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Abstract

Recent research, which argues that discourses shape and are shaped by social reality, has contributed to the development of Critical Literacies and Critical Language Awareness in education. Critical Language Awareness researchers argue that, unless challenged, discourses reproduce dominant ideologies based on the understanding that discourse is a social process and that it is inherently ideological. Therefore, the social aspect of language should not be ignored in literacy education. However, in the context of this study, i.e. Turkey, the current approach to literacy, and in particular to reading, is a traditional one, which does not take the social aspect of language into account. Sharing the principles of Critical Language Awareness, this study seeks to find out the impact of a critical reading course in the Turkish Anatolian High School context.

The first chapter opens by exploring the theoretical foundations of Critical pedagogy, later on moving to the principles and practices of Critical Literacies and Critical Language Awareness. In this chapter, student motivation and resistance as a recurring theme in Critical Language Awareness practices is also explored together with theories on motivation.

Chapter 2 reviews studies of Critical Discourse Analysis, where Critical Language Awareness has its roots, together with the use of Systemic Functional Grammar as a tool for textual analysis in Critical Language Awareness. In this chapter, I also briefly consider the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and Turkish language as a case of linguistic relativism and linguistic determinism.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the overall action research approach and particular research instruments (questionnaires, interviews and repeated reading activity) adopted in this study, and this is followed by an account of the critical reading course, given in Chapter 4.

Findings of the research are presented in Chapters 5 and 6. In Chapter 5, the findings are presented in relation to the impact of the course on students’ approach to written texts. Students involved in this study reported and showed in repeated reading activity an increase in recognition of reading as a social process and of the effect of lexicogrammatical structures in texts. In Chapter 6 I present findings in relation to the impact of the course on students’ motivation. There was some resistance to the course due to the current exam system, but the students who participated in this study reported increased motivation for reading lessons.

In Chapter 7, I present an overall discussion and implications of these findings. Finally, in the Conclusion, which includes limitations to the study and implications for further research.
List of abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used frequently in the thesis:

EFL: English as a foreign language
ESL: English as a second language
ÖSS: Student selection exam
YDS: Foreign language exam
CLA: Critical language awareness
CL: Critical literacies
SFG: Systemic functional grammar
INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to explore the impact of a critical reading course on students in the Turkish Anatolian High School context, where, despite Ministry of Education endorsements of the development of critical perspectives, reading class practice has been oriented towards literal comprehension and language work.

The theoretical foundation emerges from studies in Critical Pedagogy, Critical Language Awareness in particular, and Critical Discourse Analysis. Sharing their perspective that social reality is created by the individuals living in it and that language and social reality are interrelated, I argue that raising awareness of the role of language, or discourse, in the power relations in social reality is an essential component of language education. To this end students were given an intervention in critical reading for a term, i.e. seventeen weeks, and the impact of the course on the students’ approach to reading and to reading lessons was investigated.

The students involved in this study are 10th grade high school students in Antalya, Turkey, from two different classes in two different schools. The high schools are called Anatolian High Schools, where the medium of education is English. All students attending these schools have to attend a Preparation Class before Grade 9 to prepare them for subsequent English medium education.

At the end of the academic year Grade 9 students have to decide in which academic branch to study. The branches offered by the Ministry of Education are Turkish and maths, science and maths, social studies, foreign languages (mostly English but students can also choose German or French, as long as the school has resources), art, physical education, and music. From Grade 10 on the students study in the branches they choose, provided that relevant Grade 9 marks are satisfactory. The Grade 10 students who participated in this study were studying in foreign language (English) branch classes and they had intermediate to upper-intermediate English proficiency levels.

At the end of Grade 11, all students take a university entrance exam, the ÖSS (Öğrenci Seçme Sınavı – Student Selection Exam), and the foreign language branch students who wish to continue their studies in foreign language higher education, take an additional exam, YDS (Yabancı Dil Sınavı – Foreign Language Exam). Let me discuss these exams in greater detail to set the scene for the reader as they are of
utmost importance for the students, teachers and parents and they played an important part in this research with regard to student resistance.

Because of Turkey’s economic situation, the unemployment rate is very high and a university degree is essential to increase the chances of finding a job. Therefore, the university entrance exam ÖSS (‘ÖSS’ will be used to refer to both exams unless YDS is being referred to specifically), is very competitive. In 2004, according to the figures released by ÖSYM, (Student Placement and Selection Centre), out of 1,727,957 students whose exam entry was valid, only 574,867 students were placed in state and private universities (http://www.osym.gov.tr/BelgeGoster.aspx?DIL=1&BELGEBAGLANTIANAH=1377). As private universities cannot be afforded by a large majority, the ÖSS becomes even more competitive for state universities. Therefore, high school education in Turkey is expected to prepare students for this exam. The whole process of school education is seen as a means to the higher education.

Although this may not seem problematic at first glance, it causes problems as very often the curriculum is abandoned for the sake of preparation for ÖSS. Therefore, rather than ÖSS evaluating the students’ proficiency gained in various subjects, it has an enormous washback effect in that it becomes the main point according to which school education is shaped. This problem has been on the public agenda for at least the last ten years and the exam has been changed and re-changed frequently in the last five years or so to try to overcome this problem. However, ÖSS is still problematic and interferes with school education, which is also supposed to provide the students with the necessary skills for their future life.

It is a widely accepted practice that final year, Grade 11, students use medical reports from doctors to be absent from school to prepare for the exam, which causes controversy in the health sector as much as in education. These students attend school only when their medical report expires for a couple of days until they obtain another one. In the end, the classes are very often cancelled due to absence of students. And it is not uncommon that when there are students attending, the curriculum is abandoned for the sake of practicing for the exam, i.e. mostly practicing answering multiple-choice questions.

Having witnessed this practice personally while doing the research, I asked predominantly English teachers working in the schools involved in this study what they thought of it. They expressed their concern at losing these students in their final
year. At the same time, they mentioned the difficulty of having only one or two students in the classroom. They said that they would rather have no students at all for a class than as few as one or two as they could not follow the curriculum with so few students, who were absent for most of the term anyway.

The Grade 10 students who participated in this study were also attending private language courses after school and/or at weekends to prepare for the exam. It has become accepted practice by now that students who want to take the exam attend private courses. This is partly a result of the inconsistency between the curriculum and the university exam questions. The private English courses focus mainly on grammar and reading paragraphs to find the main argument, synonyms or antonyms, or to answer the comprehension questions about the paragraphs. As the university exam is a multiple-choice exam, the paragraph questions are also multiple-choice questions.

According to the curriculum provided by the Ministry of National Education of the Turkish Republic, students are expected to study the texts in their textbooks in the reading lessons; but the typical practice in the classes participating in this study, was reflective of general practice in that they read paragraphs from past years’ university exam questions, or those prepared by language institutions to practice for the university exam. At best they practiced for the exam as well as following their textbooks in their class hours, which ideally should be devoted to developing/improving reading skills.

