

INSTRUCTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS
PROJECT WORK AS AN ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT TOOL AND AS AN
INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH AT KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT OF BASIC ENGLISH

A Master's Thesis

by
RAMAZAN ALPARSLAN GÖKÇEN

Department of
Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Bilkent University
Ankara
July 2005

To my beloved parents, my wife, Tuba, and my children

INSTRUCTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS
PROJECT WORK AS AN ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT TOOL AND AS AN
INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH AT KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT OF BASIC ENGLISH

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

RAMAZAN ALPARSLAN GÖKÇEN

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2005

BILKENT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MA THESIS
EXAMINATION RESULT FROM
JULY, 2004

The examining committee appointed by the Institute of Economics and Social
Sciences for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student
Ramazan Alparslan Gökçen
has read the thesis and has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Title: Instructors and Administrators' Attitudes towards Project
Work As an Alternative Assessment Tool and As an
Instructional Approach at Karadeniz Technical University
School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English

Thesis supervisor: Prof. Dr. Theodore Rodgers
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee members: Dr. Susan Johnston
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu
Middle East Technical University, Department of Foreign
Language Education

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Prof. Theodore Rodgers)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Susan Johnston)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

(Prof. Erdal Erel)
Director

ABSTRACT

INSTRUCTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS
PROJECT WORK AS AN ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT TOOL AND AS AN
INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH AT KARADENIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT OF BASIC ENGLISH

Gökçen, Ramazan Alparslan

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Prof. Theodore Rodgers

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Susan Johnston

July 2005

The study investigated the attitudes of the instructors of English currently working at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English towards project work as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach and their knowledge about project work. In this study administrators' views on implementation of project work in the program is also investigated.

Data were collected through interviews and questionnaires. First the instructors were given a questionnaire. Second interviews conducted both with administrators and volunteer instructors.

The results of data analysis revealed that both instructors and administrators working for Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English have positive attitudes towards project work as an

alternative assessment and as an instructional tool. Most of the instructors found using project assessments more satisfying and acceptable than using traditional pencil-paper tests such as multiple-choice or short answer tests. However, the analysis interviews revealed that some of the instructors have difficulties in implementing projects in their classroom. The results of the interviews conducted with administrators also revealed that there is a need for in-service training for instructors in respect to use of projects.

Moreover, the results of this study suggest that participants have some concerns about current implementation of project work at KTU and a variety of suggestions for possible improvements. This study suggests that if the instructors are given enough training about use of projects, the benefits of project work may be maximized in the curriculum.

Key words: Alternative assessment tools- project work- project-based assessment-project-based learning- project-based instruction

ÖZET

KARADENİZ TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ YABANCI DİLLER YÜKSEKOKULU HAZIRLIK BÖLÜMÜNDE ÇALIŞAN OKUTMAN VE YÖNETİCİLERİNİN DEĞERLENDİRME ARACI OLARAK VE BİR ÖĞRETİM METODU OLARAK PROJELERE KARŞI OLAN TUTUMLARI

Gökçen, Ramazan Alparslan

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Professor Theodore Rodgers

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Susan Johnston

Temmuz, 2005

Bu çalışmada Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Hazırlık Bölümünde çalışan okutmanların değerlendirme aracı olarak ve bir öğretim metodu olarak projelere karşı olan tutumları incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmada ayrıca bölüm yöneticilerinin proje çalışmalarının programa uygulanışı ile ilgili görüşleri de incelendi.

Çalışmada veriler röportaj ve anket sorularıyla elde edildi. İlk önce okutmanlara anket soruları verildi. İkinci olarak program yöneticileri ve beş adet gönüllü okutman ile röportajlar yapıldı.

Data analiz sonuçları, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Hazırlık Bölümü'nde çalışan okutmanların ve yöneticilerin her iki grubun da değerlendirme aracı olarak ve öğretim metodu olarak projelere karşı olan

tutumlarının olumlu olduklarını göstermiştir. Okutmanların büyük bir çoğunluğu proje tabanlı değerlendirme sistemini, çoktan seçmeli veya kısa cevaplı gibi klasik testlere göre daha tatmin edici ve daha kabul edilebilir bulmuşlardır.

Buna rağmen, röportaj analizleri bazı okutmanların sınıflarında projeleri uygulama konusunda bazı zorluklar yaşadıklarını ortaya çıkardı. Program yöneticileriyle yapılan röportajların sonuçları, okutmanların projeleri kullanmakla ilgili bir hizmet içi eğitime ihtiyaç olduğunu göstermiştir.

Bunun yanında bu araştırmanın sonuçları, araştırmada yer alan katılımcıların bölümde, hali hazırda uygulanmakta olan projelerle ilgili bazı kaygılarının olduğunu ve bu konuda katılımcıların olası gelişmeler için çeşitli görüşlerini de ortaya koymuştur. Bu çalışma, eğer okutmanlara projeleri kullanma konusunda yeterli eğitim verilirse, proje çalışmalarının programdaki faydalarının arttırılabileceğini ileri sürmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Alternatif değerlendirme araçları- proje çalışmaları- proje tabanlı değerlendirme- proje tabanlı öğrenim- proje tabanlı öğretim.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank and express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Theodore Rodgers, who has supervised me in my preparation of this thesis. His precious and critical suggestions in preparing the structural outlook of this study and in developing further arguments have always been welcome. His contributions and patience throughout the preparation of my thesis were highly considerate.

I am gratefully indebted to Dr. Susan Johnston, who has stimulated and supported me throughout the year. Whenever I needed her, she was always there to help me. I would also like to thank Michael Johnston for his assistance and contributions to improve my academic writing skill.

It would be pleasure for me to thank to Assistant Professor Naci Kayaoğlu who is the current Director of Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign languages and Dr. Recep Şahin who is the current director of Western Languages Department at KTU, for their encouragement to attend to the MA TEFL program. I owe much to Assistant Professor Kasım Varlı, because he supported my thesis research with several sources.

I would like to thank my colleagues at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign language who participated in this study. I owe much to my colleagues Kazım Babacan and Buket Sağlam for their help in every stage of my data collection procedures.

Many thanks to my friends in the MA TEFL Program for the worthwhile

relationships we shared. I would especially like to thank my dearest friend in the program, Mustafa Özdere, who made my life easy this year. There were sometimes, without his help, I could not have overcome.

I would also like to thank Soraya Elbard, a Faculty Academic English instructor new to Bilkent, for her friendship and conversation on matters pedagogical. Her hard-working personality and example of professional dedication had a positive effect on my own study motivation throughout the year.

Special thanks to Dr. Frederica Stoller for her assistance and valuable papers on project work, which helped me a lot in conducting this study.

I also would like to thank to my High school English teachers, especially Mrs. Tuncay Güçlü who is currently teaching at Nazilli Anatolian High school in Turkey, for having such a dedicated personality in teaching and having a big heart full of love for her students.

Finally, I am grateful to my parents and my wife for their continuous encouragement and support throughout the whole year. Without them nothing would be so meaningful and valuable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Research Questions.....	7
Significance of the Problem.....	7
Conclusion.....	8
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Introduction.....	9
Project work in education.....	10
Types of Project.....	15
Historical background of project work.....	18
Project work as an alternative assessment tool.....	22
Advantages and disadvantages of project work.....	25
Implementing project work in ELT classrooms.....	31
Instructors' attitudes towards alternative assessment types.....	37
Conclusion.....	39

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	41
Introduction.....	41
Participants.....	41
Piloting.....	42
Instruments.....	44
Questionnaire.....	44
Interviews.....	46
Data collections procedures.....	46
Data Analysis.....	48
Conclusion.....	48
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	49
Introduction.....	49
Data Analysis Procedures.....	49
Quantitative Data- Questionnaire.....	50
Background Information of The Participants.....	52
Instructors’ Attitudes Towards Using Projects as an Alternative Assessment Tool.....	56
Using Projects In Assessing Working Group Skills.....	58
Using Projects In Assessing Students’ Language Skills.....	59
Instructors’ Opinions Towards Using Project Based Assessment Versus Traditional Testing Methods.....	62
Instructors’ Opinions Towards Assessing Student Projects.....	64
Instructors’ Attitudes Towards Using Projects as Instructional Tools.....	66

Instructors' Views on Using Projects in Teaching Working Group Skills.....	66
Instructors' Views On Using Projects In Teaching Language Skills.....	67
Using Projects In Promoting Motivation And Lowering Language Anxiety.....	69
Qualitative Data Analysis: Interview Data.....	73
Instructors' Understandings of Projects in General.....	76
Instructors' Attitudes towards Project Assessments.....	77
Instructors' Opinions Towards Using Project Assessments Versus Traditional Tests.....	78
Instructors' Attitudes towards Fairness of Projects In Assessing Students.....	79
Students' Attitudes Towards Project Based Assessment From The Instructors' Point of View.....	81
Current Implementation of Project Instruction And Assessments At The Department.....	82
Topic Selection.....	82
Assessing Projects.....	83
Project Samples Implemented at KTU School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English.....	83
Instructors' Attitudes towards Project-Based Instruction in ELT Classes.....	87
Instructors' Opinions to Improve Project Approach in KTU.....	89
Interview Analysis of the Administrators of the Program.....	89
Administrators' views on using projects as alternative assessments in the assessment system.....	89
Instructors' attitudes towards project work from the administrators' administrators' points of view.....	91

Administrators' views on using projects as instructional tools as opposed to more traditional teacher-centered approaches.....	93
Conclusion.....	94
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS.....	95
Overview of the Study.....	95
Findings.	96
Current Assessment Instruments Used at KTU School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English.....	97
Instructors' attitudes and knowledge about using projects as alternative assessments.....	97
Instructors' Attitudes towards Using Projects as instructional Tools.....	100
Administrators' views on using project work in their curriculum.....	101
Pedagogical implications.....	103
Suggestions for Further Studies.....	105
Limitations of the Study.....	106
Conclusion.....	106
REFERENCE LIST.....	108
APPENDICES.....	113
APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE.....	113
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (FOR ADMINISTRATORS).....	117
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (FOR INSTRUCTORS).....	118
APPENDIX D. SAMPLE INTERVIEW (ADMININISTRATOR).....	119
APPENDIX E. SAMPLE INTERVIEW (INSTRUCTOR).....	122
APPENDIX F. INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	125

APPENDIX G. RUBRIC FOR INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS (SPEAKING PROJECTS)	126
APPENDIX H. RUBRIC FOR GROUP ORAL DEBATES (SPEAKING PROJECTS).....	127
APPENDIX I. RUBRIC FOR READING PROJECTS.....	128
APPENDIX J. RUBRIC FOR WRITING PROJECT ‘BIOGRAPHY’.....	129

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Background information of the instructors who participated in the pilot study of questionnaire.....	43
2. Original Questionnaire Section.....	52
3. The structure of data analysis.....	53
4. Total Years of Teaching Experience (Part A).....	54
5. Total Years of Teaching Experience at KTU (Part B).....	55
6. Level of students they are currently teaching (Part C).....	55
7. Educational Background of the Participants (Part D).....	56
8. Institutional Receptiveness to innovations (Part E).....	56
9. Familiarity of the instructors with the project work (Part F).....	57
10. Using projects in assessing students' working skills.....	58
11. Using projects in assessing students' language skills.....	59
12. Projects in assessing students' language skill progress.....	60
13. Using projects for only upper-level students.....	61
14. Instructors' views towards project based assessment versus traditional testing.....	62
15. Instructors' Confidence in Using Projects versus traditional Tests in Assessing Language Skills.....	63
16. Combination of Projects and Traditional Testing.....	63
17. Assessing students projects on a continuing basis or end product.....	64
18. Using Scales in Assessing Projects.....	65

19. Timing in Assessing Projects.....	65
20. Using projects in teaching working skills.....	67
21. Using projects in teaching language skills.....	68
22. Instructors view on usefulness of project as a combination of assessment and teaching.....	69
23. Using projects promoting active learning and motivation.....	69
24. Students' attitudes towards aspects of project-based instruction from instructors' point of view.....	70
25. Categories of the instructors' responses to the interviews.....	75

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Project work, as an alternative assessment type, has received increasing attention in foreign language (EFL) classes in Turkey, since education authorities have accepted the importance of using alternative assessment types. Activities such as portfolios, journals, presentations, logs, project work, self or peer observations, and oral exams that teachers use to determine how much learning has taken place, are all types of alternative assessments. My home university, Karadeniz Technical University (KTU) has recently revised its traditional testing system to include project work as a means of alternative assessment. This follows from an administrative agreement that using only tests to make decisions about the learning process of students is not a sufficiently reliable measure in any assessment system. The administrative view is that project-based assessment implies project-based instruction as well.

The experience of my university and others has been that alternative assessments, unlike standardized tests, are not what follow after instruction but become an integral part of instruction itself. Therefore, the change from using only tests to include alternative assessments, particularly projects, seems to require rethinking of instructional as well as assessment processes. However, educators and teachers, specifically in Turkey, have limited experience in use of projects either as instructional techniques or as assessment alternatives. There is a longer tradition

of basing instruction on textbooks and assessment on tests, such as multiple choice tests, short-answer tests and true-false question tests. Therefore, to integrate project work in a significant way is going to require considerable re-thinking, planning and institutional trials.

How are teachers adjusting to the changing project-based shape of instruction and assessment at KTU? The aim of this study is to discover the attitudes and understandings of teachers towards the use of project work in English Language Teaching (ELT) classrooms in both the roles of instructional technique and assessment tool. The further purpose of this study is to explore what administrators' views are on implementation of project work in their institutional language education programs.

Background of the Study

Teaching theories and methods of assessment in second language education have received significant attention in worldwide educational systems. There have been considerable innovations in the field of language teaching education in the last few decades (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Project work is one of those interesting contemporary proposals which has received increasing attention in general and vocational education, as well as in personal hobbies and family home maintenance. Project work has also become quite popular in second language learning and learning assessment (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Sheppard and Stoller, 1995; Stoller, 1997).

Although language educators did not introduce project work in language classrooms until the mid 1970s (Eyring, 1997), the history of projects in education dates back to 1590s at architectural schools in Italy (Knoll, 2000). Richards and

Rodgers (2001) state that “project work is an educational idea which came to the fore in vocational education, moved into general education classrooms and is now being studied more intensively as a possible technique for supporting the particular goals of second language learning”. Project work can be defined as learner-centered, multi-skill activities and tasks requiring students to conduct extended research on a topic (Haines, 1986; Eyring, 2003).

In this respect, projects are not only instructional tools but also assessment tools. Project-based assessments as other alternative assessment types, which include conferences, portfolio assessment, self or peer assessments, have arisen as a reaction to the traditional pencil-paper tests such as multiple choice tests, short answer tests or gap filling tests (Brown & Hudson, 1998). The supporters of project work as an alternative assessment tool find traditional tests misleading and unreliable. As Hudson and Brown (1998, p.670) state “assessments should be made up of a sufficient number of observations to increase the chances that they will collectively be reliable”. Many researchers agree that assessment has a crucial role in education, (Rowe & Hill, 1996; Freeman & Lewis, 1998; Nitko, 1996), since assessment is the only way to discover if the desired outcomes have been achieved during or at the end of a course. Brady (1997) states that assessment in language classrooms is concerned with measuring and evaluating students’ performance in the language program. In this respect projects are good examples of performance assessments, because projects allow language teachers to assess students’ language performance as well as their language skills.

A “Project” as an alternative assessment exhibits not only what a student knows about language but also how h/she uses that language in a situational context.

In this sense, project work has been seen as a means to “fill-in” the missing parts of traditional testing methods. This new concept of project-based assessment will not only alter the assessment system but, will, naturally affect changes in instruction as well.

Project work also serves as an instructional approach. A project is defined by Hedge (1993, p. 276) as “an extended task, which usually integrates language skills work through a number of activities. That is, students learn and practice their language skills while they are processing the project they undertake. This type of instruction is called project-based instruction”. A project is a way of integrating students into language learning by providing them with meaningful tasks through which they can actively take part in shaping the nature and the outcome of learning and act independently in its accomplishment (Sheppard and Stoller, 1995); Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Malcolm & Rindfleisch, 2003).

There are a variety of project types according to content, purpose, design, and organization (Kayser, 2002). For example, Haines (1986) divides projects into four main categories: information and research projects, survey projects, production projects, and performance and organizational projects; these vary according to the nature of the project tasks, the data collection procedures and the way information is reported (Haines, 1986; cited in Sheppard & Stoller, 1995).

Projects have been promoted as having considerable advantages both as an instructional approach and as an alternative assessment tool in education. Project work gives students opportunities to take an effective part both in deciding the theme or subject of the project and seeking project information through group negotiation sessions (Stoller, 1997; Eyring, 1997: Alan & Stoller, in press). Booth (1986) notes

the more fully the student is involved in an exercise the more likely he or she is to see the work through to the end and benefit from it. Through outside classroom activities, project-based instruction further promotes students' communication and collaboration with community members.

While citing advantages of projects in ELT programs, researchers have expressed some cautions. Katz (1998) asserts that problems with a project cannot be anticipated, since each project has various unique conditions according to the topic and where and by whom it is investigated. In this respect, the problems or challenges of projects often result from implementation problems.

Tabarlet (1996) attributes the success of any language approach in English language teaching (ELT) to teacher and administrator variables. One of the most important factors affecting the success of projects is teachers' attitudes towards the approach they are using and the care and attention they take in setting up projects and maintaining them.

Teachers' knowledge about underlying theory and principles are another significant factor affecting the success of a project approach in language teaching. Hence, there seem to be two major variables affecting the success of a project approach in ELT classes: (i) teachers' theoretical knowledge and understanding about the projects and (ii) their attitudes towards project work

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the use of project work is to improve instruction and learning and the validity and reliability of evaluation. Every curriculum needs to have different types of assessment systems, since using only one assessment instrument in order to collect information about the knowledge and skills students have acquired, is

not sufficient to make judgments about students' level of learning. The problem is to decide the appropriate assessment tools to best serve instruction and assessment and to best serve both students and teachers. Assessment is not only a process of measurement but also has a significant influence on both students' and teachers' attitudes towards language learning.

The assessment system at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English has been based on standardized testing methods, but this year the program has changed from using only tests to additionally using projects. In the previous assessment system, the tests were centralized exams prepared and evaluated by the testing office. The testing office was staffed by the English instructors of the institution. This year, although the students are required to have midterm and final exams, presentations and projects are part of the program-wide evaluation system. That is, student projects are as important as midterm and final exams in determining overall average grades. The projects are designed by teachers themselves for each class, and the tests are prepared jointly by instructors of the faculty instead of by a centralized testing office. The teachers seem to view this change of policy from using centrally-developed standardized test to including teacher-crafted classroom projects quite a radical one. The aim of this study is to detail the teachers' attitudes towards the revised language program based on projects, both as these are used as alternative assessment tools and as instructional tools. The details of the implementation of project work at the administrative/institutional level are also anticipated to have a direct affect on teacher attitudes.

Research Questions

1. What are instructors' attitudes about use of project work as an instructional approach?
2. What are instructors' attitudes about use of project work as an alternative assessment tool?
3. What are administrators' views on project work in their curriculum?

Significance of the Problem

Although there are a number of studies in the field of alternative assessment, there is lack of research specifically focused on project work in language learning in Turkey. Although many educators agree on the importance of using a variety of alternative or authentic assessment techniques in the classroom, traditional testing methods are still the most common assessment tools in language classrooms. The reason for this may be the lack of knowledge about and experience with alternative assessments; this may particularly be so in respect to the use of projects as an alternative assessment tool in language learning. This research may guide educators in their perceptions about the language assessment system both in regards to its design, its content and its implementation.

This paper will be the first research study directed towards understanding the instructors' attitudes towards the new assessment system at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English. The results of this study may contribute to revisions in the new assessment system by revealing the attitudes of instructors towards the projects and their place in English teaching and by identifying particularly successful projects and project types. With the help of this study, teachers and the course designers can become more knowledgeable about

projects, be more aware of the potential use of projects and be better able to plan next steps in implementation of projects to support English language learning and teaching.

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to introduce the study by providing background information, explaining the purposes of the study and its potential value. The statement of the problem, research questions and the significance of the problem were discussed as well.

