Teacher's name:

Teacher's sex: Male (1).....

Female (2).....

Age :

Class :

No. Of years teaching:

Please write ;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

	Remember that you are describing your actual classroom	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	I consider my students' feelings	1	2	3	4	5
2	I am friendly towards my students and talk to them	1	2	3	4	5
3	I go out of my way to help my students	1	2	3	4	5
4	I help my students when they have trouble with their work	1	2	3	4	5
5	I move around the classroom to talk with my students	1	2	3	4	5
6	I am interested in my students' problems	1	2	3	4	5
7	I am unfriendly and inconsiderate towards my students	1	2	3	4	5
8	I try out new ideas in this class	1	2	3	4	5
9	I use new and different ways of teaching in this class	1	2	3	4	5
10	I think up innovative activities for my students to do	1	2	3	4	5
11	The teaching approaches I have used in this class are characterized by innovation and variety	1	2	3	4	5
12	Seating in this class is arranged in the same way each week	1	2	3	4	5
13	I often think of unusual activities in this class	1	2	3	4	5
14	I seem to do the same type of activities in every class	1	2	3	4	5
15	My class is made up of individuals who do not know each other well	1	2	3	4	5

16	Students in my class know one another by their first names	1	2	3	4	5
17	Students make friends easily in my class	1	2	3	4	5
18	Students in my class do not get much of a chance to know their classmates	1	2	3	4	5
19	Students in my class take a long time to get to know everybody by his/her first name in this class	1	2	3	4	5
20	Students in my class have the chance to know their classmates well	1	2	3	4	5
21	Students in my class are not very interested in getting to know all their classmates	1	2	3	4	5
22	Students in my class know exactly what has to be done in this class	1	2	3	4	5
23	Students find getting a certain amount of work done is important in this class	1	2	3	4	5
24	Students often get sidetracked in this class instead of sticking to the point	1	2	3	4	5
25	My class is always disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
26	My class assignments are clear and my students know what to do	1	2	3	4	5
27	My class starts on time	1	2	3	4	5
28	I plan the activities in this class, clearly and carefully	1	2	3	4	5
29	Students in my class cooperate with other students when doing assignment work	1	2	3	4	5
30	Students in my class share their books and resources with other students when doing assignments	1	2	3	4	5
31	Students work with other students on projects in this class	1	2	3	4	5
32	Students in my class learn from each other in this class	1	2	3	4	5
33	Each student works with other students in this class	1	2	3	4	5
34	Students in my class cooperate on class activities	1	2	3	4	5
35	Students work with each other to achieve class goals	1	2	3	4	5
36	I expect all my students in my class to do the same work, in the same way and in the same time	1	2	3	4	5

37	I generally allow my students to work at their own pace in this class	1	2	3	4	5
38	Students in this class have a say in how class time is spent	1	2	3	4	5
39	I allow my students to choose activities and how they will work	1	2	3	4	5
40	Teaching approaches I have used in this class allow my students to proceed at their own pace	1	2	3	4	5
41	Students have opportunity to pursue their particular interests in this class	1	2	3	4	5
42	I decide what will be done in this class	1	2	3	4	5
43	I give equal attention to all the students' questions	1	2	3	4	5
44	I give the same amount of help to all my students	1	2	3	4	5
45	I treat all students in this class the same	1	2	3	4	5
46	I give the same encouragement to all my students	1	2	3	4	5
47	All my students get the same opportunity to answer questions	1	2	3	4	5
48	I give equal praise to all my students when required	1	2	3	4	5
49	All my students have the same amount of say in this class	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 4

Preferred (Teacher) Version

Directions

This questionnaire contains statements about practices which would take place in the class. You will be asked how well each statement describes what you would like or prefer your class like to be. There is no right and wrong answer. Your opinion is what is wanted. Think about how well each statement describes what you would prefer this class to be like.