The general approach to reading in foreign language education, and in L1 reading education, in Turkey in school settings is a traditional approach that is comprehension oriented. The socio-cultural aspect of literacy does not have a place and reading in EFL is part of a four skills approach. Reading is seen as a linear act whose aim is to crack the code and to get the meaning hidden in the text, following the structuralist paradigm, as will be discussed in Chapter 1 in greater detail.

As Wallace points out, critical reading is already very rarely an issue in EFL/ESL classrooms as, regardless of the general approach to reading in traditional settings:

*EFL readers are often marginalized as readers; their goals in interacting with written texts are perceived to be primarily those of language learners. What is missing is:*

1. *an attempt to place reading activity and written texts in a social context.*
2. *The use of texts which are provocative*
3. *A methodology for interpreting texts which addresses ideological assumptions as well as propositional meaning.*

(Wallace 1992a: 62)

This study explores what happens in Turkish Anatolian High School (English branch) education when these gaps are filled.

As will be argued in Chapter 1, a traditional approach to reading, which does not reflect an understanding of reading as a social process or discourse and ideology as interrelated, is an approach that has been under criticism for some time now, as it fails to grasp the dialectical relationship between language and power.

Therefore, based on the principles offered by critical pedagogy and Critical Language Awareness (henceforth CLA), and in the light of the studies done in these areas, a course on critical reading was given to the students for this research. Whereas previous studies in CLA or Critical Literacies (henceforth CL) were conducted mostly at university level and predominantly in L1 or ESL contexts, this study seeks to investigate the impact of a critical reading course at high school level in an EFL context.

The findings will therefore be of wider interest, as they will provide insights into the place of a course on developing critical reading skills in an EFL high school context, which might be used for further research on integrating a critical reading course into the national curriculum in Turkey and elsewhere. Besides, I believe that it will help to form the bases of further research on critical reading in different contexts.

The research was carried out on an action research model. Below I provide an overview of the stages of this research, relating these stages to the organisation of the thesis.

**Stage 1: Reflection and analysis of current practice; General idea of research topic and context**

My experience both as a student in the Turkish educational system and as an English language teacher trainee, led me to realise that there is a need for research in developing critical reading skills. At the moment, developing critical thinking skills exists in the curriculum within the aims of developing reading skills but no further
explanation as to realisation of this skill is provided. Given that developing a critical approach to literacy is recognised as a need by other researchers on the Turkish Educational System (İrfan Erdogan 2002), I decided to explore the ways in which critical reading skills could be developed in the Turkish High School context.

**Stage 2: Scanning the literature, discussing with colleagues**

*Browsing through the literature can pinpoint a topic which would be both relevant and interesting for the researcher and contextually suitable*...

*It [reviewing the literature] demonstrates that the researchers have studied developments in the particular field of enquiry and that they will begin their investigations from an informed stance. This gives everyone confidence...*

(Macintyre 2000:3)

I started exploring previous studies on developing critical reading skills (Chapter 1). These studies on critical reading/writing courses were very useful as they gave invaluable insights for the development of my own course. The closest of these studies to my own study are those by Catherine Wallace. Firstly, the context and aims of her critical reading course were the closest to those of this research. Secondly, she builds the framework of her critical reading course on Systemic Functional Grammar (henceforth SFG) and Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) (Wallace 2003). However, the studies of other researchers were also useful and in the light of these studies, e.g. those by Kramer-Dahl (2001) and Leal (1998), I could pinpoint issues which were likely to come into play. On this thesis, I decided to place a particular focus on issues of motivation and possible resistance from the students in relation to a critical reading course. At the same time, while reviewing studies in this area, especially Wallace’s studies, I realised that I needed to move on to consider in detail another area, i.e. SFG and CDA.

*Functional grammar offers the possibility of looking at whole texts in their social context. The ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions of language ... are linked to the features of the social situation in which the text arises, its content, the relationship between producer and*
receiver, and the overall functional rhetorical mode of the text, whether descriptive, narrative, or expository.

(Wallace 1995:337)

Reviewing SFG and CDA enabled me to pinpoint the grammatical structures to be focused on in the analysis of discourse to find out the ideologies at play in a written text (Chapter 2). CDA and SFG together provide the means to critically analyse a written text. In other words, they provide the theoretical framework and means for developing critical reading skills. My reviews of studies in the areas of developing critical reading skills and CDA and SFG were simultaneous and complementary at times. Studies on CDA led me to also another area: the overall relationship between language and thought.

*Our studies demonstrate that social groupings and relationships influence the linguistic behaviour of speakers and writers, and moreover, that these socially determined patterns of language influence non-linguistic behaviour including crucially cognitive activity*

(Fowler and Kress 1979: 185)

Hence, I went on exploring the relationship between language and thought, and language and social reality, that is, whether they are interrelated and if they are, to what extent language reflects and reproduces thought and social reality. This in turn led to exploring the nature of reality and social reality as these arguments shape the very basic assumptions of critical pedagogy, including Critical Language Awareness.

**Stage 3: Narrowing down the topic planning the action**

*Teachers new to action research frequently comment that finding a focus and developing a research question is difficult. In fact, for many this may be one of the most difficult points in the research process. You may feel uncertain both about the kinds of questions that can be asked and about how to focus the questions sufficiently to make them manageable.*

(Burns 1999:45)
Based on the studies reviewed in Chapters 1 and 2 I established my focus in this research, i.e. developing critical reading skills, and investigating the impact of this on reading motivation. I decided to give an intervention based on these focuses and the literature reviewed, in a Turkish High School context. I went on reviewing the literature further to develop the course. Meanwhile I formulated research questions, being aware that clarifying them would be an ongoing process.

Stage 4: Tentative action plan, consideration of different research strategies

Based on the studies I reviewed, I:

a) Revised the research questions;
b) Developed a term plan and lesson plans for the course;
c) Developed a research methodology; and
d) Developed the research instruments.

The research methodology I considered at this point was a pre-test post-test experimental design. Therefore, it involved giving an intervention and measuring the effects of this intervention on the students in relation to critical reading and motivation. The research questions were based on the two focuses of critical reading and motivation, following Stage 3, and a term plan for the intervention based on the literature review on critical reading was developed. The research instruments to measure the changes were questionnaires, interviews, and pre-test post-test.

At this stage I also started searching for the texts to be used in the course. As the course was to be divided into phases according to three metafunctions of SFG, the selection of texts was based on to what extent they lent themselves to a focus on different readings, as part of developing the understanding of reading as a social process, and to grammatical analysis in the classroom (Chapter 4). For example, for use in the week the interpersonal metafunction was discussed in the classroom, appropriate texts might include salient use of personal pronouns, appraisal systems, etc.
Stage 5: Redefined topic- selection of key texts, formulation of research question/hypothesis, organisation of refined action plan in context

One question becomes another’s answer; the answer in turn becomes a question. It is a dance of communication. Questions for educators mean carefully considering practice – ‘What am I doing?’ ‘Why am I doing it?’ – and these questions give a living form to an educational enquiry.

... Life is not static. Answers and questions will change, as will focus, perspective, and the living form of the individual who is formulating them.