In the second chapter of the study, the theoretical background of project work in education, particularly English language teaching, will be presented in light of the information obtained from the review of literature on project work as an alternative assessment and project work as an instructional tool. In the third chapter, information concerning the methodology of the study will be presented under the following headings: participants, materials and instruments, procedures and data analysis. In the fourth chapter, detailed data analysis results of the study will be presented. Finally, in the fifth chapter, research findings will be summarized in accordance with the research questions and an overview of the study, discussion of findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and implications for further research will be presented.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study investigates attitudes of instructors and administrators at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English towards the use of projects in language teaching (ELT) classrooms. Two operational aspects of project work are explored in this study: project work as an instructional approach and project work as an alternative assessment.

This chapter reviews the literature on the roles of project work in educational settings, both as an alternative assessment type and as an instructional approach. First an overview of project work in education is given. The major emphasis in the first section will be on the use of projects as an instructional technique in language teaching. In the second section, different types of projects will be presented. Then, an historical background of project work in general education will be discussed. The consideration of project work as an alternative assessment is then considered. This is followed by a discussion of the implementation of project work in ELT classrooms, including description of and research on sample projects. In the fourth section the advantages and disadvantages of using projects in ELT classrooms will be discussed. Then, the ways of maximizing the benefits of project work will be presented. As the main focus of this study is on teachers' attitudes to innovation, the research on examining teachers and administrators' attitudes will be reviewed in the final section.

Project Work in Education

Teaching and assessing have always been two critical issues in general education. (Rowe & Hill, 1996; Freeman & Lewis, 1998; Nitko, 1996). For many years now researchers have been trying to find better ways of teaching and assessing in all subject areas. The educational world has been the center of several innovations in terms of methods of both teaching and assessment, particularly since the 1970s (Eyring, 2001; Wrigley, 1998). One interesting example of this is ‘project work’, one of the popular emphases in of today’s second language methodology. In educational discussions, the terms “Project Work” and “Projects” are often used interchangeably. There is, perhaps, a greater tendency for “Project Work” to be used in discussions of general education and “projects” in more recent discussions, particularly in respect to language teaching. In this review, I will use the terms as the authors cited use them, while preferring the term “projects” in my own comments.

Projects have for some time been receiving attention in general and vocational education, as well as in personal hobbies and family home maintenance. Recently project work has become quite visible as well in second language learning and learning assessment (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Since the 1970’s, many educational systems have been adapting projects into their language curricula.

There are a number of definitions regarding the term “project” in L2 education. For example, Eyring (1997, p. 1) defines projects, in language learning settings, as “assignments that incorporate student input, with content deriving from real second language use through extensive contact with either native speakers or native texts, integrating language skills and extending over several weeks or more”. According to this view, projects appear to have five major components: first, a

project is an assignment. Second, projects require students to incorporate the language knowledge they have learned in the language course with the real world usage of the language. Third, native speakers or native texts are essential for learners' exposure to real language usage. Fourth, integrated language skills are necessary to develop a project. Fifth, time frames should be sufficient (several weeks) for students to immerse themselves in their projects. Carter & Thomas (1986) and Schuler (2000) characterize project work as cross-curricular work, which involves activities outside the class requiring learners to set their own learning targets as they proceed. That is, project work not only deals with the language presented in classes and textbooks but also the language in actual community use (Knutson, 2003; Gibson & Clarke, 1995).

A project is defined by Haines (1989) as learner-centered, multi-skill activities, which allow students to work independently in terms of choosing topics or themes as well as methods for processing them (cited in Kobayashi, 2003). A project is a way of integrating students into language learning by providing them meaningful and integrated tasks through which they can actively take part in shaping the nature and the outcome of learning and act independently in its accomplishment (Sheppard and Stoller, 1995; Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Malcolm & Rindfleisch, 2003). In this respect, a project involves tasks requiring learners to organize and perform an in-depth investigation on a single topic, either in pairs, in groups, or individually by using a variety of skills and knowledge (Beckett, 2002; Eyring, 1989; Haines, 1989; Wallace, 1991; cited in Kobayashi, 2003).

Hedge (1993, p. 276) defines a project as “an extended task, which usually integrates language skills work through a number of activities. These activities

combine in working towards an agreed goal and may include planning, the gathering of information through reading, listening, interviewing, etc., discussion of the information, problem solving, oral or written reporting, and display”. Hedge extends this definition by saying that projects are authentic English language tasks, emphasizing student group-centered experience rather than teacher directed work, which gives students responsibility for planning, carrying out and presenting their project.

In compiling several definitions of project work, Stoller (1997) defines project work as having six characteristics. First, project work consists of content-based activities with topics derived from the real world, matching students’ interests and needs. Second, project work comprises student-centered activities, with the teacher acting as a facilitator. That is, in project work students have an active role in almost every stage of a project; selecting the topic and deciding on the method they are going to use to conduct the project. Third, projects are sets of cooperative activities rather than competitive ones, allowing students to work independently and then in groups to complete a project. Fourth, projects are sets of tasks, which lead students to use integrated skills through authentic real world engagement. A fifth feature of ‘project work’ that Stoller (1997) proposes is that projects are also product-based works as well process based works; the products (an oral presentation, a poster session, a bulletin board display, a report, or a stage performance) also benefit other students. Sixth, projects are selected so as to be motivating, stimulating, empowering, and challenging activities, which promote students’ self esteem, autonomy, language skills and cognitive abilities. In this regard, project work typically assumes several components including curriculum content, student direction, learner collaboration,

real world connection, extended time frame, multimedia use and non-standard assessment procedures (Hedge, 1993; Eyring, 1997; Stoller, 1997; Alan & Stoller, in press).

Eyring (1997) reviews characteristics of projects as comprising a process syllabi, team based learning, progressive learning, problem based instruction including other communicative based learning types. Although projects share common features with other communicative approaches, project work differs from typical communicative LT approaches in specific ways. Eyring (1997) suggests three features of project work, which distinguish it from other communicative, learner-centered approaches. These features are the student-negotiated syllabus, extended research on a single topic and collaborative assessment.

The ‘student-negotiated syllabus’ indicates that the syllabus for the language program is developed through negotiation with students (Eyring, 2001). Project work builds on the interests and needs of the learners to develop practical language use and demonstrate the language abilities that they have studied in their formal language program (Stoller, 1997; Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Malcolm & Rindfleisch, 2003). Negotiated syllabus sessions occur as one of the most important features of project work. In negotiating the syllabus, students take an active role in every aspect of the project; deciding on the project topic, determining how to process the project they undertake and defining the desired product at the end of the project. Although the main responsibility for conducting the project they undertake belongs to the students, the teacher is always a facilitator and guide to the students (Stoller, 1997).

“Extended research” implies student projects that move beyond fixed-form

research exercises typical of many class assignments. Research sources can be varied and numerous, as I review in following sections. That is, the more research sources the learners explore, the richer in breadth and depth their projects become.

“Collaborative assessment” is the third distinguishing factor of project work proposed by Eyring (1997), suggesting project work is not only a teaching approach but also an assessment tool through which students’ collaborative or group work skills can be assessed.

Despite these differences, project work has still a close relationship with the other communicative approaches, which employ collaborative participation. Project assignments are often collaboratively discussed; projects move forward through group work; and, importantly, project outputs are shared, reviewed and assessed in a collaborative manner. Project products shared with fellow students may involve topical class magazines, preparing group wall displays about students' countries and model designs for cities of the future (Alan & Stoller, in press).

Another definition of project work is given by several authors in the literature in noting that ‘a project’ is a way of integrating students into language learning by providing them with meaningful tasks through which they can actively take part in shaping the nature and the outcome of learning and personally act to accomplish it (Grabe & Stoller, 1997; Stoller, 1997; Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Malcolm & Rindfleisch, 2003). All these definitions and characteristics of projects given in the literature above imply that project work requires learners to perform several activities built around authentic communication, collaborative work, critical thinking and self and group monitoring.

Having reviewed several different understandings of projects according

to various researchers, the next section will discuss different types of projects, with some project samples given in the literature.

Types of Projects

There are a variety of project types according to content, purpose, design, and organization (Kayser, 2002). Legutke and Thomas (1991) suggest three types of projects: encounter projects, text projects, and class correspondence projects. Encounter projects here refer to the projects which require students to contact with native speakers of that language. Text projects are used to refer to projects requiring student use of English language texts. Legutke and Thomas (1991) define class correspondence projects as tasks “involving letters, audio cassettes or photographs, etc. as exchanges between school pupils in different countries”, (as cited in Hedge, 1993).

Sarah North (1990), classifies project types in four different categories: community projects, case studies, practical projects, and library projects. Community projects, similar to the encounter projects proposed by Legutke & Thomas (1991), are projects where students gather their information from the local community through interviews, letter-writing and questionnaires. ‘Case studies’ are types of tasks requiring students to find a solution to a specific a problem based on their research. The problems for case studies might be either documentary or imaginary. Practical projects are often like scientific or architectural assignments that require the students to carry out practical work to reach their objective, for example producing a design of a church or a machine, building a model or real object. Finally library projects proposed by North are similar to the types of text projects suggested by Legutke and Thomas (1991). That is, library projects are projects where the major information source is a library and texts. In this type of project students are required

to conduct research on a particular topic, read about it and produce a written piece about the topic they undertake.

Another view of project types is offered by Warschauer, (2001). Warschauer is interested in collaborative projects carried out by participants working via computer mediated communication links. These parallel closely the types of projects proposed for individuals and groups in fixed site language teaching classrooms. In the original article Warschauer explains each of these project types and gives citations where the project types are documented and are described in greater detail. Warschauer (2001:211) documents five on-line, collaborative project types: interviews and survey, on-line research, comparative investigations, simulations, and on-line publication.

1. Interviews and survey: Participants interview each other or share reports of surveys conducted in their own locale.
2. On-line research: Students explore research questions they nominate or are assigned by an instructor.
3. Comparative investigations: Students investigate local customs, economic conditions, etc. and compare results on-line.
4. Simulations: Students work as team-members to design a business, an international school or to work out potential solutions to international problems.
5. On-line publication: Students cooperate in preparing on-line newsletters, magazines, or reports. (Warschauer, 2001:211)

Haines (1989) divides projects into four main categories: information and research projects, survey projects, production projects, and performance and organizational projects; these vary according to the nature of the project tasks, the data collection procedures and the way information is reported (Haines, 1989, cited in Sheppard & Stoller, 1995; as cited in Skehan 1998).

Information and research projects require students to do research on a particular topic in some depth through using variety of information sources (e.g.

library, internet, TV programs...). The end products in information and research projects are often presented in written formats, which may include maps, charts, diagrams and scrapbooks. Topics for these kinds of projects may derive from themes related to students' interests and needs.

Survey projects require students to accomplish their projects depending on community, business and association interviews and questionnaires. The end product in surveys can be reported both through written formats and verbal presentations. However, an important feature of these projects is that survey reports should contain taped and/or transcribed data. Statistics for questionnaire based surveys and interviews should be reported in standard form (perhaps, simplified) and qualitative findings through written or audio/video recordings (Haines, 1989). Survey project topics are often related to sampling the beliefs, attitudes or perceptions of the survey participants (Brown & Rodgers, 2002).

Production projects involve organizing group work or a team to develop a media presentation or a script, record a radio program from a script, edit a newspaper, layout a magazine or video-tape a TV program. All of these are examples of production projects.

Performance and organizational projects can be defined as those projects requiring students to plan and organize a public meeting. Organizing a "British Evening" or "organizing a conference" are examples of this sort of project. Performance and organizational projects necessitate not only "basic" language knowledge but also the particular genre used in public settings.

We have overviewed different types of projects in the literature in this section. The following section will present brief historical background information

about project work in the literature.

Historical Background of Project Work

Although language educators did not introduce project work in language classrooms until the mid 1970s (Eyring, 1997), the history of projects in education dates back to 1590s at architectural schools in Italy (Knoll, 1997). Italian architects are viewed as the first educators to recognize the inadequateness of traditional methods in meeting demands of art and science as well (Knoll, 1997). The first implementations of projects began with competitions in respect to art in 1596. The further aim of these project competitions was also to promote students' training. In this respect, it can be understood that projects are from the outset considered as having both teaching and assessment functions. That is, while students were vying to be the winner of a competition, they were also improving their creativity and their technique. Teachers gave advanced students challenging project assignments such as designing a church, designing monuments or palaces which allowed students to work independently and required them to present their projects through formal lectures and demonstration workshops (Knoll, 1997).

After recognizing the potential of using projects in art schools, projects were adopted by engineering educators, such as Stillman H. Robinson, professor of Mechanical Engineering at the Illinois Industrial University at Urbana around 1870 (Knoll, 1997). Instruction by project became known worldwide and appeared as a candidate teaching method in American school education between the years 1775-1880 (Knoll, 1997).

Since then the projects have found many advocates in the world. For example, John Dewey is one of the outstanding educational figures promoting

project work in the late 1800s within his theory of education. His descriptions and recommendations regarding project work, such as in his promotion of education as “shared organized experiences” appeared in his first major work on education, *The School and Society* (Dewey, 1899; cited in Kobayashi 2003). Dewey (1897, p.77) notes that “I believe that the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child's powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself. Through these demands he is stimulated to act as a member of a unity, to emerge from his original narrowness of action and feeling, and to conceive of himself from the standpoint of the welfare of the group to which he belongs”. The appropriate choice and structuring of social situations and encouragement for the learner to engage with others in working out responses to social situations are two prime elements in Dewey’s philosophy of education as well as in most later conceptions of Project Work. In this view, the educators’ role is to help students locate and structure social situations for their study and to encourage them to work cooperatively in finding closure to issues raised in their explorations.

Kilpatrick is another outstanding figure of the 20th century promoting project work in his writing, (Wrigley, 1998; Kobayashi, 2003; Beyer, 1997). Kilpatrick (1918) is the first language teacher to discuss project-based learning as an educational approach to mother tongue K-12 education in his article entitled, "The Project Method" (as cited in Wrigley, 1998; Beyer, 1997). One of the features that distinguish Kilpatrick from other supporters of project work is that he was more interested in cognitive development than collaboration in project work. Another distinction is that although many advocates of project work support the idea that project work can be applied for every level of student and for both native and non-

native speakers, Kilpatrick believed that projects are most appropriate for younger native speaking children (Beyer, 1997). Although Kilpatrick built his ideas mostly on Dewey's approach to education, he put less emphasis on student-student collaborative work than Dewey (Wrigley, 1998; Knoll, 1997). Even so, both Dewey and Kilpatrick share a view of the classroom as a democratic institution in which students and teachers share decision-making. Kilpatrick states "there should be no division between the student and the teacher. That is, there should be a reciprocal relationship between the two and that students should know that their teacher is their advocate" (cited in Beyer, 1997). Dewey considers democracy as a process where individuals consciously participate in a continual growth process (Holt, 1994). The democratic notion that students should have a say in the curriculum is similar to discussion of the 'negotiated syllabus' in Eyring (1997). The systematic support of democratic decision-making is a major benchmark of project work (Dewey, 1899; Booth, 1986; Haines, 1989; Eyring, 1997; Stoller, 1997). This idea established the nature of project work as defined by Knoll (1997), in that project work is a teaching method which allows students to develop their independence and responsibility, at the same time practicing social and cooperative modes of behavior. Some examples of educational projects will help clarify some of the distinctions discussed above.

Brumfit (1984) gives as an example of a project for advanced adult students where these students are required to produce a radio program about their own country. Students were required to work in groups in this activity. The topics for the theme may be various, including ethnic groups, religion and education.

Hutchinson (1991) describes a project on "Animals in danger" as an example for secondary school students. This project requires learners to use knowledge from

science and geography to research threatened species, write an article and make a poster (cited in Hedge, 1993).

Haines (1989) gives an example of a project for all levels of students from elementary to advanced proficiency level of English. The topic of the project is 'British or American companies in your country'. Haines suggests this project particularly for Business English students. This project requires learners to use all four language skills. Main activities described for this project are writing (descriptions, letters, reports or questionnaire), speaking/listening (through discussions, interviews and reporting back), reading (newspapers, reports or advertisements). The end product either could be written, audio visual or verbal reports summarizing survey findings or could be classroom displays including reports, photographs. 'Protecting the environment' is another example of a project described by Booth (2002) for elementary level students or young adolescents. The aim of this project is to help students enlarge their vocabulary knowledge through specific readings and to improve writing skills and translation skills. The classroom and library are the major locations for this project. (In this respect, this project might also be an example of library projects as defined by North, 1990). Booth (2002) suggests several sources for this project including pictures and photographs cut out of magazines, or photocopied environmental issue articles. Students are required to present their project product through posters and oral presentations.

Project work also consists of sets of tasks that exhibit how much learners have advanced in language learning and in communicational competence throughout a language course. From this point of view, project work serves as an alternative

assessment type. Therefore, project work serves two main areas in ELT classes. It is an instructional approach and as well as an alternative assessment type. We have overviewed ‘project work’ in the literature based on some different perspectives of educational theorists and language educators. An historical overview of project work has taken us to the current role of projects in language education. We have discussed how project work can help students improve their language usage skills. In this respect project work is said to serve as an instructional technique in mother tongue and ELT classes.

In the discussion above, I have focused on project work as an instructional approach. The following section considers project work as an alternative assessment type.

Project Work as an Alternative Assessment Tool

‘Assessment’ has come to include two major types of educational evaluation: traditional testing and alternative assessment (Huerta- Macias, 1995; Brown & Hudson, 1998). Traditional tests include standardized pencil-paper tests such as multiple-choice tests, true false tests, gap-filling tests, cloze tests, and c-tests (Hughes, 2003; Weir, 1990). Alternative assessment types, on the other hand, include performance-based assessments such as portfolios, diaries, journals, collaborative assessment, self- assessment, surveys, interviews, problem-solving assessments, reports, discussion, research papers, and project-based assessments (Huerta- Macias, 1995; Brown & Hudson, 1998; Genesee & Upshur, 1996; Miller, 1995).

Performance assessments are sets of tasks focused on students’ performance skills rather than proficiency skills. Performance based assessment is defined as “a set of strategies for the application of knowledge skills and work

habits through the performance of tasks that are meaningful and engaging to students” (Hibbard and others, 1996, p.5 as cited in Brualdi, 1998). Performance based assessment is defined by Shohamy (cited in Li & James, 1998) as a form of test in which students’ language performance is evaluated. That is, performance based assessments in a second language teaching context concern what students can do with that language rather than what they know about that language. Process based assessment can be defined as a type of assessment, focusing not only on the end product of the student work but also on the processes the student used to arrive at the end products. Traditional tests such as multiple choice tests and short answer tests are examples of product based assessment tools, alternative assessments such as projects, portfolios and journals are examples of “process plus product” based assessments.

Although standardized tests have been the major instruments in assessment systems in the past, an increasing number of educational systems have included alternative assessments in recent years (Brown & Hudson, 1998). These have risen partly as a rejection of tests and partly as a supplement to testing (Brown & Hudson, 1998), because standardized tests have been thought to be insufficient and less valid tools to mirror what students have achieved in the classroom (Wildemuth, 1984; Pat, 1993; James, 1995). While objective tests, such as multiple choice and true false questions, are held to make testing reliable, they have major shortcomings in respect to assessing communication skills (McNamara, 1996; Weir, 1990). In this regard, project work as an alternative assessment type has received increasing attention in educational systems and in language classrooms. Project work as an alternative assessment exhibits not only what a student knows about language but also how

h/she uses that language in a situational context.

For example, a project described by Alan & Stoller (in press) is a good example of a project covering various alternatives mentioned above. In this project students were required to conduct a project about the tramcar transportation system of the city they are living in. Students were expected to conduct a number of interviews with the experts from the university, from city governments and residents to collect background information about the issue. Students were also directed to write formal letters to the city requesting information. Students' projects including their findings and recommendations based on their research were presented by oral talks and displayed on bulletin billboards. Students' final products were evaluated on their overall individual and group work skills as well as on their language skills.