Please write;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

Be sure to give an answer for all the questions. If you change your mind about an answer just cross it out and circle another. Some statements in this questionnaire are fairly similar to other statements. Do not worry about this. Simply give your opinion about all statements.

All opinions and information supplied will be treated in strict confidence. No particulars will be released for any reason. All information is to be used for research only.

Teacher's name:

Teacher's sex: Male (1).....

Female (2).....

Age :

Class :

No. Of years teaching:

Please write ;

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | if the practice takes place | almost never |
| 2 | if the practice takes place | seldom |
| 3 | if the practice takes place | sometimes |
| 4 | if the practice takes place | often |
| 5 | if the practice takes place | almost always |

	Remember that you are describing your preferred classroom	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	I would consider my students' feelings	1	2	3	4	5
2	I would be friendly towards my students and talk to them	1	2	3	4	5
3	I would go out of my way to help my students	1	2	3	4	5
4	I would help my students when they have trouble with their work	1	2	3	4	5
5	I would move around the classroom to talk with my students	1	2	3	4	5
6	I would be interested in my students' problems	1	2	3	4	5
7	I would be unfriendly and inconsiderate towards my students	1	2	3	4	5
8	I would try out new ideas in this class	1	2	3	4	5
9	I would use new and different ways of teaching in this class	1	2	3	4	5
10	I would think up innovative activities for my students to do	1	2	3	4	5
11	The teaching approaches I have used in this class would be characterized by innovation and variety	1	2	3	4	5
12	Seating in this class would be arranged in the same way each week	1	2	3	4	5
13	I would often think of unusual activities in this class	1	2	3	4	5
14	I would seem to do the same type of activities in every class	1	2	3	4	5
15	My class is made up of individuals who would not know each other well	1	2	3	4	5

16	Students in my class would know one another by their first names	1	2	3	4	5
17	Students would make friends easily in my class	1	2	3	4	5
18	Students in my class would not get much of a chance to know their classmates	1	2	3	4	5
19	Students in my class would take a long time to get to know everybody by his/her first name in this class	1	2	3	4	5
20	Students in my class would have the chance to know their classmates well	1	2	3	4	5
21	Students in my class would not be very interested in getting to know all their classmates	1	2	3	4	5
22	Students in my class would know exactly what has to be done in this class	1	2	3	4	5
23	Students would find getting a certain amount of work done is important in this class	1	2	3	4	5
24	Students would often get sidetracked in this class instead of sticking to the point	1	2	3	4	5
25	My class would always be disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
26	My class assignments would be clear and my students would know what to do	1	2	3	4	5
27	My class would start on time	1	2	3	4	5
28	I would plan the activities in this class, clearly and carefully	1	2	3	4	5
29	Students in my class cooperate with other students when doing assignment work	1	2	3	4	5
30	Students in my class would share their books and resources with other students when doing assignments	1	2	3	4	5
31	Students would work with other students on projects in this class	1	2	3	4	5
32	Students in my class would learn from each other in this class	1	2	3	4	5
33	Each student would work with other students in this class	1	2	3	4	5
34	Students in my class would cooperate on class activities	1	2	3	4	5
35	Students would work with each other to achieve class goals	1	2	3	4	5

36	I would expect all my students in my class to do the same work, in the same way and in the same time	1	2	3	4	5
37	I would generally allow my students to work at their own pace in this class	1	2	3	4	5
38	Students in this class would have a say in how class time is spent	1	2	3	4	5
39	I would allow my students to choose activities and how they will work	1	2	3	4	5
40	Teaching approaches I have used in this class would allow my students to proceed at their own pace	1	2	3	4	5
41	Students in my class would have opportunity to pursue their particular interests in this class	1	2	3	4	5
42	I would decide what will be done in this class	1	2	3	4	5
43	I would give equal attention to all the students' questions	1	2	3	4	5
44	I would give the same amount of help to all my students	1	2	3	4	5
45	I would treat all students in this class the same	1	2	3	4	5
46	I would give the same encouragement to all my students	1	2	3	4	5
47	All my students would get the same opportunity to answer questions	1	2	3	4	5
48	I would give equal praise to all my students when required	1	2	3	4	5
49	All my students would have the same amount of say in this class	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 5