(McNiff 1988:42)

After my end-of-first-year panel review, based on the feedback I got from it, I decided to change the research methodology and the term plan for the course. In this panel, the choice of an experimental design was focused on as this methodology is in the positivistic paradigm and requires a highly controlled environment and quantitative data. However, my data would be qualitative as a result of the nature of the changes I wanted to detect. I was mostly relying on students’ self reports and this was another problem for this paradigm.

My attention to practical issues in the lesson plans such as timing was also drawn at this stage. Hence, I revised the lesson plans and the term plan (Chapter 4) and decided to abandon the experimental design (Chapter 3).

Working on the research methodology and the research instruments I also revised and refined the research questions (Chapter 3). At this stage I also went on looking for texts.

Stage 6: Take action. Monitor effects - evaluation of strategy and research question/hypothesis. Final amendment.

... educational practices provide the data, the subject matter, which form the problems of inquiry... These educational practices are also ... the final test of value of the conclusions of all researches

(Dewey as cited in Noffke 1997: 6)
At this stage I gave the intervention to two groups of students in a seventeen-week-course in two high schools in Turkey. As I went through the course, each week, I adopted the basic action research cycle suggested by McNiff (1988) and Burns (1999) to make the necessary adjustments throughout the course. Each week had a lesson plan and as this course was novel in the Turkish context, I used students’ feedback that came through questionnaires and verbal interactions with students to make necessary adjustments on an ongoing basis. For example, students’ feedback made me realise that my explanations on SFG structures to be used in the analysis were one-way and did not enable any input on the students’ side. Having noticed this, I tried to find ways of involving students more during these lessons (Chapters 5 and 6).

Stage 7: Evaluation of entire process

This stage involves issues of validity, reliability, and triangulation (Chapter 3), giving an account of the intervention (Chapter 4), as well as data analysis, (Chapters 5 and 6).

Stage 8: Conclusions, claims, explanations; Recommendations for further research

This stage involves discussions of the data analysis, implications of the findings, as well as recommendations for further research, which are discussed in Chapter 7 and my Conclusion.
CHAPTER 1 CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

In this chapter I review work on critical pedagogy (1.1) and critical literature (1.2) in general as a foundation for reviewing work on critical language awareness (1.3) which more specifically informs the present study.

1.1 Critical Pedagogy

1.1.1 Paulo Freire’s Critical Pedagogy

To study is not to consume ideas, but to create and re-create them

(Freire 1985: 4)

Freire’s studies on literacy have been very influential in the development of critical pedagogy. Although his studies focus on adult literacy, they have been influential in developing a new and a rather radical approach to education, and in particular to literacy. Understanding Freire’s concept of reading is essential to understanding the conceptual foundations of the critical reading course adopted in this study. He not only challenges the traditional approach to reading but his fundamental arguments are shared in my study, as I discuss below.

Freire claims that reading “is an attitude towards the world”, that is, it “cannot be reduced to the relationship of reader to the book or reader to the text” (1987: 3). In other words, “reading the word” and “reading the world” are interrelated:

Reading does not consist merely of decoding the written word or language; rather it is preceded by and intertwined with knowledge of the world. Language and reality are dynamically interconnected.

(Freire and Macedo 1987: 29)

The meanings created and reproduced through discourse produce a social reality as opposed to a given and unchangeable natural reality, and this social reality will favour those holding the power, as they are the ones that have the “power to define, profile, and describe the world” (Freire and Macedo 1987: 53). Therefore, “social reality” is created by those
who oppress and are oppressed collectively, but it reproduces the “meanings” of the oppressors, which will be in conflict with the reality or interests of the oppressed.

Let me point out here that this study, too, shares the understanding that social reality is constructed by those living in it. However, Freire’s definition of oppression is problematic for this study as his argument regarding oppression, especially in his earlier works *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and *Politics of Education*, is fundamentally based on class struggle. He worked in Brazil and other countries on adult literacy, and the ‘pedagogy of the oppressed’, the critical pedagogy he offers, aims at empowering the working class to fight against economic oppression. Therefore, his notion of oppression is essentially related to means of production and emancipation and empowerment in his studies and in his context are more clearly defined on the basis of class struggle. In this study, however, I adopt the understanding that there are multiple forms of oppression, and, therefore, that emancipation and empowerment are related to these multiple forms of oppression, as I discuss in sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.2 below. Indeed Freire’s notion of oppression being limited to the division of labour has been subject to critique frequently, especially by feminist theorists (Morgan 1997).

As argued above, Freire challenges the traditional approach to reading. His approach to literacy is based on the understanding that language is not just a “means” for communication but creates the very “meanings” we communicate (Berthoff in Freire and Macedo 1987, xiv), as well as being based on the relationship Gramsci develops between language and “hegemony” (Freire and Macedo 1987). Gramsci argues that language has a dialectical role in “hegemony” and “counter-hegemony”, where language is the means both to rationalise and legitimise the hegemony of the dominant class through “silencing” the experiences of those oppressed, and to struggle with “hegemony” through putting meaning into these experiences (Freire and Macedo 1987: 8).

Oppression is not a dead-end condition according to Freire either; his notion of power is dialectical too (Freire 1985, Freire 1987). Similar to Gramsci’s notion of hegemony, it is both positive and negative, as Giroux argues, it is positive as it is the basis of the struggle “for their [people’s] image of a better world” (Giroux in Freire 1985: xix). The notion of agency is of utmost importance in Freire’s studies. He suggests that as social reality is created by human beings, it can be changed by them. The first step to this change, he suggests, is raising consciousness of the oppression, the subjective nature of social reality, and people’s (both oppressors and the oppressed) own role in creating and re-creating it as the agents of that reality, i.e., *conscientization*. Conscientization will be
followed by emancipation and empowerment of the oppressed (Freire and Macedo 1987). Freire’s dialectical notion of power is shared in this study too. Similarly, agency is central in this study as I discuss in Sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.2. Accordingly, conscientization is the main objective of my course.

Freire suggests that literacy should serve to emancipate those silenced through:

... develop(ing) an alternative discourse and critical reading of how ideology, culture and power work within late capitalist societies to limit, disorganize, and marginalize the more critical and radical everyday experiences and common sense perceptions of individuals

(Giroux in Freire and Macedo 1987: 6)

As argued above, what lies at the heart of these arguments is human beings’ agency, as opposed to being placed in object positions, whereby they can transform their social reality, or their history as Freire puts it. Freire remarks, “... their perception of themselves as oppressed is impaired by their submersion in the reality of oppression” (Freire 1987: 30). In other words, he claims that social reality is created by human kind and that it is the very same reality that makes humankind forget that they are the creators of this reality and that they can transform it.