In this sense, project work has been seen as a means to "fill-in" the missing parts of traditional testing methods. Traditional standardized tests such as pencil-paper tests are viewed as antithetical to the actual processes of language learning (Brown & Hudson, 1998). Evaluators have looked to more authentic demonstrations of language use capability based on student learning. If contemporary language classes are intended to teach students to use authentic language as related to communication situations, then assessment resources must focus on these goals and situations. These considerations have led evaluators to reconsider or even discontinue traditional testing in language classrooms (Airasian, 1997). In this view, assessment is no longer viewed as an external instrument to measure students' knowledge at the end of a course but as an integral and on going part of instruction which helps teachers review their own instruction as well as make judgments both about students' improvement and their future needs. In this respect, project work, as alternative

assessment, is a good example of “process based assessment”.

Although project work as an alternative assessment has received considerable research attention, not all educators and teachers share this enthusiasm for using project work and maintain their commitment to use of traditional tests. One reason for this may be that teachers find it difficult to understand and manage projects and perceive that project work requires considerable extra effort and extra work and class time. In the following sections, proposals of advantages and disadvantages of project work and suggestions as how to maximize the benefits of using project work will be summarized.

Advantages of Project Work and Disadvantages of Project Work

Projects have considerable advantages both as an instructional approach and as an alternative assessment tools in education. Project work contributes to language growth in several ways. The advantages of projects can be grouped under two broad theses: projects in developing students’ social skills and projects in developing students’ linguistic competence.

Although different projects require different procedures (Booth, 1986) and may call heavily on a particular skill in the process of completing projects, students need to integrate a variety of skills successfully. In that ‘project work’ involves sets of tasks requiring multiple capacities of language use (Booth, 1986; Haines, 1989) then the use of integrated language skills is essential both inside and outside the classroom.

For example, while survey projects seem to promote speaking, listening (e.g. through interviews), and writing (taking notes), (Haines, 1989), students need to read enough materials in order to develop the survey they undertake. This underlines what

Booth (1986) suggests: “in the project work the skills are not treated in isolation but combined”.

According to Richards & Rodgers (2001) there are two major reasons for this current attention to using projects in second language education. One reason derives from the idea that project work is viewed as a very efficient method for promoting a communicative language teaching (CLT) philosophy in language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Eyring, 1997). The other factor promoting project work in language education arises from general education itself (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Project work, like other recent instructional movements in general education - such as cooperative learning, multiple intelligences, problem-based learning, and competency-based instruction - is a movement developed to meet learners' community language requirements outside the classroom. Knolls (1997) views project work as one of the best and most appropriate teaching methods when integrated with such constructivist concepts as inquiry-based learning, problem solving and industrial education. Richards and Rodgers (2001) summarize that project work is an educational idea which came to the fore in vocational education, moved into general education classrooms and is now being studied more intensively as a possible technique for supporting the particular goals of second language learning.

During projects many processes and skills as well as language skills are developed such as problem solving skills, group working skills, leadership skills and persuasive skills (Katz & Chards 1998; Stoller, 1997). Gibson and Clarke (1995) state that “the benefits to be gained from such work as projects are almost limitless”. According to Gibson & Clarke (1995), with the help of projects students can develop

their life and social skills, increase self confidence, citizenship, social abilities, critical faculties, assertiveness and self-awareness.

Among alternative assessments, project-based assessment is viewed as the one of the most effective methods in the company of self-assessment, peer-assessment, collaborative assessment, journals, portfolios, or oral presentations (Booth, 1986; Eyring 2001; Haines, 1989; Stoller, 1997). While students are conducting their projects, projects allow students to gather information from first-hand, authentic experience that cannot be gained in traditional seminars. Project work gives students opportunities to take effective part both in deciding the theme or subject of the project and seeking project information through group negotiation sessions (Stoller, 1997; Eyring, 1997: Alan & Stoller, in press). Booth (1986) notes “the more fully the student is involved in an exercise the more likely he or she is to see the work through to the end and benefit from it.” Through outside classroom activities, project-based instruction further promotes students’ communication and collaboration with community members. These help students to develop their social skills (Larsen–Freeman, 2000). Through project work, students improve their problem solving, negotiating and interpersonal skills. Project work involves students in-group decision making with the teacher playing a facilitating and supporting role (Stoller, 1997; Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Alan & Stoller in press; Sheppard & Stoller, 1995). To quote from Alan & Stoller, (in press) “accompanying enhanced language and content learning are increased student motivation, autonomy, engagement, and more positive attitudes towards English”. Project work is seen as providing a model of open classrooms, open discussion democratic learning (Eyring, 1997), as contrasted to more traditional top-down, teacher-centered classroom instruction. This is also

called as “Open classroom theory”, another innovational concept, structured around the idea of students’ freedom to make instructional choices in the classroom.

Through project work, students have more responsibility and control of their own learning as they are allowed to select, organize and carry out a project of their own choice (Fried-Booth 1986; cited in Kayser 2002). This also helps learners to become more independent and autonomous learners.

Learner autonomy can be defined as self-directed learning (Lee, 1998; Benson, 2001), referring to learners taking responsibility for their own learning (Holec, 1981). If “learner autonomy consists in making decisions in learning, including setting objectives, defining contents and progressions, selecting methods and techniques, monitoring the procedure, and evaluating the outcome of learning,” (Holec, 1981 cited in Lee, I. 1998, p. 282), then project work is one of the most efficient methods for promoting learner autonomy by letting learners take “some of the initiatives that give shape and direction to the learning process, and share in monitoring progress and evaluating the extent to which learning targets are achieved” (Little, 1991, p.4). Independent learning can be defined as a kind of learning approach “which allows learners to make the necessary decisions to meet the learner's own learning needs (Kesten, 1987). Independent learning also encourages student motivation, curiosity, self-confidence, self-reliance and positive self-concept; it is based on student understanding of their own interests and a valuing of learning for its own sake (Kesten, 1987; Holec 1981; Benson, 2001). In this respect, if one of the biggest challenges in education is viewed as motivating the students to learning (Lynch, 2000), then project work is one of the most useful methods for increasing student motivation by letting them to work independently and supporting them in

learning how to do this.

Since project work guides learners to benefit from multiple sources of information to conduct their studies (Haines, 1989; Burke, 1994; Booth, 1986; Booth, 2002), learners are provided with an opportunity to develop their own learning skills and language knowledge as well as general knowledge about a topic within their project (Schuler, 2000). Eyring (1997) sees project work, viewed in the context of other communicative approaches, as the most useful method for organizing learner-centered approaches to language learning (Eyring, 1997).

For example, the project “school magazine” described by Fried-Booth (2002), for elementary level students, requires students to produce a school magazine based on local issues. In this project students are expected to work in groups and to use a variety of sources such as local newspapers and magazines, maps of the locality, posters, photographs, reference books, regional studies and political campaigns, to conduct their study. While conducting this project, students are also required to do interview local people.

Burke (1994) identifies nine advantages of project work in L2 classes

- (1) project work allows students to formulate their own questions and then try to find answers to them,
- (2) through projects students find opportunities to use their multiple intelligences to create a product,
- (3) projects can be assigned to students at different levels of proficiency and can be adjusted to learners’ own individual learning styles and ability levels,
- (4) projects may increase students’ motivation,
- (5) through projects students are provided an opportunity for positive interaction and collaboration among peers,
- (6) projects provide an alternative for students who have problems reading and writing,
- (7) projects, unlike tests or traditional writing

assignments, help students to increase their self-esteem, , (8) project work also provides an environment for students to share their learning and accomplishments with other students, classes, parents, or community members and (9) project work can achieve essential learning outcomes through application and transfer.

According to Katz (1994) “Project work (i) provides children with opportunities to apply skills; (ii) addresses children's proficiencies; (iii) stresses intrinsic motivation; and (iv) encourages children to determine what to work on and accepts them as experts about their needs”.

While citing advantages of projects in ELT programs, researchers have expressed some cautions. Katz (1998) asserts that problems with a project cannot be anticipated, since each project has various unique conditions according to the topic chosen and where and for whom it is undertaken. One challenge in using project work occurs with choosing the project topic. The negotiation sessions might be troublesome in terms of choosing the appropriate topics for the students’ level, students’ interests, instructional language targets and fitting all these to the curriculum. Legutke and Thiel (1982) (as cited in Carter & Thomas, 1986) note that time constrictions and lack of familiarity with the new community, second language learners might have problems finding enough resources to conduct their projects. Therefore, the students might need a great deal of assistance from teachers to organize even simple information gathering exercises outside the classroom. Another disadvantage pointed out by Legutke and Thiel (1982) (as cited in Carter & Thomas, 1986) is that projects sometimes are very tiring for learners because of the effort they have to invest. Above all, each project requires from teachers a high level of pre-planning and co-ordination together with dedication to monitor and generate and

support learners' motivation, particularly at the beginning stages. Getting cooperation of community members may also be a challenge. "As a project is an activity involving the community outside the classroom, great consideration should be given to how one makes approaches to people and institutions in order not to overburden them"(Legutke & Thiel, 1982 ; cited in Carter & Thomas, 1986, p.196). Hedge (1990) attributes the success of project work basically to factors such as availability of time, access to authentic materials, receptiveness of learners the possibilities for learner training and the administrative flexibility of instructional timetabling. If these factors are not in place project-based instruction will suffer.

We have noted both advantages and disadvantages of projects in ELT classrooms. The next section will present how to maximize the advantages of projects in ELT classrooms.

Implementing Project Work in ELT Classrooms: Some Alternative Models of Project Development and Use

Given discussion of project types and different aspects of projects in ELT classrooms the issue of implementing project work is presented in this section.

There have been several different models proposed which suggest how project work can be carried out in language classes. There are similarities in these models, but there are also sufficient differences so that these will be discussed separately in order that their applications are clear. The models most frequently cited in the literature and reviewed in this section are provided by Lee (2002), Booth, (1986) and Stoller (1997). After reviewing these models, some summary comments are made. As mentioned before, there are various types of projects which call upon different skills and sources in operation. Therefore, there are no definite rules about

how a project is processed (Wrigley, 1998).

However, according to Wrigley (1998) all projects progress through some common phases such as: “identification of a problem or issue; preliminary investigations; planning and assigning tasks; researching the topic; implementing the project, drafting and developing a final product; disseminating; and evaluating what worked”.

The primary issue in implementing projects is considered to be deciding on the project topics appropriate to the levels, ages and interest of the students (Stoller, 1997; Lee 2002; Booth, 1986), because current advocates of project work view its application as adaptable to all age and proficiency levels (Booth, 2002; Lee, 2002).

Schuler (2000) describes the project process in three broad phases: selecting the project topic, data collection and culmination of the project. In the first phase, the project topic is selected based on a discussion of the teachers’ and students’ ideas and knowledge about the related topic including personal stories and experiences about the topic are shared. In this respect, Lee (2002) suggests that project topics should be appropriate in respect to students’ background and challenging enough to allow the students to use their imaginative and creative thinking. In the second phase, students collect data through various sources (e.g. taking notes, interviews, books, web, etc.). In this session outside speakers might also be invited to answer students’ questions about the related topic. In the third phase, learners are expected to share their findings or end products with their peers, families, and school and community members.

Projects in practice may be divided into two major types such as full-scale projects and bridging or motivating projects (Haines, 1989; Booth, 1986). Stoller

(1997) adds to these two types of projects, a type she calls “unstructured projects”. Although the main focus in this study is on “full-scale” projects, preparation activities and sub-projects are also very important components, especially for second language learners.

According to Booth (1986) and Skehan (1998) bridging and preparation activities form the basis of full-scale projects. Preparation activities are also called as “lead-in activities” by Haines (1989) and include several kinds of activities (e.g. giving short talks written samples, video samples) in order to prepare students for formal project work and provide project focus. That is, the success of full-scale projects depends on the quality of the lead-in activities. These bridging activities help students to develop the strategy training they are going to use to conduct full scale projects. Unlike the full scale projects, during pre-project and lead-in activities, teachers’ control is greater. Teachers train their students how to conduct a project, how to interview or how to do research on related topics through role-plays, demonstrations or short talks.

“Full-scale projects” and “structured projects” are used interchangeably in the literature (Booth 1986; Haines, 1989). These refer to task sets that require students to conduct their own studies with little guidance on the teachers’ side. Semi-structured projects are the projects undertaken by students with considerable guidance from the instructor. Semi-structured projects are often recommended for the elementary level students who need more help to conduct to their studies. At this point, Booth (1986) suggests four important stages to complete a project: bridging activities to prepare students for “full-scale projects, organizing the project, reviewing students’ work and evaluating the final product the students produce.

Lee (2002) suggests a number of important points to be considered while deciding on projects in order to maximize language and content learning. First, organizers and teachers should always take into consideration the students' backgrounds, including their ages and language levels, while deciding the direction of project work. Second, the topic should be interesting and relevant to the students' as future citizens and professionals. Third, the topic should be challenging to improve critical thinking but should also be manageable in terms of the time and resources available to students. Schuler (2000) notes, "the topic, the end results, and the learning process are all equally important in project work". This quote may imply that if the project topic is not carefully selected, the end product and the learning objectives might be negatively affected. The final recommendation proposed by Lee is that the topic should allow the students to improve their creative thinking and imagination.

After the decision is made about project topics, another important issue proposed by Lee is timing. Students are required to complete the project work in a given time (generally several weeks or more). Time should be neither too long nor too short. During the time period the learners need to be encouraged, monitored and guided. Teachers and learners should consider together the important steps to be taken (Lee, 2002; Booth, 1986; Haines, 1989; Eyring, 1997).

After having discussed some different models of implementing projects, more developed ten-step model for project implementation proposed by Stoller (Stoller, 1997; Alan & Stoller, in press) will be presented.

Stoller's (1997) ten-step model, which was designed for English for Academic Purposes in content-based classrooms, is another proposal for sequencing

project work in both English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning settings (cited in Celce-Murcia, 2001). Stoller (1997) suggests that teachers should propose possible themes clearly at the very beginning. In other words the teachers should make a “decision on a project theme from structured projects, semi-structured, to unstructured projects.

The second step introduced by Stoller is determining final outcomes such as poster presentation, report, oral presentation, etc. Third, the structure of the project should be determined which will help students consider their responsibilities and roles in their project work. Fourth, teachers need to prepare instructional activities necessary for the project. The fifth step of the process is to guide the students to collect information through surveys and library searches about the topic. Sixth, learners should be prepared for synthesizing, organizing, summarizing and analyzing the data collected from different sources. In the seventh step, learners are required to compile and analyze the important data collected for their project product. Eighth, the teacher needs to help students by “designing language-improvement activities helpful for them to present their final outcome”. Ninth, learners present their products according to the decisions of step 2. Finally the project products presented by the learners are assessed. The last stage is a time for providing feedback on students’ language and content learning (as cited in Alan & Stoller, in press).

As seen from the steps, the teacher’s support is an important factor and the teacher’s role becomes a guide organizer, a careful planner, facilitator, and a resource person responding to language needs in terms of vocabulary, language forms, and skills. Even though project work is not free from challenges both for students and teachers in language classrooms, most educators and specialists agree that the

advantages of project work in L2 language classrooms are considerable (Alan & Stoller, in press)

“The improvement project” for example is viewed as a good example of a project. Christina Carmelich, a sixth grade teacher in San Mateo County, working with Hudi Podolsky of Hewlett Packard, and her sixth graders planned and participated in this project (San Mateo County, 2003). This project was described for an elementary level of students and lasted several months. This project is viewed as a good example of incorporating most of the key concepts of project work - real world connection, collaboration, student direction, assessment, extended time frame, curricular content and multimedia. The topic of this project was about a problem defined by the students in their schools. That is students were required to define a problem, such as quality of bathrooms or quality of food in the cafeteria in their school and develop a survey about the problem. After they defined the problem based on their survey among the other students, the students were required to develop their suggestions into a multimedia presentation. During the project there was a member of the business community who came as a weekly visitor and helped students to go beyond the classroom to gather data and collaborate with other people. The Improvement project is not only a good example of project-based learning but also project assessment allowing the teachers to evaluate students’ on-going progress and their group and individual performance.

In this section we have overviewed, project work both as an instructional approach and as alternative assessment tool and provided some project examples. Since the main focus in this study is to investigate teachers’ attitudes towards projects in both functions, the next section will present teachers’ attitudes towards

alternative assessments.

Instructors' Attitudes towards Alternative Assessment, Project Work In Particular

Project work both as alternative assessment and as an instructional approach have received increasing attention in various educational systems (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Stoller & Alan in press). Successful innovations are not as common as they are sometimes reported to be (Tabarlet, 1996). Tabarlet (1996) attributes this to differing teacher and administrator variables. While administrators are at the point of adoption of new methods and techniques, teachers have the first responsibilities in implementing those techniques in the classroom (Parish and Arends, 1983). Tabarlet (1996) in his analysis found that administrator variables did not prove to be good indicators of teacher implementation. He cited teachers' individual levels of knowledge as the most important variable affecting the success of implementation of instructional innovations, such as alternative assessments. In this respect, attitudes of teachers might be considered as one of the most significant factors in the success of implementation of any new educational proposal (Doukas, 1996). McMeniman & Evans (1998) state that effective adoption of new methods, such as alternative assessments or teaching techniques, are closely related to positive and promotional attitudes of teachers towards such projects. Therefore, "in order to introduce a new approach in the classroom it may be necessary for the teacher to revise, refine or change attitudes which may not be compatible with the principle of that approach" (Doukas, 1996, p. 188). This reality is described by Fullan (1991) as follows:

if there is to be an educational change it will require individuals who are a part of the change process to learn new skills, change their set behaviors and question their beliefs. People cannot be forced to change; individuals cannot be made to think differently or be imposed upon to develop new skills. The impact of an innovation will be limited unless a deeper change in the thinking of the individuals takes place. For substantive change to

occur, each individual teacher must work through the change process so that it has personal meaning for him or her. Neglecting to understand how individuals experience the change process is the primary reason (school) reforms are unsuccessful. Educational change depends on what teachers do and think (Fullan, 1991, p.117-118 cited in Dinçman, 2002).

Despite the fact that teacher attitudes and perceptions have a highly significant role in the success or the failure of implementation of any innovational approach in education, teacher attitudes have not been a major focus in second language research (Doukas, 1996). Different teacher attitudes and opinions about using alternative assessments might be related to variety of reasons, including their knowledge, training, as well as demographic variables such as subject area, experience, age, etc. (Tabarlet, 1998). The individual knowledge factor is seen as the most significant factor affecting attitudes of teachers. This suggests that the more that teachers are knowledgeable about functions and potential applications of using alternative assessments or new instructional ideas, such as projects, in classrooms, the more likely it is that they will accept and integrate those approaches in the curriculum and so in their classes (Akbaba & Kurubacak, 1998; Clark, 2000; McWilliams & Taylor, 1998 as cited in Önsoy, 2001; Skehan, 1998).

Teachers' negative attitudes might be related to several factors including teachers' set beliefs about new innovational approaches; their reluctance to change their usual methods; lack of self-efficacy; their lack of training and support from their administration, and their lack of knowledge and experience in using such alternatives (Bebell, O' Conner, O' Dwyer, & Russell, 2003; Dupagne & Krendl, 1992; Dusick, 1998; Ertmer, Addison, Lane, Ross, & Woods, 1999 as cited in Özsoy, 2001). According to Baylor and Ritchie (2002), the success or effective use of new methods depends on teachers' receptivity to the new instructional ideas and

willingness to take risks, and on their knowledge and practice in using the proposed new ideas (as cited in Özsoy, 2001).

In this respect, if we understand what present teacher attitudes are towards use of projects as alternative assessment tools and as instructional tools, we can better provide teachers with informational guidelines and structures for administrative support – training sessions, focus group discussions, and inclusion of teacher representatives in decision-making in respect to these proposals. Through timing and provision of support structures, the effectiveness of implementing project work in ELT classes at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English can be maximized.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the literature on project work in educational settings, both as an instructional approach and as alternative assessment type. This chapter also provided background information about the role of teachers and administrators' attitudes in implementing innovative language teaching proposals, such as the use of projects as alternative instructional approaches and assessment techniques. The next chapter will describe the methodology of the study covering information about the participants, instruments, and data collection procedures and data analysis of the study.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This survey study focuses on the attitudes of instructors and administrators at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English in respect to implementation of project work in their department. The research questions below will be answered in this study:

1. What are instructors' attitudes about use of project work as an instructional approach?
2. What are instructors' attitudes about use of project work as alternative assessment tool?
3. What are administrators' views on project work in their curriculum?