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

NAME:
OBSERVER:

COURSE:
SEMESTER:

DATE:

	Items	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	The teacher considers the students' feelings	1	2	3	4	5
2	The teacher is friendly and talks to the students	1	2	3	4	5
3	The teacher helps the students when they are having trouble with their works	1	2	3	4	5
4	The teacher moves around the classroom to talk with the students	1	2	3	4	5
5	The teacher uses new and different ways of teaching in the class	1	2	3	4	5
6	The teaching approaches used in this class are characterized by innovation and variety	1	2	3	4	5
7	The teacher thinks up innovative activities for the students to do	1	2	3	4	5
8	Class assignments were clear	1	2	3	4	5
9	Class started on time	1	2	3	4	5
10	Activities were clearly and carefully planned	1	2	3	4	5
11	The students cooperate with each others	1	2	3	4	5
12	The seating arrangement facilitated learning	1	2	3	4	5
13	The students were allowed to work at their own pace	1	2	3	4	5
14	The teacher gave equal attention to the students' questions	1	2	3	4	5
15	Class atmosphere was warm, open and accepting	1	2	3	4	5
16	The teacher praised the students' works	1	2	3	4	5
17	Students in this class know one another by their first names	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 6

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST RESULTS

item	F / %	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Total
1	N	0	4	2	2	2	10
	%	0	40	20	20	20	100
2	N	0	0	4	3	3	10
	%	0	0	40	30	30	100
3	N	0	0	1	5	4	10
	%	0	0	10	50	40	100
4	N	0	2	2	3	3	10
	%	0	20	20	30	30	100
5	N	0	3	3	3	1	10
	%	0	30	30	30	10	100
6	N	0	0	2	5	3	10
	%	0	0	20	50	30	100
7	N	0	0	5	2	3	10
	%	0	0	50	20	30	100
8	N	0	1	1	3	5	10
	%	0	10	10	30	50	100
9	N	0	1	0	1	8	10
	%	0	10	0	10	80	100
10	N	0	0	0	9	1	10
	%	0	0	0	90	10	100
11	N	0	5	2	2	1	10
	%	0	50	20	20	10	100
12	N	0	0	0	0	10	10
	%	0	0	0	0	100	100
13	N	0	3	2	4	1	10
	%	0	30	20	40	10	100
14	N	0	0	0	4	6	10
	%	0	0	0	40	60	100
15	N	0	1	0	3	6	10
	%	0	10	0	30	60	100
16	N	1	5	1	3	0	10
	%	10	50	10	30	0	100
17	N	0	2	0	2	6	10
	%	0	20	0	20	60	100
Total	N	1	27	25	54	63	170
	%	1	16	15	32	37	100

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Rifat GÜR

Place and Date of Birth: Adana- 9 February 1977

E-mail: rifat_gur@hotmail.com

Educational Background

2006 (MA) Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences

English Language Teaching Department

1995–2000 (BA) Çukurova University

Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department

1991– 1995 Adana Anadolu Ticaret Meslek Lisesi

1988 – 1991 Orhan Çobanoğlu Ortaokulu

Job Experience

2003-..... Mehmet Ali Yılmaz İlköğretim Okulu Yüreğir- Adana (English Teacher)

2000-2003 Gölovası İlköğretim Okulu Yumurtalık-Adana (English Teacher)

Experience

1999- 2000 Seyhan Rotary Anadolu Lisesi Yüreğir- Adana (Student Teacher)

1998–1999 Adana Anadolu Ticaret Meslek Lisesi Seyhan-Adana (Student Teacher)

1996 United States Air Force Escort Team (Translator)