*Domination is also expressed by the way in which power, technology, and ideology come together to produce forms of knowledge, social relations, and other concrete cultural forms that function to actively silence people. But the subtlety of domination is not exhausted by simply referring to those cultural forms that bear down on the oppressed daily; it is also to be found in the way in which the oppressed internalize and thus participate in their own oppression.*

(Giroux in Freire 1985: xix)

Freire recognises the complexity of transforming this reality, as he argues that resistance to such transformation can be encountered within both dominating and dominated groups as this is the only world-view that either group adopts. That is, to change it means to change their whole conception of the world (Freire 1985). Indeed, it is not uncommon to see resistance from learners in studies of critical pedagogy. I discuss resistance in relation to Critical Language Awareness in Section 1.3.1.
Freire suggests that in order for perceptions of reality to be followed by “transformation” in “objective reality”, the perception of reality should be followed by a “critical intervention” (1987: 37). The pedagogical approach that Freire offers for this includes understanding the nature of domination, and of the problems that emerge from it as well as understanding of the “historical and cultural particularities, the forms of social life, of subordinate and oppressed groups” (Giroux in Freire 1985: xx).

In other words, Freire argues that social reality is produced by human beings and that it is in favour of the interests of those in power, which results in oppression of certain groups, specifically the working class in his studies. However, as this reality is produced by human beings, it can also be changed by them. Language plays a major role in reproducing oppression by not giving access to those oppressed, on the other hand, language also enables those who are oppressed to give meanings to their experiences, i.e. to challenge social reality, as a result of conscientization. However, Freire acknowledges that there might be resistance to these new meanings and that through a “critical intervention” learners can be empowered to transform social reality.

As emphasised above, language plays a central role in Freire’s pedagogy and is crucial in conscientization, emancipation and empowerment. In the following section, I discuss the pedagogical approach he offers and the role of language in this approach.

1.1.2 “Banking Education”

Based on the arguments reviewed above, Freire suggests that education is a political act by its nature and that literacy should not be only about teaching learners the sounds and the corresponding written symbols, but teaching them to question problematic situations in the society to which they belong, as well as raising consciousness of the students’ place in historically constructed practice within specific relations of power (Freire 1987, Freire 1985, Freire 1974, Freire and Macedo 1987: 7).

He criticises the traditional notion of education, which he calls “banking education” (1987: 58). He remarks that in banking education the students are “depositories” and that the teachers are “depositors” (ibid.). In banking education, the students memorise and repeat instead of comprehending and critically approaching to the subject matter, which results in reproducing the social reality.

Banking education is practiced very commonly in the educational system of the context of this study. This is partly due to the traditional approach to education, educational
goals and objectives, and mostly due to the prevailing exam system in Turkey. Although both educational professionals, that is, teachers, teacher trainers, and educational theorists, and the public question banking education with the concern that school education will fail to help the students become independent individuals, the overwhelming importance of the university exam represents a very important obstacle to radical changes in the educational system. Although the exam board has been adopting and re-adopting changes in the exam based on the feedback they get from the schools, universities, students and the public, the changes achieved have not caused an impact in the educational system yet.

Freire suggests that education should seek communication rather than a banking approach. In other words, to avoid the teacher rationalising the dominant discourses in the education process, or imposing their own position and to enable students to express their own experiences, the teachers should also be open to learning from the students. The teacher should become “teacher-student” and the students should become “student-teachers” (1987: 70). Otherwise, he claims, rationalization “coincides in the end with subjectivism”, where the dominant ideology is reproduced once again (ibid.).

Through communication between the students and the teacher, the flow of knowledge should be two-way instead of one-way, that is, teacher to student. This is another reflection of the role of agency in Freire’s approach: the students should be the agents of their own learning experience too. This approach also helps to avoid the teacher, who is privileged compared to the students, from imposing their subjective reality on the students, involuntary though it might be, as argued above. This approach was endorsed in my study.

Such an approach, through which both students and the teacher learn to reflect on “themselves and the world” (ibid.: 71), Freire claims, is essential for the “problem-posing method” which he uses with adult learners to pose a problematic situation related to the students’ lives (ibid.: 69).

Similarly, he emphasises the need for texts that relate to students’ own experiences. Otherwise, he claims, the learning is alienating and far from achieving critical consciousness. The texts should be related to the learners’ own lives and problematic situations within their lives to make the students aware of the fact that ‘social reality’ is created by them and that it can also be transformed by them (Freire 1985, Freire 1987). This is a crucial point for my study. Indeed, texts have an important role in Critical Language Awareness, as I discuss later in Chapter 4.
Again consistent with his understanding of human beings’ role in shaping history, in his work *The Politics of Education*, Freire suggests that the reader should be the subject, i.e. agent, and not the object of the reading act. In other words, instead of internalising the text passively and becoming “domesticated”, the reader should study the “sociological-historical conditioning of knowledge”, the “content” of the text, and the way the text is organised (1985) These points are similar to CLA’s understanding of reading, Section 1.3, and to the approach adopted in this study.

Freire argues that readers should always be curious about the text and be willing to inquire further. Moreover, they should bear in mind that there is “a dialectical relationship” between the reader and the writer and that the text reflects the writer’s “reflections” on the subject matter (ibid.: 4).

Freire’s work is important as it draws attention to social reality, the subjective nature of reality, the role of language, and hence, the role of education in reproducing and/or transforming this reality. His work also has importance in that he not only draws attention to these aspects, but suggests ways of dealing with them, calling for education to adopt a critical perspective, and helping the students, whilst letting the students help the educators, emancipate themselves from this subjective social reality, and transform it.

It should be born in mind that Freire’s studies are influenced by Marxism as well as liberation theology and to a great extent shaped by the needs arising from his context. Therefore, his approach is based on a less fragmented understanding of social reality, oppression, struggle, emancipation and empowerment, and human agency than in a Turkish High School context.

Freire’s understanding is not only less fragmented but also defined with clearer and wider borders than those of today. It would not be wrong to claim that his pedagogy, especially his emphasis on constant development through empowerment, carry the traces of modernity, where identities, oppression, and socially constructed reality / realities vs. objective reality were more clearly defined, and where the understanding of human beings’ constant developing for ‘the better’ is visible.

However, modernity, together with its objectives and claims, is under criticism. Notions like identities, oppression, and social reality are nowadays viewed as more fragmented and hazy, hence, emancipation and empowerment appear even harder, if not impossible to achieve in post-modernist, post-structuralist perspective.
Both modernity and postmodernism pose challenges to critical pedagogy, as I discuss in the sections below. But let me point out again here that this study adopts the claim of Freire on the nature of social reality that it is created collectively by human beings; on the role of language in creating this reality; and on human agency. Freire’s emphasis on text selection, two-way communication, and students’ being the agents of their own learning also have a place in this study. As will be seen below in reviewing critiques of Freire, this study also adopts post-structuralist tenets.

I shall now move to discuss the underlying assumptions of this study in greater detail in this chapter and in Chapter 2, in relation to literacy education, and in particular, in relation to literacy in EFL contexts, and in relation to Critical Language Awareness. Now let me look at the place of Freire’s critical pedagogy in post-structuralist approaches to education.