This chapter outlines the methodology selected for this study and explains the rationale for selecting the methodology. In the sections below information about the participants, instruments, and data collection procedures and finally data analysis will be given.

Participants

Since the major purpose of the study was to investigate instructors and administrators' attitudes towards project work in ELT classrooms at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign languages Basic English Department, the participants comprised all the staff members of the department. There were two

groups of participants in this study. The first group of participants was made up of all the current English instructors at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign languages Basic English Department. The second group of participants was composed of the administrators of the department. While the English instructors participated in both questionnaire and interviews, the administrators only participated in interviews.

There are 45 English instructors and three administrators who are currently working at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign languages Basic English Department. As this is a survey study, data were collected through interviews and questionnaires. Both of the data collection procedures were piloted, before they were conducted in order to explore whether there should be any changes in the final versions of the questions.

Piloting

From the 45 English instructors, 10 instructors were selected for the pilot study. Ten instructors participated in the questionnaire piloting, and two participants took part in the pilot for the interview procedure. The instructors who participated in the pilot study did not participate in the actual study. The instructors who participated in the pilot study were selected so as to provide a broad background. The instructors were intentionally selected according to their background information such as teaching experience and their educational training. The reason for selecting participants carefully for the pilot study was to make sure that the questions were understandable and interpretable for every instructor. The background information of the instructors who participated in the pilot study is as shown in the table below:

Table 1

Background information of the instructors participating in the pilot study of questionnaire

Total years teaching experience	1 to 5 years 5	6 and above 5	Total 10
Educational background	MA 2	BA 8	Total 10
The departments the instructors graduated from	ELL 5	ELT 5	Total 10

The questionnaire used in the study was piloted in the first week of March. The pilot study revealed that some parts of the questionnaires needed to be revised. The questionnaire and interviews, revised on the basis of pilot feedback, were distributed to the remaining 35 instructors in the last week of March. Four of the remaining instructors chose not to participate in the study. Therefore, there were 31 instructors who participated in the questionnaire section of the study.

Because the major change in the assessment system from using only tests to including projects was a school management decision, it was decided to include all of the administrators currently working at the department in the study. The administrators were to be interviewed as to their original intentions and expectations in regards to implementation of project work in the department. There are three administrators in the department: the director of the department and two assistants to the director. The interview questions for the administrators were piloted with one of the assistants to the director. Therefore, there were two administrators who participated in the actual interviews of the study.

There were five volunteer instructors who participated in the interviews.

The reason for choosing volunteer teachers for the interviews was that volunteer instructors are, as a rule, more enthusiastic in responding to interviews in greater detail.

In the next section of the chapter the instruments used in the study will be introduced in detail.

Instruments

A questionnaire and two interviews were used to collect data in this study. The questionnaire comprised the first stage of the data collection procedure, since the results of the questionnaire would inform the items to be covered in the interviews to be held. The interview data were collected in face-to-face meetings.

Questionnaire

The first stage of the data collection procedure was the collection of questionnaire data from KTU teachers. The reason for using a questionnaire as a research instrument is that it requires little time, is easy to process, makes group comparisons easy and is useful for testing specific hypotheses.

The questionnaire was given to the teachers to discover their understanding of projects and their attitudes towards project work as an alternative assessment and project work as an instructional approach. The questionnaire was made up of eleven parts. The questionnaire parts were composed of 4-point and 5-point Likert-scale type items.

The first four items Part A, B, C, D, (See appendix A) comprised demographic questions. These items gathered information about instructors' individual characteristics in terms of teaching experience, educational background, levels of classes currently taught and gender differences. These were factors that

might influence participants in regards to thoughts on project work and language teaching, in general.

Part E (See appendix A) was designed to discover the teachers' opinions about the receptivity of KTU as an institution to new instructional ideas.

Part F (See appendix A) was designed to discover how familiar participants were with the idea of using projects as part of the second language curriculum. It was felt that familiarity might be an important factor affecting instructor attitudes and perceptions towards using projects, both in their student assessments and teaching processes. 4-point Likert-scale type questions were used in part F.

The questions in part G (See appendix A) were designed to investigate instructors' views on provision of training in preparation for adoption of projects in their classrooms. 4-point Likert-scale type questions were used in part G.

Part H (See appendix A) was designed to find out teachers' opinions about employing project work as an alternative assessment in ELT classrooms. 4-point Likert-scale type questions were used in part H.

Both the questions in part I and part J (See appendix A) were designed mainly to discover the instructors' opinions about the usefulness of using projects as an instructional approach. 5-point Likert-scale type questions were used both in part I and J.

Part K (See appendix A) consisted of items to find out the teachers' attitudes towards project work in its combined function as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach in ELT classrooms. Questions in Part K were designed on a 5-point Likert scale.

Interviews

Interviews were to be conducted with both of the two groups of participants, administrators and volunteer instructors (See appendices B and C for interview schedules), in order to gain a deeper understanding about their attitudes towards project work. The first interviews were to be done with the administrators currently working at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign languages Basic English Department. The purpose of the interviews conducted with the school administrators is to find out their understanding of project work and their expectations about using project work both as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach in the department. The interview with the school administrators would help me to preparing and revising the interview questions used in the instructor studies.

The second phase of the interviews was conducted with instructors. There were five volunteer instructors willing to participate in the interviews. The reason for choosing volunteer teachers is that the volunteer teachers may be more thoughtful and thorough in their responses. In the interviews, the data were collected in face-to-face meetings. The reason for choosing face to face interviews was that they are more reliable and authentic than interviews conducted by e-mail, or by memo. Also the number of face to face interview responses to be processed can be determined exactly.

Data Collection Procedures

I already had oral permission from the head of the Department of School of Foreign languages at Karadeniz Technical University to conduct this study. I obtained the official permission letter by the 25th of February. The pilot study was

done in the first week of March.

Ten volunteer teachers currently working at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign languages Basic English Department took part in the pilot study in order to ensure that all the items in each questionnaire were clear enough for the participants to understand. It took ten to fifteen minutes for the teachers to answer the questionnaire. The results of piloted questionnaire revealed that there was a need to make several changes in order to make some questions clearer and more focused. The revised questionnaire was completed by mid March and the final questionnaire administrated to the participating instructors at the end of March.

The questionnaire data was analyzed using the Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0 version). After completing the entry of the data, the frequencies and mean scores of the results for the perceptions and attitudes of the teachers towards project work in ELT classrooms were reviewed and interpreted.

The second phase of data collection involved interviews both with instructors and program administrators. After collecting and scanning the questionnaire responses, the interview questions and schedules were determined. There were two different sets of interview questions, one for program instructors and the other for program administrators. The first draft of the questions in the interviews was piloted in the second week of April. The interviews were revised and conducted in the first week of May.

Data Analysis

In this study both qualitative and quantitative data collection procedures were used. There were two sets of data used in data analysis procedures: questionnaire responses and interviews.

First, the data was collected through a Likert scale type questionnaire and was analyzed quantitatively. The second set of data was gathered through interviews and was analyzed qualitatively.

The gathered data both from pilot and the actual study was statistically analyzed by using SPSS (13.0 version). An ANOVA test was run, and the results revealed that there was no significant relationship between demographic variables and instructors' attitudes towards project work. Thus, the demographic data of the first questionnaire section were not used as variables for analysis of the questionnaire responses. The questionnaire was composed of 42 Likert scale questions (See appendix A), and the data from these questions was entered using SPSS (13.0 version). The frequencies and the mean scores for each item were calculated in order to find out both the general and specific views of instructors towards use of project work in ELT classrooms.

The researcher then analyzed the qualitative data gathered from interviews conducted with administrators and program instructors. After the interviews were transcribed, the responses were categorized and coded in respect to different aspects of project work in ELT classrooms.

Conclusion

In this chapter the site of the study was discussed. Then, the subjects who were involved in this survey study were introduced. General information about the purpose of the study and the specific research questions were detailed. Finally, the instruments used, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures were discussed.

The next chapter will discuss the results of the data gathered through both qualitative and quantitative data collection procedures. In the first section, the data

gathered from the questionnaire conducted with the program instructors will be presented. The second section of the data analysis chapter will present the results of data gathered through interviews.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study was conducted in order to investigate the attitudes of administrators and instructors of English towards the use of project work in ELT classrooms at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English. The research questions posed for this study were as follows:

Research Questions

1. What are teachers' attitudes about use of project work as an instructional approach?
2. What are teachers' attitudes about use of project work as alternative assessment tool?
3. What are administrators' views on project work in their curriculum?

Data Analysis Procedures

In this study both qualitative and quantitative data collection procedures were used. There were two sets of data used in data analysis procedures: questionnaire and interviews. The first set of data was gathered through a Likert scale questionnaire and was analyzed quantitatively. The second data sample was collected through interviews and was analyzed qualitatively.

Quantitative Data Analysis – Questionnaire Data

The quantitative phase of data analysis was the analysis of the Likert scale questionnaire. The questionnaire was composed of 42 Likert scale items (See appendix A) and the data from these questions was entered using SPSS (13.0 version). The frequencies and the mean scores for each item were calculated in order to find out the general tendency of instructors towards use of project work in ELT classrooms.

The questionnaire was composed of three parts: the preliminary section of the questionnaire is composed of questions investigating demographic information about the instructors. The second section is composed of questions designed to understand participating instructors' attitudes towards using projects as alternative assessment tools. In the third section, the results of instructors' opinions about using project work as an instructional approach in ELT classrooms is presented. The questionnaire was composed of 11 parts: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K. Demographic information about the participants was collected by the questions in parts A, B, C, D, E, F. For the summary of original questionnaire, Table 2 is provided below:

Table 2

Original Questionnaire Section

P	NI	Item Topic
A	1	Total number of years of teaching experience
B	1	Total number of years of teaching experience, specially at KTU
C	1	Level of students instructors are currently teaching
D	1	Educational background of instructors
E	1	Instructors' attitudes towards the institute as welcoming innovations
F	1	Instructors' familiarity in using projects for instruction and assessment
G	5	The form of help in using projects that instructors need
H	5	Instructors' attitudes toward the usefulness of projects in assessing students' language skills
I	6	Instructors' attitudes toward the usefulness of projects in teaching skills
J	8	Instructors' opinions about the aspects of projects that students like
K	17	Instructors' opinions of projects, both in their teaching and assessment roles
TOTAL: 11 sections ; 47 items		

Note: P = Questionnaire part; NI = Number of items in the section

For data analysis purposes, responses to the questionnaire were broken down into three particular sections. The preliminary section of the questionnaire is composed of questions investigating demographic information about instructors. The second section is composed of questions designed to understand participating instructors' attitudes towards using projects as alternative assessment tools. In the third section of the chapter, the results of instructors' opinions about using projects as an instructional approach in ELT classrooms is presented. For the summary of the data analysis structure, Table 3 below is provided

Table 3

The structure of data analysis

Sections	Parts Covered	Purposes
Section 1	A&B&C&D&E&F	Background information of the participants
Section 2	H & K	Teachers attitudes towards using projects as alternative assessment tools in ELT classes
Sub-section 1	H 1, H2	Usefulness of projects in assessing working skills (group work and individual work)
Sub-section 2	H3, H4, H5, H6, K5	Usefulness of projects in assessing four language skills such as reading, writing, listening and speaking,
Sub-section 3	K3, K9, K14	Instructors' opinions towards using project assessment versus traditional testing methods
Sub-section 4	K13, K11, K7, K3, K8	Instructors' opinions towards projects in assessing student projects
Section 3	I & J & K	Instructors' attitudes towards using projects as instructional tools in ELT classes
Sub-section 1	J1, J2, J3, J4, J5, J6, J7, J8	Instructors views on using projects in teaching working skills (group work and individual work)
Sub-section 2	I 3, I 4, I 5, I6	Using projects in teaching language skills
Sub-section 3	I.1, I.2	Using projects to promote language learning strategies
Sub-section 4	K15, K16	Using projects to lower language anxiety.

Background Information about the Participants

The first section includes item parts A, B, C, D, E, F. Each demographic information item was composed of a single question designed to ask participants' A, 'teaching experience as English teachers, in general'; B, 'teaching experience as instructors at KTU'; C, 'the level of students they are currently teaching'; D, educational background, in terms of departmental major of graduation.

Demographic information gathered through the first part of questionnaire will be presented in four tables. Table 4 gives information about participants' total years of experience, Table 5 shows the teaching experience at KTU of the subjects who participated in the study, Table 6 provides information about the level of students respondent teachers are currently teaching, Table 7 gives educational background information about the participants.

The aim of designing demographic questions was to investigate if instructors' backgrounds might affect their attitudes towards projects. ANOVA tests were run to answer this question, but the results revealed that there are no significant relationships between demographic differences and instructors' attitudes towards project work.

Table 4

Total Years of Teaching Experience (Part A)

	N	F	P
1 to 5 years	31	13	41.9%
6 to 10 years	31	9	29.0%
11 to 15 years	31	4	12.9%
16 to 20 years	31	4	12.9%
21 to 25 years	31	1	3.2%
Total	31	31	100.0

Note. N= number of the participants; F= Frequency; P= Percentage

Table 4 shows the general teaching experience of the 31 instructors who participated in the actual study. As seen in Table 4, the majority of the participants (41%) are novice teachers in the field with between 1 and 5 years experience. The second largest group (29%) has been in the field 6 to 10 years. The third and forth groups are composed of 4 subjects for each block 16 to 20 years (12.9%) and 21 to 25 years (12.9%) There is only one subject who has been in the field 21 to 25 years.

Table 5

Total Years of Teaching Experience at KTU (Part B)

	N	F	P
1 to 5 years	31	20	64.5%
6 to 10 years	31	8	25.8%
11 to 15 years	31	3	9.7%
Total	31	31	100.0

Note. N= Number of the participants; F= Frequency; P= Percentage

As can be seen in Table 5, the majority of the respondents are new instructors teaching at KTU. The majority (64.5%) of the instructors have been at KTU 1 to 5 years. There are 8 subjects who have been at KTU for 6 to 10 years, and there are three instructors who have been at KTU for 11 to 15 years.

Table 6

Level of students instructors are currently teaching (Part C)

	N	F	P
Pre-intermediate	31	6	19.4%
Intermediate	31	3	9.7%
Beginner & pre-intermediate	31	3	9.7%
Beginner & pre-intermediate & intermediate	31	5	16.1%
Beginner & pre-intermediate & intermediate & upper-intermediate	31	3	9.7%
Pre-intermediate & intermediate	31	11	35.5%
Total	31	31	100.0

Note. N= Number of the participants; F= Frequency; P= percentage

Table 6 shows that the plurality of the instructors participating in the study (35%) are teaching students at the pre-intermediate and intermediate levels. 19% of the respondents are teaching students at the pre-intermediate level.. The results show that the frequency level is the same for the three other levels shown in the table.

Table 6 also indicates that many of the instructors teach mixed levels of students.

While there are 9 instructors who teach solely pre-intermediate (6) or intermediate (3) levels of students, there are 22 instructors who teach students at various levels.

Table 7

Educational background (Part D)

	N	F	P
English language teaching (ELT)	31	19	61.3%
English language literature (ELL)	31	10	32.3%
Total	31	31	100.0

Note. N= Number of the participants; F= Frequency; P= Percentage

As can be seen in Table 7, the majority of the participants had their training in an ELT department. 19 participants graduated from an ELT department, and 10 participants graduated from ELL department.

Table 8

Institutional receptiveness to innovations (Part E)

	N	F	P
very receptive	31	10	32.3%
somewhat receptive	31	17	54.8%
not sure	31	3	9.7%
unreceptive	31	1	3.2%
Total	31	31	100.0

Note. N= Number of the participants; F= Frequency; P= percentage

Table 8 is designed to show teachers' opinions about the receptivity of KTU to new instructional ideas. As can be seen in the table the majority of the respondents think that KTU is quite receptive to new instructional ideas. The majority of the respondents think that their institution is somewhat receptive or very receptive to new ideas, with the proportion being 89.1 percent. There is only one respondent who thinks KTU is unreceptive to new instructional ideas.

The item in Part F was designed to investigate how familiar the instructors are

with the notion of project work in ELT classrooms. Results are as shown in Table 9 below. Since all instructors are involved with implementation of project work in their classes no provision was made for the response “unfamiliar.”

Table 9

Familiarity of the instructors with the project work

	N	F	P
Very familiar	31	7	22.6%
Quite familiar	31	15	48.4%
Slightly familiar	31	9	29.0%
Total	31	31	100.0

Note: N= number of the participants; F= Frequency; P= Percentage

As can be seen in Table 9, the large majority of the respondents say that they are quite familiar with the notion of project work in ELT classrooms. While 71 percent of the participants say that they are very or quite familiar with project work, 29% of the participants say that they are slightly familiar with project work.

Responses to the questions covered in this section of the questionnaire were not significantly correlated with other question responses in the questionnaire as previously noted.

Instructors' Attitudes towards Using Projects as an Alternative Assessment Tool

This section covers parts H and K in the questionnaire designed to investigate teachers' attitudes towards using projects as alternative assessment tools. The results of this section will be presented under four subsections: (i) usefulness of projects in assessing working group skills (group work performance and individual work performance), (ii) usefulness of projects in assessing the four language skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking, (iii) project assessment versus traditional testing methods, and (iv) assessing particular student projects.

The results indicate that the majority of the instructors participating in the study find projects useful and satisfying as alternative assessment instruments both for assessing language skills and language performance. Most participants provided positive responses towards using project assessments when asked their views on project assessment versus traditional tests. However, the results of this section also revealed that instructors have some concerns about using projects as alternative assessment instruments and have some difficulties in assessing projects.

All items in the following tables were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, 13, 0 version) to identify instructors' attitudes towards use of project work as an alternative assessment tool in ELT classes. Frequency values, means and standard deviations were computed and used to analyze the data.

Using projects in assessing students' working group skills

The first sub-section (H 1, H2), explores instructors' opinions towards using projects in assessing working group skills (group work and individual work). Table 10 below summarizes the H 1 and H 2 results. (Note: low means are most positive responses.)

Table 10

Using projects in assessing students' working skills

Items	N	MS	U	NS	DN	M	Sd
H 1 Assessing working in groups	31	9	16	6	0	1.90	0.70
H 2 Assessing individual work	31	13	14	3	1	1.74	0.77
Total	31	22	30	9	1	1.82	0.74

Note. N= Number of the participants; MS = Most useful (1); U = Useful (2); NS = Not so useful (3); DN = Do not know (4) M= Mean Sd= Standard deviation

As can be seen in Table 10 the majority of the participants agree that projects are useful or most useful assessment tools in testing students' performance in both

individual work and group work. 25 respondents reported that project assessments are useful tools in assessing group work, while 6 respondents think projects are not so useful in assessing group performance.

In terms of using projects to assess individual work, 27 subjects think that projects are useful (14) or the most useful (13) assessments in assessing individual work, while 3 felt projects are not so useful in this function. The results reveal that the majority of participants find projects slightly more useful in assessing students' individual performance than in assessing students' group performance

Using projects in assessing students' language skills

The second sub-section covers questions H3 H4 H5 H6, and presents the instructors attitudes towards using projects in assessing students' language skills.

Responses to four questions of H3 H4 H5 H6, were analyzed, Table 11 below summarizes the results.

Table 11

Using projects in assessing students' language skills

Items	N	MS	U	NS	DN	M	Sd
H.3 Assessing writing	31	8	19	2	1	1.87	0.68
H.4Assessing listening	31	3	22	5	1	2.13	0.62
H.5Assessing speaking	31	12	19	0	0	1.61	0.50
H.6Assessing reading	31	8	18	2	1	1.86	0.69
Total	31	31	78	9	3	1.87	0.62

Note: N= Number of the participants; MS = Most useful (1); U = Useful (2); NS = Not so useful (3); DN = Do not know (4) M= Mean Sd= Standard deviation

Instructors found projects most useful in assessing language skills in speaking, reading, writing and listening in that order. The overall mean value for the items in Table 11 was found to be 1.87. All respondents (31) found projects useful in assessing speaking.

Table 12

Projects in assessing students' language skill progress

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K.5.I can assess my students' language progress in detail through projects	1	6	17	7	1	-	2.1	0.75
K.11.I find it hard to assess specific student skills....	31	1	8	10	7	5	3.2	1.12
Total	31	7	25	17	8	5	2.6	0.63

Note. SA= strongly agree (1); A= agree (2); U= uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5) M=mean; Sd= standard deviation

As can be seen in Table 12, the majority of the respondents state that they can assess their students' language skill progress in detail through projects. There were 23 respondents who agree or strongly agree with the statement. The mean value for item K 5 was found to be 2.1.

Table 12 also shows that respondents were more divided on the issue of using projects to assess specific language skills. Twelve respondents indicated that they did not find it hard to assess specific language skills using projects. However, 9 respondents took an opposite view, and there were also ten responses indicating uncertainty. These uncertain responses might be a consequence of the notion (Booth, 1986) that projects are better for assessing integration of skills rather than individual skills. The results of Table 11 and Table 12 in this section indicates that instructors are mostly satisfied with using projects as alternative assessment tools in assessing their students' performance.

Another item 'K17 – "Projects are useful assessment tools for only upper-level students" was designed to investigate instructors' attitudes towards using project assessment for different levels of students. Question K17 was designed to sample instructors' opinions about the appropriate level of students for which project

assessment is appropriate. (Since this item indicates a somewhat negative/restricted view of projects it was reversed scored.)

Table 13

Using projects for only upper-level students

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K17- Projects are useful assessment tools for <i>only</i> upper-level students.	31	7	8	5	8	3	2.74	1.34

Note. SA= strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= strongly disagree (5) M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

The results in Table 13 indicate that the plurality of the participating instructors think that projects are not useful assessment tools for *only* upper-level students with the mean score 2.74. The number of participants who disagree or strongly disagree (15) with the statement K17 ‘Projects are useful assessment tools for *only* upper-level students’ is greater than those who agree or strongly agree (11). This result also matches with the view (Booth, 2002) that project work assessment can be applied for every level of student and both native and non-native speakers.

We have overviewed instructors’ opinions about using project-based assessment tools in assessing students in ELT classrooms. The following sub-section will present teachers preferences in using project-based assessment versus traditional tests.

Instructors’ opinions towards project-based assessment versus traditional tests

The third sub-section includes questions, K3, K9, K14, and investigates instructors’ views about using project assessment versus traditional tests.

Responses to questions, K3, K9, and K14 were analyzed and are reported in the next two tables. (Since item K9 indicates a somewhat negative/restricted view of projects it was reversed scored.)

Table 14

Instructors' views towards project-based assessment versus traditional testing

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K.3.I like using projects to assess students' language skills.	31	7	22	2	-	-	1.84	0.52
K.9.Pencil-paper tests ...give better evidence of a student's...	31	8	9	8	5	1	2.41	1.15
K.14.Through projects ... which cannot be evaluated with tests.	31	7	22	2	-	-	1.84	0.52
Total	31	15	49	12	9	8	2.03	0.73

Note. SA= strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5) M=mean Sd= standard deviation

The first item in Table 14 reveals that the majority of instructors (29) like “using Projects to assess students’ language skills.” For item K9 (reverse scored approximately three times as many instructors disagree with the statement, “Pencil-paper tests (e.g. multiple choice tests) give better evidence of a student’s language ability than projects can provide” as there are those who agree with this statement. The mean score for item K9 found 2.41.

As for item K14, Table 12 reveals that the majority of the instructors reported that “Through projects we can evaluate learning outcomes, which cannot be evaluated with paper and pencil tests” with the mean value 1.84. Table 14 shows that 29 of 31 respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement and none disagree, This may be interpreted as a broad vote of confidence for project-based assessment or, more narrowly, that particular kinds of learning outcomes lend themselves best to project-based assessment.

Table 15

Instructors' Confidence in Using Projects versus Traditional Tests in Assessing Language Skills

Items	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K.6. I feel more confident using traditional tests in assessing language skills.	2	8	10	10	1	3.00	1.00

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

Since this item indicates a somewhat negative/restricted view of projects, it was reversed scored. An almost equal number agree (10) as disagree (11) with the statement "I feel more confident using traditional tests in assessing language skills" with the mean value 3.00. Almost the same number (10) is uncertain as to their views on this statement. These split responses in Table 15 may reflect the views of instructors who feel somewhat positive about the use of project-based assessment in principle, but are uneasy about their own confidence/experience in using such assessment measures in place of more familiar traditional tests.

However, the results indicated that participating instructors are in favor of a combination of both traditional tests and projects as an alternative assessment in student evaluation as shown in Table 16 below.

Table 16

Combination of Projects and Traditional Testing

	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K13. We should use some combination of projects and traditional testing	31	10	13	6	2	-	2.00	0.89

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5) M= Mean Sd= Standard deviation

Table 16 indicates that 23 instructors (89%) agree or strongly agree with the statement K13 'We should use some combination of projects and traditional testing', suggesting that they favored a mix assessment types, a combination of projects and

traditional testing methods. There were only two respondents who disagree with this statement.

We have overviewed instructors' general views towards project-based assessment versus traditional testing in this section. The next sub-section will present instructors' attitudes towards assessing student projects.

Instructors' opinions towards assessing student projects

In this last sub-section of the second section, questions K3 K7 K8 will be analyzed to explore instructors' opinions on assessing students' projects.

Table 17

Assessing students projects on a continuing basis or as an end product

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K 8-I Assess each student project on a continuing basis.	30	3	15	11	1	-	2.33	0.71

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

As can be inferred from the Table 17, the majority of the respondents (18/30) reported that they assess student projects on a continuing basis. While there were 18 respondents who stated that they assess students' projects on a continuing basis, 11 of the respondents were uncertain as to continuing assessment throughout the projects. This may indicate that there is some disagreement on the statement or a sensed ambiguity in the statement.

Table 18

Using Scales in Assessing Projects

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K7-The scales for skill assessment that we use assist me. . . .	29	2	16	7	4	-	2.45	0.83

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

The majority of the participants (18/29) (mean score 2.45) responded that they benefit from the scoring scales they are given to assess student projects.

Although many of the participating instructors are in favor of the grading rubrics they are provided, they still report having grading problems. One of the problems they reported in assessing projects is that projects take extra work time. Table 19 below was designed to explore instructors' opinions on this timing issue.

Table 19

Timing in Assessing Projects

	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K3-Assessing projects requires a large amount of work time	31	10	13	2	6	-	2.13	1.09

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

Table 19 shows that the majority of the participants reported that assessing projects requires a large amount of time. While 23 of the participants chose the strongly agree (10) or agree (13) response, there were 6 instructors who do think that a long time is required to assess projects.

The timing issue was the one most frequently addressed by the instructors in the interviews as well. The major point complaint about timing was that they could not fairly evaluate all the projects as completely as required. (In each unit, the students are expected to complete three projects in each of three language skill classes - reading, writing and speaking. Nine projects are required over a semester.

Instructors' Attitudes towards Using Projects as Instructional Tools

This section covers questions designed to investigate teachers' attitudes towards using projects as instructional tools. These questions comprise parts I1, I 2, I 3, I 4, I 5, I 6 & J1 to I 8 and the items K1 and K 2 in the questionnaire. The results

of this section will be presented under four subsections: instructors views (i) on using projects in teaching working group skills; (ii) on using projects in teaching language skills, (iii) students attitudes towards aspects of projects (from the teachers' point of view) and (iv) on using projects to lower language anxiety.

The results indicated that the majority of the instructors who participated in the study find project work useful and satisfying as an instructional tool both in teaching language generally and in helping students improve specific skills. The plurality of the participants provided positive responses towards using project-based instruction in their classrooms.

Each item in the tables below was analyzed using the Statistical Package For Social Science (SPSS 13, 0 version) to identify instructors' attitudes towards use of project work as an instructional approach in ELT classes. The frequencies, means, standard deviations were computed and displayed in the tables/

Instructors' views on using projects in teaching working group skills

The first sub-section covers items which explore the instructors' opinions towards using projects in teaching working group skills. Three questions, I 1, I2 and K2, were analyzed and reported in Table 20 below, to present teachers attitudes towards project work as an instructional approach in teaching working group skills. Table 20, indicates instructor responses to using projects in (i) teaching group work and (ii) teaching independent work.

Table 20

Using projects in teaching working skills

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
I1 Teaching working in groups	31	13	15	2	1	-	1.71	0.74
I 2Teaching working independently	31	12	15	2	2	-	1.67	0.61
K.2 Projects help students become more independent learners.	31	21	8	2	-	-	1.39	0.62
Total	31	46	38	6	3	0	1.81	0.72

Note. SA= strongly agree (1); A= agree (2); U= uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= strongly disagree (5) M=mean Sd= standard deviation

Table 20 shows that the majority of participating instructors are in favor of using projects in teaching working skills, with the average mean value 1.81 for the three items. The number of respondents who find projects useful tools in teaching working skills is almost unanimous on all three items. This result also corresponds with the general information about projects in the literature which states that projects are useful in support of “problem solving skills, group working skills, taking responsibility for conducting projects and expressing ideas” (Katz & Chards 1998)

Instructors' views on using projects in teaching language skills

The second sub-section includes questions I 3, I 4, I 5, I.6 which investigate instructors' views on using projects in teaching (as contrasted with assessing) language skills. Four questions were analyzed and the results summarized in Table 21.

Table 21

Using projects in teaching language skills

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
I 3 Teaching writing	30	9	20	1	-	-	1.73	0.52
I 4 Teaching listening	31	5	19	7	-	-	2.06	0.63
I 5 Teaching speaking	31	15	16		-	-	1.52	0.51
I 6 Teaching reading	30	7	20	3	-		1.87	0.57
Total	31	36	75	11	0	0	1.80	0.56

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

In all four items I3, I4, I5, I6, the results support the idea that the majority of English instructors participating in the study see projects as useful tools for skills instruction. As can be shown in Table 21, the majority of the respondents agree that projects are seen as useful tools in teaching language skills, with the overall mean value 1.80. There was no one who disagrees or strongly disagrees with any of the statements. However, there are 11 uncertain responses about use of projects in teaching language skills with 7 of the uncertain responses concerned with use of projects to support teaching of listening.. Table 21 indicates that projects are seen as most useful in teaching the skills of speaking, writing, reading and listening in that order. This parallels with the project assessment data in Table 11. The overall results of this section can be compared to the preceding discussion about the usefulness of projects as a form of alternative assessment of language skills.

In sum, the majority of participating instructors' view projects as slightly more valued as instructional tools than as alternative assessment tools. However, there seems to general agreement among participants that they find that projects are useful tools both for teaching and assessing students' language performance. This issue is dealt with directly in item K 1 as shown in Table 22 below.

Table 22

Instructors' view on usefulness of projects as a combination of assessment and teaching

Item	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K1. Projects are useful tools for teachers both for teaching and assessing...	31	18	13	-	-	-	1.42	0.50

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

As can be seen in Table 22, there is no disagreement on the statement in K1 that 'Projects are useful tools for teachers both for teaching and assessing'. All of the participants agree or strongly agree that projects are useful tools both for teaching and assessing students' language performance, with the mean value 1.42. On this statement there is unanimous agreement.

Using projects in promoting motivation and lowering language anxiety

The third sub-section includes questions K 15 & K 16 that investigate instructors' views on using projects to promote student motivation and active learning. Two questions in part K (K 15 and K 16) are analyzed in Table 23 below:

Table 23

Using projects to promote active learning and motivation

Items	N	SA	A	U	D	SD	M	Sd
K15-Projects help students become more active learners in the classroom	31	18	12	1	-	-	1.48	0.68
K 16-Projects help classrooms become more enjoyable places for students	31	13	13	5	-	-	1.74	0.73
Total	31	31	25	6	8	7	1.61	0.70

Note. SA= Strongly agree (1); A= Agree (2); U= Uncertain (3); D= Disagree (4); SD= Strongly disagree (5); M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

As can be seen from Table 21, the majority of the respondents provided positive answers to items K 15 and K 16, with an overall mean value 1.61. There was no disagreement expressed on either statement. These results indicate that instructors

find projects satisfying in terms of promoting “active learning”. This result also supports the idea in the literature which states that ‘Project work gives students opportunity to have active roles in almost every stage of a project; selecting the topic and deciding on the method they are going to use to conduct the project’ (Stoller, 1997).

While participants agreed that projects help students become more active learners, five instructors were uncertain whether projects, in fact, made the classroom any more enjoyable. The next section presents students’ attitudes towards aspects of project-based instruction from the teachers’ point of view as shown in Table 24 below:

Table 24

Students’ attitudes towards aspects of project-based instruction from teachers’ point of view

Items	N	RL	L	N	D	RD	M	Sd
J 1-Working in groups	30	5	13	8	4	-	2,37	0,93
J 2-Real world topics	30	12	16	2	-	-	1,67	0,61
J 3-Learning information search strategies	28	3	16	6	2	1	2,69	2,00
J 4-Motivation for using all language skills	29	3	14	10	2	-	2,38	0,78
J 5-Using internet for their research	30	12	13	3	2	-	1,83	0,87
J 6-Assessment rather than testing	29	6	15	8	-	-	2,07	0,70
J 7-Improvement of speaking in public	29	7	14	7	1	-	2,07	0,80
J 8-Building general knowledge	29	5	16	5	2	1	2,24	0,95
Total	31	53	117	49	13	2	2,16	0,95

Note: RL= Really like (1); L=like (2); N=neutral (3); D=dislike (4); RD=really dislike (5) M= Mean; Sd= Standard deviation

As can be seen in Table 24, responding instructors think that their students like both aspects of project work - project-based learning and project-based assessment. Table 21 shows that the total number of the responses indicating that students like or really like different aspects of projects (170) is more than the number

of responses indicating that students are neutral (49), dislike (13) or really dislike (2) different aspects of projects.

The items covered in Table 21 will be presented separately since each of them represents different aspects of project work.

The first item "Working in groups" in the Table 21 shows that the majority of the participants share the idea that students like working in groups while conducting their projects. However, as we will later note, the results of the interviews reveal that the projects used in KTU are usually individual work projects

The second item in the table regarding authenticity in tasks revealed that real world topics are that aspect of projects most appealing to students' interests. As can be seen in Table 12, the number of participants who think students like or really like real world topics is 28/30. There was no one who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

The third item "learning information search strategies" in Table 24 indicates that instructors suppose that the majority of the students like learning information search strategies while conducting their projects. The number of respondent instructors who assume that students like or really like (19) is more than the number of those who assume that students dislike (2) or really dislike (1) this aspect of projects.

The fourth item "motivation for using all language skills" in Table 21 indicates that instructors suppose that their students like being motivated for using a variety of language skills through projects. Although the number of the respondents who think that students like or really like this aspect of projects composes the

majority (17/29), there were 10 respondents who were uncertain on this statement. This statement had the weakest response among the 8 items in the table.

The fifth item, “using internet for their research” was considered the second most attractive aspect of projects for students. As can be seen in the table, the number of participants who think the students like or really like using internet for research is 25/30.

The sixth item “assessment rather than testing” in Table 21, shows that according to the instructors, students seem to like project-based assessment more than traditional pencil-paper tests.. There were 21 participants who felt their students like or really like assessment through projects rather than standard testing.

The seventh item “improvement of speaking in public”, shows that the majority of respondents support the idea that students like the idea of projects as improving their speaking skill in public. As can be seen in the table, there were 21 participants who felt that their students like (14) or really like (7) improving their speaking skill in public.

The eighth and the last item “building general knowledge”, reveals that the majority (21/29) of the participants agree that students like the fact that projects promote their general knowledge.

In sum, all student attitudes towards projects assumed by instructors had high positive values. The most clearly attractive aspects of projects was that they allowed students to pursue real world topics and to use the internet as a major instrument in their project work.

We have overviewed and analyzed the results of quantitative data gathered through questionnaires in this section. The next section will present the results of qualitative data gathered through interviews.

Qualitative Data-Interview Data

This part of data analysis chapter is composed of the analysis of qualitative data gathered through interviews with the five volunteer instructors and administrators of the department. The analysis of the interviews will be presented in two different parts: Part 1 presents instructors attitudes and understanding of projects both as alternative assessments and instructional tools (see Appendix C for interview schedule for instructors). In the second part, the results of the interviews conducted with administrators to investigate administrators' views on using projects in the curriculum are discussed (see Appendix B for interview schedule for administrators).

The first part is composed of two sections: (a) 'instructors' opinions about project work as an alternative assessment; (b) 'instructors' attitudes towards project work as an instructional approach.

The first section of 'part one' is presented in six categories: A, 'Instructors' general understandings about project assessment'; B, 'Instructors' attitudes towards using projects as alternative assessment tools in ELT classes; C 'Instructors' opinions towards using project assessment versus traditional testing methods'; D 'Instructors' attitudes towards fairness of projects in assessing students; E. 'Students' attitudes towards project-based assessment from the instructors' point of view'; F "Current implementation of project instruction and assessments at the department' including sub-sections "topic selection", "assessing student projects", and "project samples implemented at KTU".

The second section of 'part one' is presented in two categories: A, 'Instructors' attitudes towards using projects as instructional tools in ELT classes is presented; B, 'Instructors' opinions to improve project approach in KTU'.

The second part of the qualitative data set includes three sections: A 'Administrators' views on using projects as alternative assessments'; B, 'Instructors' attitudes towards project-based assessment from the administrators' point of view'; C 'Administrators' views on using projects as instructional tools as opposed to more traditional text centered/teacher-oriented approaches'.

Table 25 categorizes the instructors' responses to the interviews.

Table 25

Categories of the instructors' responses to the interviews

Part 1a Assessment	PURPOSES
A	Instructors' general understandings about projects
B	Instructors' attitudes towards using projects as alternative assessment tools in ELT classes
C	Instructors' opinions towards using project assessment versus traditional testing methods
D	Instructors' attitudes towards fairness of projects in assessing students
E	Students' attitudes towards project-based assessment from the instructors' point of view
F	Current implementation of project instruction and assessments at the department
Part 1b Instruction	
A	Instructors' attitudes towards using projects as instructional tools in ELT classes
B	Instructors' Opinions to improve project approach in KTU
Part 2	Administrators' views on using projects in the program
A	Administrators' views on using projects as alternative assessments
B	Instructors' attitudes towards project-based assessments from the administrators' points of view
C	Administrators' views on using projects as instructional tools as opposed to traditional teacher-centered approaches

Instructors' Understandings of Projects in General

The responses to the questions 1 and 2 'What is your understanding of projects in general and can you give some examples of projects you have used this year' will be analyzed in this section. Instructors provided a variety of project examples and definitions of projects in response to questions 1 and 2. The results of the interviews conducted with five volunteer teachers revealed that most of the interviewees view projects as sets of tasks that allow students to perform and practice what they have studied in the classroom. The interview transcripts indicate that each of the participants provided similar responses, as seen from the interview samples quoted below.

Examples of instructors' definitions of projects

(Participant 1): Projects are kind of home-work assigned to students in respect to what they have learnt in the classroom. ...For example: last week we taught simple present tense and students were required to prepare a poster displaying their daily routine life based on simple present tense....

(Participant 2): Projects are assignments given to students to extend of knowledge of students after teaching something ... grammar subject revision, unforgettable event for you

(Participant 3): Projects are assignments to help students investigate and understand the subjects they have learnt in the class more easily

The definitions provided by the instructors indicate that they seem to be familiar with the project approach in their teaching. The definitions parallel the definitions in the literature, such as Hedge's (1993, p. 276) definition of a project as "an extended task, which usually integrates language skills work through a number of activities....". In addition to the definitions instructors gave a variety of project examples as follows:

(Participant 1): nature under threat, animals becoming extinct, the relationship between EU and Turkey,

(Participant 2): grammar subject revision, unforgettable event for you

(Participant 3)...preparing a book report, searching information about a famous celebrity and presenting in the classroom...Debate the education system, ...books, hobbies, natural resources... every kind of topic is possible and important to teach something to students.