1.2 Critical Literacies

1.2.1 Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed and Critical Literacies

It is not uncommon to find expressions in the studies on critical literacies denoting drastic shifts in the perception of the world. For example, McLaren and Hammer (1996: 82) say, “We have for some time been chilled by the recognition that we are living in an age gone mad”. Perhaps, their claim is rather dramatic compared to that of Gee’s, “We are living amidst major changes, changes creating new ways with words, new literacies, and new forms of learning” (1990: 43). It is no coincidence that so many researchers emphasise a change the world is going through, as the rise of post-structuralism, and postmodernism means radical changes in the way we understand the world, ourselves, and the relationships we build with the world. Due to such fundamental change in approaches to reality, it is possible to see changes in education in general and in notions of critical pedagogy in particular.

As reviewed above, Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed proposes that raising awareness of the subjective nature of social reality will help the oppressed to emancipate themselves from subjective reality, which is presented as objective and self-justified, and having realised their place in creating this reality, they will be able to transform it.
Although Freire’s critical pedagogy has come under criticism due to its reductionist approach to oppression, for example by feminist theory, much has been adopted by literacy theorists from Freire (for a discussion of Feminist Theory and Freire see for example, Weiler 1994). However, it is worth repeating at this point that Freire worked on adult literacy and his studies are mostly based on his work in Brazil with (landless) peasants in the 1970s. Hence, Freire’s critical pedagogy is placed in and reflects a less fragmented world with more hope, which is in tension with the understanding of ‘realities’ of the post-structuralist era. I discuss this understanding in the coming section as it has direct implications for developing approaches to critical literacies.

1.2.1.1 The Problem of Fragmentation

One of the main issues that present themselves as challenges to developing critical literacies is related to the concept of oppression. Different approaches to and accounts of reality will lead to different ways of understanding and of dealing with oppression. Among the challenges more strict versions of post-structuralism and postmodernism pose to developing critical pedagogy is the fragmentation and multiplicity they suggest, in contrast to the centrality of unity presented in modernity through the emphasis put on structuralism, although, I would like to argue, the very fragmentation and multiplicity make critical pedagogy possible.

Modernity proposes a universal endeavour of humankind to achieve development, through a universal reasoning. Through this universal reasoning, “social and political tendencies” were expected to be “progressive” (Lobivond 1989:6 as cited in Peters and Lankshear 1996: 8). However, postmodernism rejects these claims.

...(postmodernism) rejects the doctrine of unity of reason. It refuses to conceive of humanity as a unitary subject striving towards the goal of perfect coherence (in its common stock of beliefs) ...

(ibid.)

This scepticism to the claims of modernity is due to a number of reasons including the end of the Cold War, post-colonisation, globalisation on the economic

At the heart of rejection of the claims of modernity by postmodernism lies the issue of structuralism, and the importance modernity attached to structuralism. It is modernity’s claim that social structures, which exist and function within their paradigms autonomously, define and shape people, power relations, and social reality. The role and importance of the structure resonates with modernity’s goal of progression and unity of reason (ibid.).

However, the role of structures in modernity has been criticised due to a number of reasons. Firstly, structuralism and modernity are criticised for denying human agency. Structuralism suggests that human beings live in a reality, which is imposed by the structures, and they have to comply with this imposed reality (Torfing, 1999).

Secondly, the nature of structure itself has been subject to criticism. Derrida problematizes the issue of “centre” in structuralism (Torfing, 1999: 39). He argues that the centre has been given different names throughout history. Hence, he argues, structuralism being governed by an autonomous centre is contradictory with itself as “the centre is supposed to govern the idea of structuration of the structure while itself escaping the process of structuration” (ibid.). Hence, “the unfulfilled desire for a centre” results in “endless displacements and substitutions of the centre”, through myths, religion, economy, etc (ibid.: 40). Therefore, he argues, the centre is actually not already existing but rather always substituted; it is not autonomous, fulfilled, and in “full presence” but “absent” (ibid.).

Due to the absence of a centre, i.e. “transcedental signified”, the “signification” becomes de-centred as well, and “extends indefinitely” (ibid.). “In the absence of a centre or origin, everything becomes discourse” (Derrida as cited in Torfing 1999: 40). This understanding I believe is also problematic as it reduces everything to discourse and denies a shared reality. Indeed, this has been a criticism of strict versions of post-structuralism.

Such fragmentation is also visible in Foucault’s work The Archaeology of Knowledge. Foucault too argues for the absence of “totalities” and “continuity”, although he states explicitly that he is not dealing with the issue of structure directly (Foucault 1969: 9). A linear and continuous understanding of history of ideas, with an underlying continuity and totality of events, phenomena, concepts, and so on leaves
its place to a more fragmented one where events, phenomena, concepts are not parts of a linear causal pattern but form separate, individual series of coherent unities. These series are not parts of a totality either and, therefore, what matters is to establish the circumstances and limits of these series and place them in relation to each other rather than placing them in a linear totality (Foucault 1969).

However, Foucault does not reduce everything to discourse but claims the social situatedness of the individual series. He does not deny possible relationship(s) between such individual series, but suggests that in the absence of a totalising unity, which reduces such series into their relationship with the "core" of the totality, it is possible to draw relationships between such series without the reductionist effect of the totality.

Fragmentation on the ontological and/or epistemological level has direct implications in terms of oppression. Such de-centring and rejection of the imposition of structure provides space for the existence of multiple forms of realities and for multiple forms of oppression to be voiced and addressed.

Therefore, through fragmentation some groups and forms of oppression that are denied voice by structuralism find space for existence in the public domain. Hence, oppression can manifest itself in numerous spheres such as ethnicity, gender, religion, age, heterosexuality vs. homosexuality, local vs. global, etc. as well as in relation to means of production, and this is important in terms of emancipation and empowerment critical pedagogy aims for.

Fragmentation also suggests multiple identities:

... it is indispensable to develop a theory about the subject as a decentred, detotalized agent, a subject constructed at the point of intersection of a multiplicity of subject positions between which there exists no a priori or necessary relation...

(Mouffe, 1988: 35 as cited in Peters and Lankshear 1996: 22)

Although post-structuralism promises the agency that structuralism denies, such fragmentation in the form of multiple identities pose challenges to agency too. For example, a group that is oppressed in terms of class can have different identities that may or may not intersect with each other. Therefore, emancipation and empowerment get muddier, than that in Freire, since we are no longer dealing with a
group of people occupying one position within power relations, but with individuals occupying multiple positions, which may or may not be in relation to each other.

It is possible to argue that this is a necessary component of post-structuralism, since, as Foucault suggests, circumstances and limits of individual series need to be established, as reviewed above.

Nevertheless, although Foucault leaves room for possible relationships between individual series, fragmentation also leads to a more strict understanding where the possibility of any relationship between series, meanings, discourses, and so on is denied due to fragmentation and multiplicity of realities and absence of structure.

Fragmentation has direct implications for critical pedagogy as it entails fragmentation of identities and oppression. Ellsworth (1989), for example, reports a critical course, where the participants had difficulty in finding ways to voice their experiences in relation to oppression due to their fragmented identities. Thus, I would like to clarify here, before moving on to discussion of reality and representation, that this study adopts the post-structuralist understandings of agency, fragmentation, and social situatedness. However, I do not accept the claim of an absence of a shared reality, since this fails to account for the power inequalities and unequal power relations. Besides, assuming “commonality” and “not difference” provides the required space for negotiations, as I discuss in the next section (Wallace 1999: 103).