The topic samples provided by the participants illustrate that there have been various types of projects in use in the department. Some appear more like traditional testing assignments and others more extensive and interest-based. The next section reviews instructors' attitudes towards project-based assessments.

Instructors' Attitudes towards Project Assessments

The analysis of the interviews to the question about how are projects different from previous assessment types they have used, showed that most of the instructors seem to be satisfied with using projects as alternative assessment tools. There were two major points identified as being challenging in implementing projects. One critical point was the timing issue in assessing students' projects. That is, the instructors reported that projects require a large amount of preparation and class time. The participants attributed this timing issue to the number of projects assigned to students. The other identified critical point is determining a grading policy in assessing projects. In respect to the first critical point 'the timing issue' instructors mentioned the following:

(Participant2): ...they take too much time for us to assess them. Sometimes we cannot even catch up with the curricula because of the projects.

(Participant 3): ...Traditional tests may be questionable and unsatisfying in terms of assessing students' language performance they are easier, practical and take much less time than assessing projects.

(Participant 5): they are useful but shouldn't be that many...they are sometimes really time consuming...

In respect to the second critical point, the 'grading issue', instructors mentioned the following:

Participant 1: grading students' projects is really annoying or lets' say much more difficult... than grading multiple choice or gab filling tests...cause you have only one answer in those tests...

Participant 3: I would always prefer multiple-choice tests to projects in terms of grading.

Participant 5): Assessing projects has too many variables. I mean there is no one correct answer in grading projects...this is really tough...even I myself can score the same student project different from day to day...

As can be seen from the results of the interviews most of the participants have questions and some uneasiness in using projects in assessment. The two most prominent issues, as discussed, regard timing and grading.

The following section reviews what instructors think about project-based assessment versus traditional tests.

Instructors' opinions towards using projects assessments versus traditional tests

The analysis of the interviews inquiring how projects are different from traditional assessment types, showed that most of the instructors seem to be somewhat satisfied with using projects as alternative assessment tools, particularly in assessing students' language performance. However, in other respects many of the instructors seem to be more in favor of maintaining traditional pencil paper tests. The analysis of the interviews revealed that instructors are more comfortable and confident in using pencil paper tests than in using projects in student assessment.

(Participant 1): before we began to use projects in the assessment system we wouldn't be able to assess a variety of skills. We were using only multiple-choice tests to assess students' language proficiency levels.... they are very useful to assess students' language performance.

(Participant 3): I like using projects and I definitely believe that they are useful assessment tools Although I should accept that although projects seem to me promising in many cases as opposed to traditional tests. For example we wouldn't be able to assess students writing and speaking skills in the past through traditional tests.. I, as a teacher, would prefer traditional tests.

(Participant 4): According to me projects are very useful tool in terms of testing students' language levels. You can assess variety of language capacities through projects. In the past, we could not assess even the successful students, because in multiple-choice tests you have always a chance to select the correct answer. To me language is what you speak and perform not the rules in the books.

(Participant 5): ... Besides, to assess students' performance 'fairly' through projects is not possible. Let's say as fairly as possible because they are too many variables in the process. However, I can still say they are better than examinations especially in terms of assessing speaking and writing skills.

As can be seen from the interview samples, instructors seem to agree that projects are useful tools in assessing students' language performance. Although instructors seem to be in favor of using projects in assessing students' language proficiency levels and their language performance, they have some implementation problems in using project assessments as opposed to traditional pencil-paper tests. We have overviewed the responses in respect to teachers' opinions towards project assessments versus traditional pencil-paper tests in general. The next section will be about teachers' attitudes towards project assessment in terms of fairness.

Instructors' attitudes towards fairness of projects in assessing students

Almost all of the interviewees reported that they think that projects are not as fair as multiple-choice tests. The responses to the question 'Do projects seem to fairly assess student's language development and ability?' in the interview were analyzed. Most of the interviewees reported that projects are attractive assessment

tools but scoring makes them unfair and difficult.

(Participant 1):... no not really because the nature of the projects itself. Even if we were provided scales for assessing projects, I can't say yes. Projects might not be as fair as multiple-choice tests ...

(Participant 2): I am not sure but ... at least they are not as fair as multiple-choice tests. Because there is only one answer for the multiple choice or gap filling tests...that is, whoever grades the multiple-choice tests the result is always the same but ...the scores of student projects assessment change from teacher to teacher...

(Participant 3): 60/70 % yes. But here I would like to add that especially in-group projects do not reflect the individual effort.

(Participant 4): No I don't think so. For example some of the students who don't know even how to write simple sentences, can hand in two-three pages projects...through plagiarism or getting help from somewhere else... it might be obvious but you have to evaluate it if you can't prove that it is plagiarized from somewhere else.

(Participant 5): yes they do. At least, project assessments are much better than multiple-choice tests in any case..

The analysis of the interviews illustrated that three of interviewees provided negative responses in respect to the issue of fairness of projects as opposed to multiple choice or gap filling tests. The major reason provided for this was that traditional tests, such as multiple-choice tests, have only one absolute answer, while the scores for a project can change from grader to grader. However two of the interviewees provided positive answers to the same question, suggesting that projects are fair. The reason for this might be that they are more familiar with use of projects, depending on their background knowledge and experience.

As can also be seen in the interview quotes participant 3 attributed unfairness to assessing group projects reporting that 'group projects do not reflect the individual effort'. The following subsection was designed to investigate the current implementation of project assessments by the instructors at KTU assuming a

student's point of view.

Students' attitudes towards project-based assessment from the instructors' point of view

The majority of the instructors interviewed believe that their students like project-based assessments. However, the results revealed that instructors think that students find oral presentation projects embarrassing, especially for the low level students.

(Participant 1): students seem to like project assessments especially for writing courses. I think, that is because students have opportunity to prepare their writing projects outside the classroom. , Especially group-work projects make them happy.

(Participant 2): at the beginning they found projects very difficult, boring but as soon as they begin to produce end products like posters, oral presentations, they begin to enjoy them. However oral presentations are like their nightmares, particularly for low-level students... They usually read the texts instead of presenting them verbally.

(Participant 4): I cannot say that students' responses to projects are totally positive or they really understand what to do in the process. But according to me the majority of them like projects more than in-class exams. In-class exams make students feel more embarrassed, I think.

The results of the interviews indicated that most of the participants think that students find project-based assessment more interesting and less stressful than pencil paper tests. One reason for this is attributed by one of the interviewees to the fact that students like preparing their assignments outside the classroom.

Students' attitudes towards project-based instruction from the instructors' points of view were discussed in this section. The following section will present the instructors' opinions about implementation of the project approach at KTU.

Current Implementation of Project Instruction and Assessments at the Department

The results of the interviews revealed that instructors implemented projects in three basic steps: selecting project topics, assigning projects to the students and assessing the project end products. The results of the interviews showed that the instructors decide the project topics, and a typical project takes almost a month for students to complete. As for the third step, assessing projects, the results indicated that instructors assess students' projects based on the end product rather than the process.

Topic selection

The results of the interviews revealed that the major criterion in selecting project topics is the subjects covered in the course. This implies that students do not have much freedom to choose their own interest topic. That is, they have to choose a topic from the list that they are provided by the instructors.

(Participant 1): the topics are first decided by the coordinators according to the levels of classes and students' professional field of education. We as teachers assign those topics to the students in our classrooms....

(Participant 2): each skill coordinator and group members come together and decide on the general themes.. then students are required to choose one of those topics that are already decided by the coordinators

(Participant 3): projects topics are decided according to students' language level and interests. Many of the topics are chosen according to subjects studied in the classroom dependent on the course book syllabus.

(Participant 4): in the first semester they were chosen by the committee consisting of the instructors of that course... then the project topics is determined by the class teacher and together with the students of course.

(Participant 5): by considering the continuing program subject and the lesson.

As can be inferred from the interviews, most of the interviewees replied to the question ‘How are the project topics chosen?’ that project topics are decided by administrators and instructors, and students are supposed to choose one of the topics which are already decided upon. That is, students do not have the opportunity to choose their own interest topic.

Assessing projects

The responses to question 5 ‘How do the instructors assess projects, at the end of each project or on the continuing basis?’ are presented in this section. The result of the interviews conducted with the five instructors showed that projects are assessed by the end product but not during the process.

(Participant 1): we assess projects at the end ...we all were provided standard assessing scale for each skill project by the administration....

(Participant 2): no, we don’t assess students’ works during the process, but the end product.... but it changes according to the types of projects...

(Participant 4): except for the writing assignment projects, we only assess the end product.

Having discussed the issues of topic selection of the projects and some idea of assessing projects at KTU School of Foreign Languages Department Of Basic English, in the following section some project examples used in the department will be presented.

Project Samples Implemented at KTU School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English

Students are expected complete nine projects per semester, which usually take place over a three-week or a month period: three writing projects, three reading projects and three speaking projects. The three skill projects are going on at approximately the same time. That is, students are expected to conduct three

different skill projects in a month: one speaking project, one writing project and one reading project.

Instructors were given four different rubrics to assess students' project products: One for writing projects (See scoring rubric for writing projects in Appendix J), one for reading projects (See scoring rubric for reading projects in Appendix I) and two different rubrics for speaking projects -one for individual presentations and one for group debate presentations (See scoring rubrics for speaking projects in Appendices G and H). Each project is evaluated separately, and the average of all three projects comprises 35 % of students' overall grade. Students overall grade is compiled as follows: 35% projects, 35% midterm exam, 30% final exam.

An example of a writing project described by the instructors for the elementary level of students is an assignment requiring students to write a biography of a famous dead person. The students are required to answer some questions about the famous person that they are going to describe, such as 'What did s/he do to deserve fame?' and give specific detailed information from the early years of his/her life until his / her death. The end product of this project is presented through a paper supported by posters and pictures. Recommended sources for this project are the library, encyclopedias and web sources. The purpose of this project is to develop students' writing skills and let them practice the grammar structures they have studied in the course (e.g. simple past tense, past continuous tense and the use of time conjunctions such as "when" and "while"). Students have three weeks to conduct this project. The end product is evaluated as a percent of 100 points, according to the rubric given by the administrators. (See writing rubric in Appendix

J).

There are three reading projects assigned to the students: a book report, a text report from the course book and text report from authentic materials. Each of the three reading projects represents 30 % of the “reading” projects grade. As well, instructors have the option to give up to 10 % credit for students’ general performance in the reading projects. (See rubric for reading projects in Appendix I)

An example of a reading project described by the administrators for intermediate level of students was an assignment requiring students to write a book report. Students are assigned to read a book at the reading stages levels of 3, 4, and 5. These reading books might be any book at the suggested levels. Novels (special EFL editions) such as Wuthering Heights by Emily Bronte or Trial and Triumph by Richard M. Hannula might be examples of the books suggested to the students. The aim of this project is to let students develop their reading and analytical abilities and improve their vocabulary knowledge. Students are expected to present the end product of this project in both written and oral form. Instructors evaluate students’ both written and speaking performance based on a rubric they were given by the administrators. (See reading rubric for book report in Appendix I).

The second reading project is an assignment requiring students to present what they understand from a text in the course book. The aim of this project is to develop students’ reading and speaking skills and to see how well s/he understands and can explain the text they have read. The other aim of this project is to allow students to practice grammar rules they have studied in their lessons, since the sentence structures in the reading text is prepared according to the grammar topics covered in the course book. The end product of this project is an oral presentation

(See scoring rubric for this reading project in Appendix I)

The third reading project requires students to find any text from magazines, newspapers or internet which appeals to their interest and report what they understand. The end product of this project comprises both written and oral presentations (See scoring rubric for this project in Appendix I).

After these examples of writing and reading projects, I cite examples of speaking projects used at KTU. There are two kinds of speaking projects used at the department: individual oral projects and group debate projects.

An example of a speaking project described by the instructors for intermediate level of students is a task requiring students to talk about a journey they had in their life. This is an individual project and students have three weeks to prepare this project. The aim of this project is to improve students speaking skill and the use of grammar structures such as time clauses (“conjunctions such as when”- “after”-“while”- “before”, etc), simple past, past continuous, past perfect and past perfect continuous, and question forms. The end product required from students is an oral presentation.

Another speaking project example described by the instructors was a group project developed for intermediate level students. Students are divided into pairs and required to conduct a discussion about the advantages or disadvantages of having a working mother. This is a group discussion project. As in a debate, one group of students supports the idea that having a working mother is advantageous and the other group supports the idea that it is not advantageous to have a working mother. Students are required to gather information through newspapers, magazines and books. They present their points of view through oral presentations. They can also

use OHPs and handouts in their presentations. They have a week for preparation of this project. The end product is evaluated based on the rubric prepared for debates (See appendix H).

Instructors' Attitudes towards Project-based Instruction in ELT Classes

The majority of the respondents provided positive answers to the question 'How do you view projects in teaching?' The results of the interviews indicated that instructors find projects useful and satisfying in several ways such as: in teaching language skills, promoting students' motivation and encouraging students' own learning strategies.

(Participant 1): before we began projects, the only authority in the classroom was the teacher. Students were always passive learners in the classroom and the main concern was only on grammar, GTM was the major teaching method.... Through projects, students become much more active and motivated in the classroom...another point here is when the students see their own end products and they have begun to enjoy their learning...

(Participant 2): At first, projects are very helpful tools to motivate students. Especially, if the subjects are interesting to the students, they can do very interesting and nice jobs...through projects students find opportunity to display their abilities that they cant exhibit in pencil paper tests.

(Participant 3): projects helped students in many ways. ... Even if they sometimes plagiarize the things from Internet or other sources..., even this helped students learn search strategies and improve their readings. As the project topics related to the course syllabus, students find opportunity to use the knowledge they have learnt in the lesson....This also, gave the students the idea that those subjects they learnt in the lesson are useful and practical in real life....

Instructors' Opinions to Improve Project Approach in KTU

The analysis of the responses provided by the instructors to the question 'What changes in the project scheme would you like to see in the future?' revealed that instructors have interesting ideas to improve the projects approach in the program.

(Participant 1): Projects should be chosen more carefully and be more interesting for students. They shouldn't take too much time for students to prepare and present and for teachers to assess, because assessing can be very boring for us too. Before introducing projects we should negotiate with students first. Generally this aspect of projects is ignored by our instructors.

(Participant 2): the deadlines should be clearly announced before the projects are assigned. The students should know the aim of the projects.

(Participant 3): All projects must involve or include all four-language skills such as reading writing, speaking and listening. Students should be allowed to use all features of a language in their projects.

(Participant 4): The preparation process should be organized thoroughly and the evaluation should be planned accordingly. That is, not only the final draft but also the whole preparation period must be evaluated. Moreover a detailed assessment table would be of great help.

(Participant 5): The time for the lessons is not enough both for the presentations and the lesson. Therefore, it is challenging to do both in a lesson. I would be grateful if the administration would decrease the number of projects. The other thing is that projects shouldn't put too much burden on students' shoulders.

As can be seen from the interview samples most of the instructors express several critical points in implementing projects. These include topic selection, time frame, integrating skills and focus on process as well as product. This suggests that some of the instructors are aware of using projects but because of syllabus restrictions they are feel unable to practice fully what they know.. For example, the response provided by participant 4 was interesting, suggesting that projects should be assessed throughout the project process, not just at the product output stage. The analysis of the answer given by participant 3 also indicates that h/she would be pleased to see projects cover all the language skills, just as Stoller (1997) defined projects as sets of tasks, which lead students to use integrated skills. The next section will present the results of the interview conducted with administrators.

Interview Analysis of the Administrators of the Program

This part of the chapter is composed of the analysis of qualitative data gathered through interviews with the administrators of the department. The results of the interviews done with the administrators will be presented in three sections: A ‘Administrators’ views on using projects as alternative assessments’; B, ‘Instructors’ attitudes towards project-based assessments from the administrators’ points of view; C ‘Administrators’ views on using projects as instructional tools as alternatives to more traditional more teacher-centered approaches’.

The results of the interviews revealed that the administrators of the department are quite knowledgeable about the project approach, and they provided positive answers in respect to using projects in their program. They approach projects in two ways, both as alternative assessment tools and as new instructional tools. This implies that they are quite familiar with the notion of project work. The major reason for this might be that both of the administrators have MA degrees and have attended several symposiums and seminars about language teaching, including discussion of alternative approaches to assessment and instruction.

Administrators’ Views on Using Projects as Alternative Assessments

The analysis of the responses of the administrators to the question ‘Why did you decide to use projects as a basis of assessment?’ revealed that administrators did not find the previous assessment system, which used only grammar based, traditional tests, satisfactory in assessing students’ language knowledge and performance. The interviewees reported that there were not any assessment tools to measure all of the students’ language skills and language performance. That is, students’ language skills were assessed only by multiple-choice or gap-filling tests.

The interviewees stated that they found projects more satisfying and more complete than any traditional tests. The analysis of the interviews also revealed that there were only traditional pencil paper tests to assess students' language proficiency in the past. The interviewees reported that they could not assess students' speaking, writing and listening before they began to use projects in the curriculum and that students' reading skills were assessed only through multiple choice tests.

Administrator 1: Before we began to use projects we were only using traditional pencil-paper tests especially multiple-choice tests and gap filling. Short answered tests were being used to assess students' language skills.

Administrator 2: there weren't any specially designed assessment tools to assess students' individual language skills. Multiple choice tests and grammar-based gap filling tests were the only assessment tools. Therefore, we weren't able to assess students' language performance.

As can be seen from the analysis of the interviews both of the participants agreed that there were few tools for assessing students' language level before they began using projects in the language program. This was one reason why they decided to use projects in the language program: to guide determination of students' language levels. In order to get deeper understanding of the rationale for adapting project work in the curriculum the following question was asked.

“Where did the idea of using project-based assessment come from?”

Responses showed that administrators were already quite familiar with project work from their educational background. The results of the interviews indicated that the first idea of using projects emerged from the need for finding alternatives to traditional tests and traditional teaching methods. Both of the interviewees reported that they had done research on alternative assessment types and found that project-based assessments had become quite widely used in language testing worldwide.

(Administrator 1): At first, we are quite familiar with the use of projects from our overseas department From symposiums and the articles I have been following, evolves the idea of using projects here....

(Administrator 2): this is not a new idea. Projects have already been used very effectively and successfully in many institutions in the world. ...

Administrators described the major differences of the new assessment system from the previous one as follows:

(Administrator1): ... we have begun to use projects to assess students' language development. Projects are also as important as midterm and final exams.

(Administrator2): the biggest change is that we began to use project work as an alternative assessment. ..There used to be only multiple-choice tests to assess students

The results of the interviews also revealed that they see projects as an adjunct rather than a replacement of standardized testing. The interviewees reported that the previous assessment system was based only on grammar based traditional pencil paper tests. They also said that the outstanding difference between the old assessment system and the current one is that they could now assess students' language skills more comprehensively.

We have overviewed the administrators' views about using project-based assessments above. The following will summarize instructors' attitudes towards project-based assessments from the administrators' points of view.

Instructors' attitudes towards project-based assessments from the administrators' point of view

The analysis of the responses provided by the interviewees to the question 'What do you think are instructors' views in using projects as alternative assessment

tools?’ revealed that administrators think that instructors did not seem to like the project idea at first.

(Administrator 1):... at first as this kind of radical change in assessment system from traditional tests to including projects in the assessment made our instructors uneasy but they seemed to be get used to them

(Administrator 2): I am not quite sure if our instructors really like project-based assessments, since projects require much more delicate work than using multiple choice tests...For example we received considerable reactions about timing and grading issues.

This initial dislike of projects might be traced to unfamiliarity of the instructors with projects. Another cause of dislike might be lack of training sessions for the instructors in preparation for project work implementation, as reported in the instructor interviews.

(Administrator1): ...as this is the first year of using projects, I should accept that instructors couldn’t get enough training about using projects. We presented some seminars, but I think, we couldn’t provide enough training sessions to our instructors. .

(Administrator 2): it is obvious that we need to work on the issue of training. Instructors unfortunately did not receive training about using projects. They were assumed to have already known projects.

As can be seen from the interviews, the analysis of the interview results indicates that if the instructors were provided sufficient training, instructors’ attitudes towards using project-based assessments might be more positive and their application more effective.. We have overviewed administrators’ views about using projects as alternative assessments in their curriculum and instructors’ attitudes to projects from the administrators’ points of view. The next section will present administrators views about using projects as instructional tools in their curriculum.

Administrators' views on using projects as instructional tools as opposed to more traditional teacher-centered approaches

Both of the administrators reported that project-based instruction is one of the best ways of teaching language to students. Both of the administrators agreed that the project approach matched well with the language program they designed and direct at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English. They stated that through projects the program was changing from pre-dominantly teacher-centered instruction to more student-centered learning.

Interview samples:

(Administrator1): In the past the teaching process at the department, grammar was the primary or maybe the only concern of the program other than language skills. However, communication in the target language should be the primary concern, because language is not only sets of grammar rules. Projects are therefore good examples of alternative instructional tools allowing students to learn how to use language. The other problem with the old program was that it was totally teacher-based instruction so students were only receivers of language and rules but never had opportunity to develop their language skills, especially in speaking and writing. Now students have to practice what they have learned in the courses, through projects. Briefly, projects are useful tools in teaching English.

(Administrator 2): Projects give students an opportunity to use language and practice it in terms of using language skills. Projects also help students produce language. Projects increase students' interest in the subjects covered in the lessons. Students also have to use the language they learned in the course through practicing the real language in use. Unlike the traditional instructional tools, projects allow students to develop their skills outside the classroom.

As can be seen from the interview samples, one of the aims of administrators' in adopting projects is to make students more active in their own learning process.

Another point identified by the interviewees is that before project-based instruction was introduced, students were not able to use language skills effectively either in the classroom or outside the classroom. We have overviewed above the

administrators' general views about the background and present use of projects in the department.

Conclusion

In this chapter the data gathered from the questionnaire and interviews were analyzed and presented in two major parts. In the first part, the data was composed of responses to 42 Likert scale statements in respect to instructors' opinions towards project work as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach in their classrooms. In the second part, the results of interviews conducted with program instructors and administrators were presented which examined their views on similar issues.

The next chapter will present an overview of the study, discussion of the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, implications for further research and a conclusion.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS

Overview of the Study

Project work as an alternative to traditional methods of assessment and teaching has received recent attention in ELT contexts in many parts of the world. However, project work is still not common in EFL situations in Turkey. Karadeniz Technical University (KTU) is one of the few Turkish universities using project work as a major component in their ELT program.

Prior to this year, the assessment system at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English has been based on standardized testing methods such as multiple choice tests or gap filling tests. This year, however, the program has changed from using only tests to additionally using projects. This change has also brought together the notion of projects not only as an alternative assessment tool but as an instructional tool as well. The main focus of this study was to investigate instructors and administrators' attitudes towards using project work in both these capacities in ELT classrooms.

The results of this thesis might contribute to the overall development of the educational system by allowing instructors and course designers to become more alert to the potentials for use of projects and better able to plan next steps in implementation of projects as alternative assessment tools and as instructional tools to support English language teaching.

This chapter will report the major findings of this research. Implications for state university preparatory classes, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research will also be presented.

The study investigated instructors' general knowledge and attitudes about project work in ELT classes. It examined the attitudes of the instructors of English and administrators currently working at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English towards project work as an alternative assessment type and as an instructional approach. The following research questions were investigated:

1. What are instructors' attitudes about use of project work as an instructional approach?
2. What are instructors' attitudes about use of project work as an alternative assessment tool?
3. What are administrators' views on project work in their curriculum?

Findings

The major findings of the study will be presented in three different sections: instructors' attitudes towards project work as an alternative assessment instrument; attitudes of the instructors towards project work as instructional approach and administrators' views on implementation of project work in their institutional language education programs.

Current Assessment Instruments Used at Karadeniz Technical University

School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English

The results showed that previously at KTU there were only traditional methods of student assessment, such as pencil-paper exams consisting of multiple-

choice, short answer and gap filling items to evaluate students' language levels.

This year, the new management decided to change the assessment system from using only tests to including project-based assessment as well. The current assessment system, as interviewees reported, has both exams and projects. The results indicated that projects are considered as important as midterm and final exams in grade determination. Interviewees reported that students are required to conduct three projects for each skill area –reading, writing, and speaking. Listening is assessed as part of speaking focus projects. This cycle assumes 9 projects per semester and 18 projects a year total.

Instructors' Attitudes and Knowledge about Using Projects as Alternative Assessments

The results indicated that the respondents are familiar with the notion of project work in ELT classrooms (See Table 7). The results of the responses instructors provided to the questions about their understanding of projects in the interviews showed that instructors view projects as a kind of homework that allows students to practice what they have studied in the course. According to instructors, the major aim of projects is to let students practice course book grammar structures while conducting their projects. However, the project samples given by the participants in the interviews indicate that they are using a variety of project topics in their courses. This suggests that project topics are based not only on course book grammar items covered in the program but as well on independent instructors' choices.

The overall picture of the results revealed that the majority of the instructors view projects as useful and satisfactory tools both in the assessment system and in

their instruction. Most of the instructors found using project assessments more satisfying and acceptable than using traditional pencil-paper tests such as multiple-choice or short answer tests. This satisfaction might be a result of the fact that instructors can assess a variety of students' language skills through projects which cannot be assessed through pencil paper tests. For example, almost all of the participants provided positive answers to the statement K 14 'Through projects, we can evaluate learning outcomes, which cannot be evaluated with paper and pencil tests' as shown in Table 12. As can also be seen in tables 8 and 9, instructors viewed projects as useful assessment tools both for assessing students' working skills and assessing the four language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. The results of the interviews revealed that students' speaking skills were assessed for the first time in projects. That is, there was not any assessment tool to assess students' speaking skills in the previous assessment system. The results showed that students' other language skills had been previously assessed only through standardized tests.

Although the majority of the instructors seemed to be satisfied with use of projects, there were also some uncertainties and disagreements found in terms of the perceived fairness of project assessment. The majority of the respondents found projects are less fair than traditional tests, particularly multiple choice tests. The results also indicated that teachers feel more comfortable in using traditional tests than using projects in their assessments. Although the results of the responses to question K 6 (See Table 13) showed that instructors feel as confident using projects as using tests in assessing students' language skills, in the interviews most of the interviewees expressed the opposite view and reported that they feel more comfortable with using traditional tests than assessing projects.

Major problematic issues in implementation identified by the participants were timing and assessing students' projects overall. Analysis of the results concerning the instructors' attitudes towards project-based assessments show that most of the instructors think project assessments take a large amount of work time and were not necessarily reliable. The plurality of the instructors who participated in the questionnaire and most of instructor interviewees reported that although projects are helpful in assessing students' language performance, they are not as "fair" as multiple-choice tests. This suggests that some of the participants have implementation problems in using projects as alternative assessment tools. This might be attributed to lack of in-service training to use project assessments. The instructor interviewees reported that they did not receive any training about using projects except for having given rubrics for assessing student projects. This is supported by the results of the interviews conducted with administrators who stated that there is a need for in-service training for instructors in respect to use of projects.

Overall results of both qualitative and quantitative data showed that although the majority of the respondents seem to be in favor of using project-based assessment, the general opinion was that they should use some combination of projects and traditional testing. In this respect, project assessments are viewed as complementary tools for the missing sides of traditional tests. As Barootchi and Keshavarz (2002) state, standardized testing methods in education should be complemented with other indicators such as alternative assessments to have reliable and reasonable outcomes.

The results of the interviews done both with the instructors and the administrators further suggested that there was no provision in the previous assessment system to assess students' language performance. That is, the concern of the previous assessment system

was to see what the students know about discrete aspects of the target language but not to assess how they use that language. All of the interviewees reported that they still use pencil-paper tests to assess students' language levels. In this respect, the results indicated that both the instructors and the administrators are satisfied with the assessment system currently in development at KTU, because the results of the interviews revealed that the assessment system is now composed of both project assessment tools and traditional tests.

Instructors' Attitudes towards Using Projects as Instructional Tools

Although projects were originally proposed as alternative assessment tools, it soon became obvious that it was necessary and desirable to consider projects as part of the instructional program as well. The results indicated that the majority of the respondents are in favor of using projects in their class instruction. The results showed that instructors find projects useful in their instruction in many ways, such as: in teaching language skills, promoting students' motivation and encouraging students' to develop and use their own learning strategies. The great majority of the participants provided positive answers to the question about using projects in teaching language skills, as can be seen in tables 18 and 19. The results of the interviews also revealed that teachers agreed that projects encourage independent learning, as well as group work or collaborative learning skills, and that they increase students' motivation about their own learning as well. This supports the views on project-based learning in the literature. As Fried-Booth (1986) states, project work allows students to have more responsibility and control of their own learning (cited in Kayser, 2002). Analysis of the results concerning the instructors' attitudes towards projects as instructional tools revealed that most of the instructors think that their students like the various aspects of project work in their learning, as can also be seen

in Table 21.

Administrators' Views on Using Project Work In Their Curriculum

The results of the interviews done with the administrators of the department revealed that they are pleased with the introduction of the project approach in the curriculum both as an alternative assessment tool and as an instructional approach. The analysis of the administrator interviews showed that they had acquired the idea of project-based assessment and project-based instruction from their own educational explorations. They reported that they had been searching for better methods of teaching and testing for some time and realized that many educational systems were using project work for these purposes in their language classes.

Over the last several years, they developed positive attitudes towards projects based on their research and reflections. The interviewees reported that they found project work one of the best ways of assessing students' language performance as well as providing a promising general teaching approach. As a result of the past year of experiences, they continue their positive attitudes towards projects both as assessment tools and as instructional tools. The analysis of the interviews indicated that administrators promote the idea that language is not only a matter of rules but a matter of communication (See appendix D, for sample interview with administrator). They see projects as supporting English communication both within and outside the classroom.

Analysis of the results concerning administrators' views on projects in the curriculum revealed that they found traditional tests limited in terms of assessing students' language proficiency. This seemed to be the major reason why administrators initially promoted use of projects in their curriculum. The

administrators felt projects fit assessment into the curriculum as a mean of assessing directly what is taught in the program. As well, they felt projects succeed in assessing student language performance fairly and accurately, in ways which cannot be achieved through traditional tests.

The analysis of the interviews conducted with administrators also revealed that the administrators are aware that some of the instructors have problems in using projects in their courses. They attributed this largely to the lack of project-focused training sessions. The results imply that administrators think that if instructors had sufficient training and were aware of more imaginative ways of using projects both as alternative assessment tools and instructional tools, outcomes would be better on the part of students and on the part of teachers.

In this section we overviewed the findings of the overall results in respect to two major data sets: instructors' attitudes towards project work both as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach and administrators' views on projects as recently introduced into the curriculum. The next section will present some pedagogical implications of the study.

Pedagogical Implications

The analysis of the data suggested pedagogical implications both for instructors and for the program designers.

Results indicated that most of the projects examples implemented at KTU do not have the characteristics of projects as cited in the lit review examples. The analysis of the interviews showed that the main concern of the projects at KTU is to teach grammar and let students practice language structures based on the textbook. However, project work not only deals with the language presented in classes and

textbooks but also the language in actual community use (Stoller, 1997; Eyring, 1997; Alan & Stoller, in press). In the next round of project planning, the potential of projects might be maximized through incorporating more of these features of project samples cited in the literature. For example, projects in the future might comprise more extended tasks integrating four language skills incorporate more students' choices and letting students work more independently. Additionally, students might be given more freedom to present their end project products. Through these adaptations, students may find more opportunity to use their skills integratedly and to set their own learning targets as they proceed.

Results also showed that instructors have two major problems in using project-based assessments. One of the problems defined by the instructors was one of timing. Instructors claimed that projects take too much time, and therefore they could not keep up with the syllabus schedule because of this. This timing problem might be eased by decreasing the number of projects for each term and carefully scheduling and planning these. In the current program students are expected to conduct three sets of projects which take place over an instructional semester. Each set comprises three projects and each project focuses on one of the language skills and occupies a three-week or a month period. That is, students have to undertake nine projects in a semester. Instead of assigning students nine projects per semester, the projects could be reorganized substantially and cut to three projects involving four integrated skills per semester. In this way, instructors could assess all the students' language skills within each project. If these three projects are carefully designed, instructors can assess both students' individual and group work skills and language skills together. For example, the project "school magazine" described by Fried-booth (2002) might

be a good example of this type of project designed to attract student interest and measure a variety of students' language skills as well as individual and collaborative skills

Another issue of concern is that students are not as actively involved as anticipated. They do not have much freedom to choose their own interest topics, since they have to choose from topics already selected by the administrators and instructors. This lack of choice may decrease students' motivation and productivity. In this respect, course instructors also do not seem to have much freedom in choosing project topics. However, in project work samples in the literature students are allowed to select, organize and carry out a project of their own choice (Booth, 1986; Eyring 1997). In order to resolve this issue, the topics might be selected in negotiation sessions with administrators, instructors and students.

Another problematic issue was assessing students' projects. Most of the participants reported that they have problems with assessing students' projects. This issue might be eased through providing more sophisticated and detailed scoring rubrics and providing training practice with these rubrics.

The results also revealed that students' projects are assessed only on the basis of final products. However, projects are intended to be process based assessments. This indicates that instructors might be given training in using on-going (process) assessment in project work.

In conclusion, if the instructors are provided with a variety of opportunities to understand the larger potential of project work in their teaching and assessment and become accustomed to using the scoring rubrics, they might be more enthusiastic and effective in using projects in their classrooms.

Suggestions for Further Studies

The study investigated the attitudes of the instructors of English and administrators currently working at Karadeniz Technical University School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English towards project work as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach.

In further studies, the attitudes of the students towards project work both as alternative assessment tools and instructional tools can be explored. Through this triangulation, a more reliable picture of the existing and potentially modified assessment system can be drawn.

An experimental study using projects would be a good idea in order to investigate alternative ways of implementing projects in local settings. For further understanding of using projects, case studies of teachers using projects might be conducted. Gathering data through interviews both with teachers and students and use of pre-and post-treatment questionnaires might reveal more detailed information concerning advantages, challenges or disadvantages of use of projects in specific contexts.

Limitations of the Study

The research had to be completed in a very limited amount of time which prevented the researcher from increasing the amount of data obtained. With more time, the number of interviewees could have been greater and results made more reliable. Since the study was conducted only with the instructors and administrators, students' own opinions and attitudes towards project work in their language education were not explored. Students' views would have helped to get more reliable and dependable information about the current implementation and outcomes of using

projects and to make necessary recommendations for the future.

Since the study was conducted in only one university with 31 participants, it is not generalizable to all the preparatory programs in Turkey. In particular, the information related to project-based assessment and instruction would be more enlightening if the study were conducted in different universities with a number of instructors who use projects in their program.

Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed that both the instructors and the administrators at KTU School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English are generally in favor of using projects both as alternative assessment tools and instructional tools. Both sets of participants indicated some concerns about current implementation of project work at KTU and made a variety of suggestions for possible improvements.

We have overviewed the study and discussed the findings in this chapter. This chapter reported the researcher's views in respect to pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and proposals for further research.

In sum, the results of this study suggest that the future of project work at KTU School of Foreign Languages Department of Basic English looks promising, with generally positive responses by instructors and indications by administrators that they were willing to modify project work plans to accommodate research findings and instructor suggestions.

REFERENCE LIST

- Alan, B., & Stoller, F.L. (in press). Maximizing the benefits of project work in Foreign language classrooms. *English Teaching Forum*
- Airasian, P. W. (1997). *Classroom Assessment* (3rd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Barootchi, N. and Keshavarz, M. H. (2002) Assessment of achievement through portfolios and teacher-made tests. *Educational Research* Vol. 44(3) 279–288
- Beyer, E. L. (1997). William Heard Kilpatrick. *Paris, UNESCO: International Bureau of Education*. 28 (3), pp. 470-485
- Brualdi, A. (1998). Implementing performance assessment in the classroom. *Eric/AE Digest*. ED 423312
- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Beckett, G. H. (2002). Teacher and student evaluations of project-based instruction. *TESL Canada Journal*, 19(2), 52-66.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (4), 653-675.
- Burke, K. (1994). *The Mindful School*. Palatine: Skylight Publishing, Inc., 157-163.
- Carter, G., & Thomas, H. (1986). 'Dear Brown Eyes': Experiential learning in a project orientated approach *ELT Journal*, 40 (3), pp.196-204.
- Celce-Murcia, M. ed. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston: Heinle-Heinle.
- Dewey, J. (1897). My Pedagogic Creed. *The School Journal*, Volume LIV, Number 3 (January 16, 1897), pp. 77-80.
- Doukas, K.D. using attitudes scales to investigate teachers attitudes to the communicative approach *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 187-196.

- Eyring, J. L. (1997). Is project work worth it? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED407838)
- Eyring, J. L. (2001). Experiential and negotiated language learning. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 333-344). Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Freeman, R. & Lewis, R. (1998). *Planning and implementing assessment*. London: Kogan Page.
- Fried-Booth, D.L. (1982). Project work with advanced classes. *ELT Journal*, 36(2), 98-103.
- Fried-Booth, D.L. (1986). *Project work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fried-Booth, D.L. (2002). *Project work* (new edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gibson, A., & Clarke, G. (1995). *Project-based group work facilitators' manual*. United Kingdom: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Genesee, F. & Upshur, J.A. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*: Cambridge University Press
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 5-21). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Haines, S. (1989). *Projects for the EFL classroom: Resource material for teachers*. Walton-on-Thames Surrey, UK: Nelson.
- Hedge, T. (1993). Key concepts in ELT. *ELT Journal* 47 (3) 275-277
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Holt, M. (1994). Dewey and the "cult of Efficiency": Competing ideologies in collaborative pedagogies of the 1920s. *JAC* 14(1), [Online available]. Retrieved on May 15 2005, from <http://www.cas.usf.edu/JAC/141/holt.html>
- Hutchinson, T. (1991). *An introduction to project work*. Oxford University Press
- Huerta-Macias A. 1995. Alternative assessment: Responses to commonly asked questions. *TESOL Journal*, 5(1), pp. 8-11
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: CUP

- James, P.W. (1995). New assessment methods for school counselors. ERIC Digest ED 388888
- Katz, L. G. (1994). The project approach. ERIC Digest. ED368509
- Katz, L.G. & Chard, S.C. (1998). Issues in Selecting Topics for Projects. ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education Champaign IL ED424031
- Kayser, A. (2002). Project work and PBCALL. *English Teaching Forum*, 40 (3), 12-19
- Kesten C. (1987). Independent Learning, Saskatchewan Education. Retrieved June, 2005, from: <http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/policy/cels/el7.html#e12e12>
- Knolls, M. (1997). The project method: its vocational education origin and international development. *Journal of industrial teacher education*, 34 (3), 59-80.
- Knutson, S. (2003). Experiential learning in second-language classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*, 20(2), 52-64.
- Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *TESL Canadian modern language review* 59(3), [Online available]. Retrieved June 1, 2005, from <http://www.utpjournals.com/jour.ihtml?lp=cmlr/cmlr593.html#a>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, I (1998). Supporting greater autonomy in language learning. *ELT Journal* (52) 4, 282-290
- Lee, I. (2002). Project work made easy in the English classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(2), 282-290.
- Li, E. & James, G (1998). Testing and evaluation in second language education. Hong Kong: the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
- Little, D. (1991): *Learner autonomy 1: definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Legutke, M., & Thomas, H. (1991). *Process and experience in the language classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Lynch T. (2000) 'The thick end of the wedge: Encouraging autonomous learning by advanced-level ESL university students'. *Links and Letters* 7: 29-48.

McAninch, A.C. (2000). *Early childhood research and practice* 2(1). [Online available]. Retrieved on May 14 2005, from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v2n1/schuler.html>

McMeniman, M & Evans, R. (1998). Call through the eyes of teachers and learners of Asian language. Panacea or business as usual? *CALL-EJ Online*, 2 (1): available on <http://www.lerc.ritsumei.ac.jp./callej/index.html>.