1.2.1.2 Issues of Subjective Reality and Representation

...if the postmodern critique is to make a valuable contribution to the notion of schooling as an emancipatory form of cultural politics, it must make connections to those egalitarian impulses of modernism that contribute to an emancipatory democracy.

(Kincheleoe and McLaren 2000: 295)

Each approach to the critical is normative, predicted on assumptions that the refashioning of language and literacy in this way will have an impact not just on individual capacities and life pathways, but also on the reshaping of institutions, of local cultures, of social lives, and of civic and political spheres.

(Luke 2004: 28)
Post-structuralism’s approach to reality/realities and representation pose a challenge to critical pedagogy, since its approach to reality can move to a stage where everything becomes discourse, as reviewed above. Hence, the structuralist notion of “misrepresentation” of reality does not have a place in the poststructuralist paradigm (Morgan 1997: 8): “These critics argue that it is simply not possible to get beyond or behind representation to some unconstructed truth or unmediated reality” (Morgan 1997: 10). Therefore, the Marxist notion of false consciousness, which forms the basis of Freire’s work, becomes questionable.

This also poses a challenge to critical pedagogy as not only is it not possible to talk about emancipation and empowerment in a Freirean sense, but also it is highly questionable whether or not such emancipation and empowerment is at all possible as this rather radical form of post-structuralism, as argued above, denies any reality other than that of representations, leaving issues of power inequality and transformation as impossible if not meaningless:

... if all representations are always and only that and there is no escape to some realm beyond, there would seem little point in conducting a critical inquiry into their truth or falsity. And thus the basis for moral indignation, the ground for launching political action, would become shifting sand.

(Morgan 1997: 11)

In fact this epistemological approach has been among the criticisms to critical pedagogy (see Morgan 1997 for responses to this criticism by critical pedagogy scholars).

Habermas, on the other hand, argues that subjective reality exists only as long as an external reality, that is, objective and social reality, exists, as they are complementary realities and/or concepts (1984: 51).

I find Habermas’s ‘theory of communicative action’ valuable since he acknowledges not only a shared reality, but a mediation between the subjective and objective reality, where meanings can be negotiated and contested, and hence, where critical pedagogy can find its place.

Drawing upon the understanding that human beings and societies are rational entities, Habermas claims that through communicative action, these entities can mobilise negotiation and transformation (1984). Building upon Popper's
categorisation of three worlds, Habermas proposes that actors in a communicative act build relationships between the utterance and the three worlds of “the objective world”, “the social world”, and “the subjective world” (1984: 100):

1. The objective world (as the totality of entities about which true statements are possible);
2. The social world (as the totality of all legitimately regulated interpersonal relations);
3. The subjective world (as the totality of the experiences of the speaker to which he has privileged access).

Through these worlds, and through engaging rationality, critique and transformation become possible, according to Habermas. I would like to state that I find the theory of communicative action valuable as it leaves room for fragmentation, multiplicity, and the role of sociohistoricity while providing a social account and possibility for social change.

Besides, I would like to note that although I accept certain claims of post-structuralism, as stated at the end of the previous section, my position in this study is not based on completely rejecting the propositions of modernity either. On the contrary, this study is based on the assumptions that human beings are historically situated beings with a socially constructed reality. Hence, they can transform that reality collectively, yet I also argue that such transformation will never be complete due to the fragmented and clashing nature of social realities. The basic assumption behind this study is that there are power inequalities and that, unlike modernity’s goal, it is not possible to talk about achieving a state where such inequalities will cease to exist through universal reason. As already stated different social realities and perceptions will co-exist and we need to make sure that the co-existence of such realities does not result in oppression, through constantly raising awareness on power inequalities. What we are left with after the claims of modernity lost their momentum, is not the goal of an enlightened golden age where human reason will prevail, but with a more modest, yet more pessimistic goal that we need to be engaged in constant struggle with any form of oppression. Thus, I would like to argue that what we are left with is not an ultimate triumph of an absolute truth, but with the struggle for the modest goal of preserving human dignity.

Thus, this study is based on a mixture of structuralist and post-structuralist paradigms. It acknowledges plurality in terms of identities, meanings, and social
realities, but at the same time acknowledges socially constructed reality as part of an external reality that we share.

I would like to state here that in the last stages of my studies I came across the work of Sealey and Carter, who discuss issues of reality and representation in social studies in relation to applied linguistics (2004). Their account of social realism is very similar to the perspective adopted in this study as they also adopt a perspective that mixes what might present themselves as opposite dualities. Their work is valuable from an applied linguistic perspective since it meets the need for hybridity, or “complexity” of dualistic approaches in actual educational research or actual educational settings (Sealey and Carter 2004: 89). They provide an account of social realism where objective and subjective co-exist, “It is ... central to the realist accounts that the world is in an important sense mind-independent. But this ... both limits and justifies objectivity...” (Sealey and Carter 2004: 15).

Similarly, they talk of the need to look for causality in social sciences, without having to give in to all the claims of positivism, which is also the claim of this study as discussed in Chapter 3.

*Research of this type will not discover ‘universal laws’, because the actualisation of the properties and powers of the objects in the world is context-dependent, but it will aim to generalize beyond the individual case of the ethnographic study, by drawing on particular conceptualisations of propensity and probability.*

(Sealey and Carter 2004: 88-89)

**1.2.2 Reading vs. Literacies: Literacy as a Social Process**

With the emergence of theories of discourse where language and social are closely linked, as indicated above, understanding of reading shifted from a cognitive approach to a social one (Lankshear et.al. 1997, Wallace, 2003). Literacy has been a term used in relation to adult literacy only and reading/writing were the terms used to refer to what was seen as a psychological act. Freire’s work which approaches reading the word and reading the world as interrelated, as well as the increased interest in research in social studies and linguistics on social situatedness of language were influential factors in this shift (Lankshear and Knobel 2003).
In other words, the shift in the focus of social studies, linguistics, and education; globalisation, development of new information technologies, changes in the means of production, very often referred to as post-Fordism; and inadequacy of psychological models on their own in providing accounts for why some learners are disadvantaged compared to others have been influential in the adoption of a social understanding of language, although in vitally different directions (Comber and Cormack 1997: 22). Different understandings of subjectivity, agency, representation, truth and power, as discussed in the previous sections, and different needs, emerging with information technologies, globalisation, and so on., lead to different adaptations of literacies.

The term 'literacies', as opposed to 'literacy', in itself, denotes and emphasises the social aspect being emphasised in literacy education nowadays. Although, it is possible to find different approaches to and dimensions of literacy such as ‘cultural literacy’, ‘critical literacy’, ‘technoliteracy’, ‘higher order literacies’, ‘three-dimensional literacy’, powerful literacy’, ‘multiliteracies’ (Lankshear and Knobel 2003: 10), all these approaches share the assumption that literacy is a social practice rather than psychological (Cervetti et al. 2001, Comber and Kamler 1997). This study adopts a social approach to literacy, acknowledging the role of the social sphere in language and the role of language in the social sphere. More precisely, this study shares principles with critical literacies (henceforth CL). I would like to discuss these principles in the next section.