McNamara, T. F. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. London: Longman.

Malcolm, D., & Rindfleisch, W. (2003). Individualizing learning through self-directed projects. *English Teaching Forum*. 41(3), pp.10-15.

Miller, W. H. (1995). *Alternative assessment techniques for reading and writing*. West Nyack, NY: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and Content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Murphy, J., & Stoller, F. L. (2001). Sustained-content language teaching: An emerging definition. *TESOL Journal*, 10(2/3), 3-5.

Nitko, A. J. (1996). *Educational assessment of students*. London: Merrill.

North, S. (1990 .) Resource materials for library. *ELT Journal Volume* 44(3) pp .222-229.

Önsoy, S. (2004). *Students' and teachers' attitudes towards the use of computer-assisted language learning at the preparatory school of celal bayar university*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

Parish, R., & Arends, R. (1983). Why innovative programs are discontinued. *Educational Leadership*, 40(4), 62–65.

Pat, N. (1993). Alternative assessment: Implications for social studies. Eric digest ED.360219.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rowe, K. J. & Hill, P. W. (1996). Assessing, recording and reporting students' educational progress: the case for subject profiles. *Assessment in Education*, 3(3), 309-351.

San Mateo County Office of Education (1998-2003). *The improvement project*. [Online available]. Retrieved on June 14 2005, from <http://pblmm.k12.ca.us/ClassExamples/Overview#Overview>

- Subaşı-Dinçman, P. (2002). *Teachers' understandings of projects and portfolios at Hacettepe University School of Foreign Languages Basic English Division*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Bilkent University: Ankara.
- Schuler, D. (2000). The project approach: meeting the state standards. *Early childhood research and practice*. [Online available]. Retrieved on May 14, 2005, from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v2n1/schuler.html>
- Sheppard, K., & Stoller, F.L. (1995). Guidelines for the integration of student projects in ESP classrooms. *English Teaching Forum*, 33(2), 10-15.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning* (pp. 273-290). Oxford: OUP
- Stoller, F. L. (1997). Project work: A means to promote language and content. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(4), 2-9.
- Stoller, F. L., & Grabe, W. (1997). A six-Ts approach to content-based instruction. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 78-94). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Tabarlet, J.E. (1996). The role of the school administrators in the implementation of alternative assessment procedures. Eric Digest 418483
- Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- Warschauer, M (2001). In R. Carter and D. Nunan (eds.). *Cambridge guide to teaching English to special of the language*, Cambridge: CUP. pp. 211
- Weir, J.C. (1990). *Communicative language testing*. UK: Prentice Hall international.
- Wildemuth, B.M. (1984). Alternatives to standardized tests. Eric digests. ED 286938
- Wrigley, H.S. (1998). Knowledge in action: The promise of project-based learning. *Focus on Basics*, 2, 13-18.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleague,

I am currently enrolled in the 2005 MA TEFL program at Bilkent University and I am conducting this study to find out your attitudes towards **projects** in English Language Classrooms.

This questionnaire will be the first phase of this study. The second phase will be interviews with volunteered teachers. Your answers are not only invaluable for the researcher himself but also they will help to reveal the strengths and the weakness of the existing system and if necessary to make new decisions about the current system. Your completion of the questionnaire will be regarded as consent in order to use the data supplied for the purpose of the study. Therefore, I appreciate your willingness to take part in this survey.

All responses will be kept confidential. You do not have to put your name on the questionnaire but some information about your background is needed to make statistical comparison and to classify your answers. The personal information you provide will be used only for this research and under no circumstances will be shared.

Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact with me or my thesis advisor. I thank you very much in advance for devoting your time for the questionnaires and cooperation.

Ramazan Alparslan Gökçen
MA TEFL Program
Bilkent University, ANKARA
Tel: (090) 312 2906276
gokcenr@bilkent.edu.tr

Prof. Dr. Theodore Rodgers
MA TEFL Program
Bilkent University, ANKARA
Tel: (090) 312 2902560
trodgers@hawaii.edu

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please tick (✓) the appropriate boxes and provide the necessary background information requested.

Part A: Total years of teaching experience _____

Part B: How many years have you been teaching at this institution? _____

Part C: At what level of students are you currently teaching?

- a. beginner ☐ c. Intermediate ☐ e. Advanced ☐
b. pre-intermediate ☐ d. Upper-intermediate ☐

Part D: Where did you get your training to be an English teacher?

- a. English Language Teaching Department ☐
b. English Language Literature Department ☐

Part E: To what extent do you feel your institution welcomes new instructional ideas?

Very Receptive	Somewhat Receptive	Not sure	Unreceptive
1	2	3	4
☐	☐	☐	☐

Part F: How familiar are you with the idea of using projects for instruction and assessment?

Very familiar	Quite familiar	Slightly familiar	Unfamiliar
1	2	3	4
☐	☐	☐	☐

Part: G: What form of help in using projects would be useful to you?

	Most useful	Useful	Not so useful	Don't know
	1	2	3	4
Readings on projects	☐	☐	☐	☐
Workshops on projects	☐	☐	☐	☐
Training Sessions on projects	☐	☐	☐	☐
Video Examples of projects	☐	☐	☐	☐
Written samples of student projects	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part H: How useful are projects in assessing students in the following areas?

MU= Most Useful U= Useful NSU= Not So Useful DN = Don't Know

	MU	U	NSU	DN
	1	2	3	4
1.Assessing working in groups				
2.Assessing individual work				
3.Assessing writing				
4.Assessing listening				
5.Assessing speaking				
6.Assessing reading				

Part I: Projects are useful tools to teach students the following skills.

SA: Strongly Agree A: Agree U: Uncertain D: Disagree SD: Strongly Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SD
	1	2	3	4	5
1.Teaching working group					
2.Teaching working independently					
3.Teaching writing					
4.Teaching listening					
5.Teaching speaking					
6.Teaching reading					

Part J: To what extent do your students like these different aspects of projects?

RL: Really like L: like N: Neutral D: Dislike RD: Really dislike

	RL	L	N	D	RD
	1	2	3	4	5
1.Working in groups					
2.Real world topics					
3.Learning information search strategies					
4.Motivation for using all language skills					
5.Using internet for their research					
6.Assessment rather than testing					
7.Improvement of speaking in public					
8.Building general knowledge					

Part K Please tick (✓) only one box for each item.

SA: Strongly Agree A: Agree U: Uncertain D: Disagree SD: Strongly Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SD
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Projects are useful tools for teachers both for teaching and assessing students' language performance.					
2. Projects help students become more independent learners.					
3. Assessing projects requires a large amount of work time.					
4. I like using projects to assess students' language skills.					
5. I can assess my students in detail through projects .					
6. I feel more confident using traditional tests in assessing students' language skills.					
7. The scales for skill assessment that we use assist me in grading the student projects more easily.					
8. I assess each student project on a continuing basis.					
9. Pencil-paper tests (e.g., multiple choice tests) give better evidence of a student's language ability than projects can provide.					
10. The projects seem to be meeting the new program's goals and objectives.					
11. I find it hard to assess specific student skills in project-based assessment .					
12 Projects encourage students to develop self-assessment skills in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of their own work.					
13. We should use some combination of projects and traditional testing in student assessment					
14. Through projects , we can evaluate learning outcomes, which cannot be evaluated with paper and pencil tests.					
15. Projects help students become more active learners in the classroom.					
16- Projects help classrooms become more enjoyable places for students.					
17- Projects are useful assessment tools for <u>only</u> upper-level students.					

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (FOR ADMINISTRATORS)

1. How has student work at KTU been customarily assessed?
2. Have there been different measures at KTU for assessing reading, writing, listening and speaking? If so, could you explain?
3. Where did the idea for using **project-based** assessment originate?
4. Did you see a need to change the writing program? If so, why was that so?
5. What kinds of changes were made?
6. What are the differences between the old program and the new program?
7. Why did you decide to use **projects** as a basis for assessment?
8. What kind of information or training did the teachers receive on using **projects**?
9. What are your views on teaching procedures?
10. Do you think **projects** on their own can be used to fairly assess students' language developmental ability?

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (FOR INSTRUCTORS)

1. What language subjects do you particularly like to teach?
2. Where did you do your training as a language teacher?
3. What is your understanding of **projects** in general?
4. Can you give an example of a couple of **project** topics?
5. What is your understanding of the **projects** used in this institution?
6. How are **project** topics chosen?
7. How long do typical **projects** take?
8. How are **projects** different from previous assessment types?
9. How do your students respond to **projects**?
10. Do you assess **projects** at the end of each **project**?
11. Do **projects** seem to fairly assess student's language proficiency levels?
12. In what ways can you see the **project** approach being improved? What changes in the project scheme would you like to see?

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW SAMPLE OF ADMINISTRATOR

Interviewer: good afternoon sir

Administrator 1: Hi! How are you?

Interviewer: Fine thx sir. But a little bit under pressure and need help from you

Administrator 1: sure! How can I help you?

Interviewer: well... as you know I am conducting a study about our instructors' attitudes towards project work in their classrooms and I need your help to clarify current implementation of projects in the program. I have some questions, would you like to answer them for me?

Administrator 1: All right.

Interviewer: First of all, I thank you very much participating in this interview which is really important for me. May I ask you first "How has student work at KTU been customarily assessed?"

Administrator 1: The only assessment tools were traditional pencil paper tests in the previous years, now we included project assessments in our assessment system. That is we have been using both using multiple choice tests and project assessments to assess our students' work.

Interviewer: Have there been different measures at KTU for assessing reading, writing, listening and speaking? Could you a little explain?

Administrator 1: no not really! Before we began to use projects we were only using traditional pencil-paper tests were being used to assess students' language skills. and basically those tests were based on grammar and vocabulary and have little to do with students' language performance. There weren't such tests to assess students' writing, listening and speaking skills.

Interviewer: were they usually multiple-choice tests and gap filling short answered tests?

Administrator 1: yes generally multiple-choice tests .that is, students were only supposed to circle or tick the right answer among A B C D. sometimes even the students who selected the right answer couldn't say the rational when asked.

Interviewer: by the way I would like to ask "Where did the idea of using project-based assessment come from". Because I think this is the first year of using such alternative assessment types in this department as far as know.

Administrator 1: yes that is right. But it is not a new idea for educational world even in KTU. My master study and the symposiums I attended shoed that the current movement in language teaching and testing is project-based programs. In addition, as you know before I was attended to this department, I had been teaching English language literature students at 'Western foreign language department at KTU.... We had been implementing project work for five years there. Of course the idea of project work in my mind dates back early times of my teaching.

Interviewer: do you think projects are sufficient assessment tools to assess students' language skills such as reading writing, speaking and reading.

Administrator 1: Yes certainly they are...

Interviewer: I see. By the way, how do the instructors take the idea o using projects in their department?

Administrator 1: At first as this is a kind of radical change in assessment system from traditional tests to including projects in the assessment, made our instructors uneasy but then seem to be get used to them. Most criticized points defined by instructors was the timing issue. However if they were a little bit more scheduled and planned they would easily make it less stressful.

Interviewer: Meanwhile do you think the instructors have received enough training on using projects.

Administrator 1: no! ...as this is the first year of using projects I should accept that instructors couldn't get enough trained about using projects. We presented some seminars but I think, we couldn't provide enough training sessions to our instructors. .

Interviewer: Could you please talk a little more about what you think about the efficiency of using projects in teaching?

Administrator 1: In the past the teaching process at the department, the grammar was the primary or may be the only concern of the program other than language skills.

However, communication in target language should be the primary concern because language is not only sets of grammar rules. Projects are therefore good examples of alternative instructional tools allowing students to learn how to use language. The other problem with the old program was that it was totally teacher-based instructions so students were only receivers but never find opportunity to develop their language skills, especially in speaking and writing. Now students have to practice what they have learned at the courses, through projects. Briefly projects are useful tools in teaching English.

Interviewer: Finally do you think projects can be used for all levels of students?

Administrator 1: Sure! That is, I don't agree that projects are not appropriate for low level students. There are variety types of projects for every level of students, when looked at the literature. That is every student can produce a project in respect to his of her level.

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SAMPLE (INSTRUCTOR)

Interviewer: Good afternoon.... I hope you are not busy for now.

Instructor 1: hey welcome! How are you doing? Where are you?

Interviewer you know I am in Ankara and kind of stress now and as I talked to you before I need your help. Would you help me?

Instructor 1: Sure. What do you want me to do?

Interviewer: Not much.... Just I need your valuable information about some questions which are very invaluable for me to conduct this study.

Instructor 1: I hope they are not so difficult...

Interviewer: No, just a piece of cake! Are you ready?

Instructor 1: yep. Waiting?

Thanks a lot. You can't imagine how much you will help me with this interview.

First of all, what language subjects do you particularly like to teach?

Instructor 1: I don't have a priority but I think I mostly like teaching speaking and listening. I have writing and grammar classes, though. According to me language shouldn't be taught only based on grammar or vocabulary.

Interviewer: Where did you do your training as a language teacher? I mean which faculties are you graduated from ELL or ELT?

Instructor 1: I am a graduate of English language teaching department.

Interviewer: What is your understanding of projects in general?

Instructor 1: Projects are kind of home-works assigned to students in respect to what they have learnt in the classroom. ...For example: last week we taught simple present tense and students were required to prepare a poster displaying their daily routine life based on simple present tense....

Interviewer: Can you give an example of a couple of project topics?

Instructor 1: ...nature under threat, animals becoming extinct, the relationship between EU and Turkey grammar subject revision, unforgettable event for you...

Interviewer: What is your understanding of the projects used in this institution?

Instructor 1: Actually we use projects by means of evaluating the students' performance in an extended period of time instead of a one-hour exam. The process includes direct feedback learning, through drafts and dependable evaluations well as better motivation.

Interviewer: How are project topics chosen?

Instructor 1: the topics are first selected by the coordinators according to the levels of classes and students' professional field of education. We as teachers assigned those topics to the students in our classrooms....

Interviewer: How long do typical projects take?

Instructor 1: It depends indeed; we experienced various examples here in our department. But the given time is usually a month or so. Of course the students have the tendency to get prepared in the last week.

Interviewer: How are projects different from previous assessment types?

Instructor 1: They are totally different. Before we began to use projects in the assessment system we wouldn't be able to assess variety of skills. We were using only multiple-choice tests to assess students' language proficiency levels.... they are very useful to assess students' language performance.

Interviewer: How do your students respond to projects?

Instructor 1: I can't say that the responses on the part of students were totally positive nor they really understood what to do at the beginning. Actually we were almost at the same position because we were new in using projects as were our students. However, students seem to like project assessments especially for writing courses. I think, that is because students have opportunity to prepare their writing projects outside the classroom. , Especially group-work projects make them happy

Interviewer: Do you assess projects at the end of each project?

Instructor 1: We have different evaluation rubrics for every single project.

I mean do you grade students' projects during the project process?

No not really. Usually the final product is evaluated. However, I think the process also be included to the grading, because students are really trying hard to conduct their project.

Interviewer: Does Projects seem to fairly assess student's language proficiency

levels?

Instructor 1: To assess their performance fairly is not possible. Because the nature of the projects itself. Even if we were provided scales for assessing projects, I can't say yes. Projects might not be as fair as multiple-choice tests or let's say as fairly as possible because they are too many variables in the process. However, I can still say they are better than examinations especially in terms of assessing speaking and writing skills.

Interviewer: In what ways can you see the project approach being improved?

What changes in the project scheme would you like to see?

Instructor 1: Projects should be chosen more carefully and be more interesting for students. They shouldn't take too much time for students to prepare and present and for teachers to assess, because assessing can be very boring for us too.

Before introducing projects we should negotiate students first. Generally this aspect of projects is ignored by our instructors

APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dear colleague,

You have been asked to participate in a survey study which is intended to investigate the English language instructors that are working at Karadeniz Technical University Basic School of English about their attitudes towards project work as an alternative assessment and as an instructional approach.

In order to achieve the goals of the study, please answer a questionnaire, which investigates your attitudes towards of project work. This interview will be the second phase of the study. You will be interviewed in order to discover insights of your attitudes towards projects and the overall assessment practices at Karadeniz Technical University Basic School of English.

Your participation in the interview will bring valuable contribution to the findings of the study. Any information received will be kept confidential and your name will not be released. This study involves no risk to you.

I would like to thank you in advance for your participation and cooperation.

Ramazan A. Gökçen
MA TEFL program
Bilkent University

I have read and understood the information given above. I hereby agree to my participation in the study.

Name : _____

Signature : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX G

RUBRIC FOR INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS (SPEAKING PROJECTS)

INTRODUCTION	
Introduction present	5
No introduction	0
GENERAL POINTS	
The presentation included enough general points/arguments related to the topics	25
The presentation included insufficient general points/arguments related to the topics	20
The presentation included very few general points/arguments related to the topics	10
ACCURACY	
Very effective use of grammar structures and forms	20
A few grammar errors but did not obscure meaning	15
Many grammatical errors that occasionally obscured meaning	10
Full of grammatical errors that obscured the meaning	5
FLUENCY	
Very fluent, no hesitation	20
Noticable hesitation, but did not disturb the listener	15
Hesitation often resulted in considerable disturbance to the listener	10
Hesitation prevented understanding	5
PREPARATION / AUDIO VISUAL AIDS	
The materials were rich enough with visual aids	25
The materials were insufficient with or a few visual aids	20
The materials were badly organized with almost no visual aids	10
CONCLUSION	
Conclusion present	5
No conclusion	0
TOTAL	100

APPENDIX H

RUBRIC FOR GROUP ORAL DEBATES (SPEAKING PROJECTS)

CONTRIBUTION (35)				
The student makes at least three very effective contribution to the discussion	35			
The student makes at least one-two very effective contribution to the discussion	25			
The student makes at least one or two effective contribution to the discussion	15			
The student makes no contribution to the discussion	5			
OWN ARGUMENTS (25)				
All of the groups arguments were effectively conveyed	25			
Some arguments were effectively conveyed to the listeners	15			
None of the arguments were effectively conveyed	5			
OPPOSING ARGUMENTS (25)				
The main objections were very effectively supported	25			
Some objections were made but not effectively supported	15			
No objections were made and supported	5			
TIME (15)				
The students used the time very effectively	15			
The students used the time effectively	10			
The students used the time ineffectively	5			
Total (100)	100			

APPENDIX I

RUBRIC FOR READING PROJECTS

I. PROJECT: BOOK REPORT: 30%

WRITTEN TEXT	Total 15%
Neatness	5 %
Accuracy in using grammar rules, spelling and punctuation	5 %
How well does the student follow the book report form?	5 %

PRESENTATION	Total 15%
Unity of the story/fluency	5 %
Answering the questions about the story	5 %
Accuracy in using appropriate vocabulary, grammar rules, pronunciation.	5 %

II. PROJECT: LESSON PRESENTATION: 30%

Talking about the title/picture	10%
Pronunciation/Fluency	5%
Asking and answering questions about the text	10%
Explanation of vocabulary	5%

III. PROJECT: PRESENTATION OF A PREPARED OR SELECTED TEXT 30%

WRITTEN FORM OF THE PREPARED OR SELECTED TEXT	Total 15%
Neatness	5 %
Accuracy in using grammar rules, spelling and punctuation.	5 %
Content of the text and the usage of given vocabulary	5 %

PRESENTATION	Total 15%
Fluency	5 %
Asking and answering questions about the text	5 %
Accuracy in using appropriate vocabulary, grammar rules, pronunciation.	5 %

IV. GENERAL CLASS PERFORMANCE : 10 %

TOTAL : 100 %

APPENDIX J

RUBRIC FOR WRITING PROJECT ‘BIOGRAPHY’

Student's name and Surname:			
Criteria		Total points	Student Grade
Grammar	Use of past tenses and other grammatical structures.	35	
Vocabulary		10	
Content Has the student utilized all information given?		10	
Organization Has the student organized the biographical information in paragraphs?	Introduction Whose biography is this? Why is he important? General remarks.	5	
	Body Early life Later life Achievements	5	
	Conclusion People's feelings Writer's feelings about the person	5	
Spelling and punctuation		5	
Neatness		5	
General class performance		20	
Total		100	