1.2.3 Critical Literacies: “Reading the World” and Transforming the World

CL suggest, in addition to literacy being a social process, that texts and discourses are inherently ideological and reflect and reproduce power inequality and dominant ideologies. In other words, critical literacy concerns “learning to read and write as part of the process of becoming conscious of one’s experience as historically constructed within specific power relations” (Anderson and Irvine as quoted in Shor 1997: 1). In other words, CL suggest that reading is not extracting meaning from the text, which is encrypted by the writer, which is the traditional view to reading, but constructing meaning as a socially constructed being, in interaction with the social context reading takes place in; and that reading is not an innocent act of decoding.
symbols but an “act of coming to know the world ... and a means to social transformation” (Cervetti et al. 2001).

Unless challenged, texts and discourses will reproduce power inequality and ideological domination through naturalization of these ideologies, i.e. through presenting themselves as natural and self-justifying. Hence, CL propose challenging the texts and discourses to disturb the naturalization process of the ideologies through language as well as raising awareness to the role of discourses and texts in reproducing the dominant ideologies and to provide students access to the dominant discourses, which ultimately means providing access to power (Comber and Kamler 1997, Comber and Cormack 1997). I discuss the issue of naturalization in relation to language in greater detail in the next chapter, but let me point out here that this study shares the above claims of CL that texts and discourses are ideological and that unless challenged, they reproduce the dominant ideologies through a naturalisation process, as discussed in sections 1.1.2, 1.2.1.2, and the next chapter.

Originally CL have their basis in critical theory, which argues that social groups are engaged in constant struggle to possess or have access to resources (Morgan 1997, Cervetti et al. 2001). However, this struggle is not only through force but through ideologies, and language has a dialectical relationship with these ideologies in terms of reflecting, reproducing, and transforming them (Fairclough 1989). I will examine these claims and the relationship between ideologies and language practices in the following chapter in relation to Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA).

Critical literacy is built on poststructuralism, critical theory and Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed (Cervetti et al. 2001, Luke 2000):

From poststructuralism, critical literacy understands texts as ideological constructions embedded within discursive systems and has borrowed methods of critique. From critical social theory, critical literacy understands that texts, being products of ideological and socio-political forces, must be continually subjected to methods of social critique. Finally from Freire, critical literacy understands that literacy practices must always have social justice, freedom and equity as central concerns.

(Cervetti et al. 2001)
For CL, similar to Freire, literacy itself becomes the subject of study, rather than being the means (Cervetti et. al. 2001).

... literacy is a social and cultural construction, ... its functions and uses are never neutral or innocent, ... the meanings constructed in text are ideological and involved in producing, reproducing and maintaining arrangements of power which are unequal.

(Comber and Kamler 1997)

Similarly to Freire also, CL aim at emancipation from imposition of such social and cultural construction through raising consciousness of the learners' position in the power inequalities as historically positioned beings (Shor 1997). Emancipation, as Freire suggests, should be followed by empowerment, to enable transformation of the social. Therefore, essential to CL is human agency, i.e. through raising consciousness, empowering the learners to transform themselves and the social reality they live in. In other words, CL propose that as the agents in constructing the social reality they live in, learners can transform social reality into a more just, equal reality assuming their roles as agents. Thus, CL claim that raising consciousness of one’s position as a historically positioned being should be followed by transforming the reality, notions adopted from Freire’s conscientization and praxis.

The aim [of the Australian CL] is a classroom environment where students and teachers work together to: (a) see how the worlds of texts work to construct their worlds, their cultures and identities in powerful, often overtly ideological ways; and, (b) use texts as social tools in ways that allow for a reconstruction of these same worlds. Hence the redefinition of critical literacy focuses on: teaching and learning how texts work, understanding and re-mediating what texts attempt to do in the world and to people, and moving students towards active “position-takings” with texts to critique and reconstruct the social fields in which they live and work.

(Luke 2000)

Emancipation and empowerment, as suggested by critical pedagogy, have been subject to criticism, which I will discuss in greater detail below. However human agency and transformation of the social reality, emancipation and empowerment, are essential to critical literacy (Bearne 2003, Wallace 2003, Shor 1997). As already
discussed in previous sections the perspective adopted in this study also assumes the importance of agency due to the reasons already discussed in the previous sections.

1.2.4 Critical Literacy Principles and Practices

CL do not provide, quite rightly, tailor-made methodologies. As the emphasis of the critical literacies is on socially constructed realities, ideologies, and identities, it would be a contradiction within itself to provide ready-made methodologies to be used in a diversity of contexts. However, based on the arguments reviewed in the previous section, CL theorists provide principles for developing CL.

Gee, for example, suggests that CL “might involve any or all of:

- knowing literacy in general, or particular literacies, critically; that is, having a critical perspective on literacy or literacies per se;
- having a critical perspective on particular texts;
- having a critical perspective on – i.e. being able to make ‘critical readings’ of – wider social practices, arrangements, relations, allocations, procedures, etc., which are mediated by, made possible, and partially sustained through reading, writing, viewing, transmitting, etc., texts.

(Lankshear et al 1997: 44)

The New London Group, on the other hand, suggest four “components” of CL, which are neither linear nor hierarchical:

- Situated Practice: immersion in experience and the utilisation of available Designs of meaning, including those from the students’ lifeworlds and simulation: of the relationships to be found in workplaces and public spaces
- Overt Instruction: systematic, analytic, and conscious understanding of Designs of meaning and Design processes. In the case of Multiliteracies, this requires the introduction of explicit metalanguages, which describe and interpret the Design elements of different modes of meaning
- Critical Framing: interpreting the social and cultural context of particular Designs of meaning. This involves the students standing back from what they are studying and viewing it critically in relation to its context.
Transformed Practice: transfer in meaning making practice, which puts the transformed meaning (the Redesigned) to work in other contexts or cultural sites.


Luke (2000) provides a “four tiered approach to early reading instruction” and remarks on the need for a metalanguage, similarly to The New London Group. These principles, in accordance with the claims of CL, emphasise raising awareness of the role of language in wider social context and vice versa and aim at transforming the practices of the learners, while making use of the immediate context and metalanguage of the learners.

Agreeing with the absence of tailor-made methodologies of CL, I would still like to argue that there is a need for studies on critical literacies in more diverse contexts to provide insight both into the principles and practices of CL, and on the possible principles and methodologies to be adopted and or adapted in a diversity of contexts.

In this connection, it is notable that the studies in this area are mostly done in “developed countries” such as Australia, Britain, and United States. They are also usually done with L1 learners (e.g. Luke 2000), though some studies, mostly Critical Language Awareness studies, are done with ESL learners (e.g. Clark 1992) or EFL learners in ESL contexts (Wallace 1999). Hence, there is a need for further research on developing CL for EFL learners in EFL contexts. This study aims at adding to the research on CL with EFL learners as well as adding to the general understanding of CL in the context of this research, i.e. Turkey, and other EFL contexts.

1.3 Critical Language Awareness

[Critical Language Awareness] argues that the use of language is a form of social practice and that all social practices are embedded in specific sociohistorical contexts where existing social relations are reproduced or contested and where different interests are served.

(Janks 1999: 111)
Within the wider agenda of CL, Critical Language Awareness (henceforth CLA) shares basic assumptions and arguments with CL and provides a more focused approach based on Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA).

As reviewed above, ideas for CL take on various forms, from a radical ideology critique model to a liberal, self-development model. CLA, within the various approaches to CL, is concerned with, on the theoretical level, “how discourse practices shape social relations and how social relations shape discourse practices” (Males 2000: 147), where language practices enable dominant ideologies to appear as neutral and/or legitimate (Fairclough 1989); and with, on the practical level, transforming power inequality by challenging the dominant ideologies embedded in texts through textual analysis, which should be followed by transformation of these social practices.

Clark, Fairclough, Ivanic', and Martin-Jones in their early work, point out the principles of Critical Language Study (CLS), which form the earlier theoretical framework for CLA:

1. **CLS sets out to explain and not just describe the discourse of a society or a social institution. The explanatory objective of CLS is to show the connection between discourse and its structural determinants and effects.**

   (Clark et al. 1987: 21)

Central to CLS is also “discourse as a social practice” (Clark et al. 1987: 22). I would like to cite the other “theoretical claims of CLS”, as presented by Clark et al. here:

2. **Socially dominant forces have the power to shape discourse as well as other social practices; they do so indirectly, via the shaping of discourse conventions.**

3. **Conventions tend to be naturalized, so that they appear to be just ‘there’, rather than being put ‘there’.**

4. **Conventions (languages, or language varieties) are valued or devalued according to the position of their users in systems of power relations, with the concept of ‘standard’ legitimising and naturalizing different valuations.**

5. **Different conventions embody different ideologies, and dominant conventions embody dominant ideologies; the naturalization of conventions also naturalizes ideologies.**
6. CLS, in contrast with mainstream descriptive language study, has a historical orientation.  
7. The explanatory objective of CLS is to show how particular ideological connections are imposed between structural determinants and discourses, and between discourses and structural effects, through struggle between social forces.  
8. Discourse is both socially determined and creative.  
9. Discourse is itself a practice of struggle  
10. CLS is a resource for developing the consciousness and self-consciousness of dominated people.  

(Clark et al. 1987: 21-24)  

CLA, therefore, challenges the traditional approach to discourse as merely a process of communication, or as “communication skills” (Fairclough 1999: 81). CLA claims, as stated above, that language and discourses are produced by and reproduce social practices, as discourses organize and produce certain social practices “at the expense of the others, and (discourses) are not ideologically innocent” (Chase in Clark 1992: 118). Therefore, discourse is not an unproblematic flow of information, but is shaped by the dominant ideologies:

... any way of using language which gets to be given and accepted does so through applications of power which violently exclude other ways, and any way of using language within any social practice is socially contestable and likely to be contested  

(Fairclough 1999: 81)  

CLA acknowledges that people are capable of reflecting on these power inequalities in discourse, which they encounter through their language practices, but this reflection will be limited unless accompanied with the knowledge of the discourses and knowledge of the relationship between language and ideology; and this knowledge should be provided from research and theory, through the field of education (Fairclough 1999).  

Therefore, to develop pedagogical practices for developing this theory, CLA makes use of CDA, which sees language as a social practice, and argues that language is in constant interaction with the value and belief systems of the individuals, and emphasises language’s role in maintaining or changing the social context (Wallace 2003: 64).
We saw the objectives of bringing CLA into the curriculum as helping learners to develop more consciousness and control over the way they use language and over the way they are positioned by other people's use of language. A corollary of awareness is action: the understandings gained by CLA should equip learners to recognise, challenge and ultimately contribute to changing social inequities inscribed in discourse practices...

(Clark and Ivanič 1999: 64)

Adopting the understanding that language reflects and reproduces dominant ideologies, CLA also is based on a dialectical understanding of language, similar to CL and critical pedagogy. It sees language as both reproducing dominant ideologies, and as means to transform these ideologies, as reviewed in the last three principles of CLS. To achieve this, CLA adapts the instruments used by CDA to educational settings to provide the ‘knowledge of discourses’ and ‘the knowledge on the relationship between language and ideology’, as CDA is the “departure point” of CLA (Wallace 2003: 64).

Among the instruments of CDA Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is very often used in the classroom procedures of CLA (see for example, Clark 1992, Clark 1993, Wallace 1992, Wallace 1999, Wallace 2003, Janks 1999, Janks 2000). I discuss the value of CDA and SFG in the next chapter in greater detail. For the time being let me discuss the principles and practices of CLA.

As Clark argues, textual analysis on its own might not necessarily account for raising awareness on the power struggle in texts (1992). There is a need for a methodological approach where textual analysis goes hand in hand with the understanding of discourse as a social process. Indeed, the very claims of CLA related to the discourse as social and historical call for such an approach. Therefore, CLA takes socially, culturally and historically situatedness of language practices into account as well (Clark 1992). Hence, discourse is seen as in interaction with the text, the processes of production and interpretation of the text, and the wider sociohistorical processes at play (Fairclough 1989: 25), which is an approach to discourse that resonates with Foucault’s understanding of discourse, as reviewed above.

Fairclough provides a model of discourse as a social process, which combines these three components of the process of discourse:
I find this model valuable since it not only portrays reading as a social process but also emphasises the non-linear nature of discourse, as opposed to the structuralist linear model of reading/writing. It is also valuable as it emphasises the interaction between reader, text, writer, the roles of sociocognitive processes and social context in this interaction, as well as showing “readers, writers, and texts as socially shaped and shaping” (Clark 1993: 118).

It is possible to see the understanding of discourse as a social process in CLA practices (see for example Clark 1992, Wallace 1999, Janks 1999). Wallace, for example, adopts the understanding of CLA on two levels: macro and micro, awareness of discourse in social contexts and awareness of the impact of this in specific texts respectively. She draws learners’ attention to discourse as a social process, for example, through exploring learners’ identities as readers (Wallace 1992). Clark, in another study, problematises academic writing and reading through approaching the texts as part of discourse as a social process (Clark 1993).

Adopting this approach also helps to develop an understanding that learners and teachers, as well as writers and readers, have socially constructed identities and, hence, are sociohistorically positioned (Wallace 1992, Fairclough 1999, Males 2000); not as “subjects” of history where their agency is in question, but as agents whose agency is in close connection with the multiplicity of perspectives, only some of which will be presented as legitimate through discourse.
As well as adopting the theoretical assumptions of CLA, I also adopt the pedagogical implications and methodologies of these assumptions. More specifically, in this study, I adopt textual analysis through the instruments suggested by CDA together with the approach to discourse as a social process. Therefore, based on the studies on CLA as reviewed above, I focused on drawing attention to discourse as a social process together with the analysis of texts using SFG, on a general level. As Wallace remarks “CLA takes a view of pedagogy which favours explicitness and transparency” (Wallace 2003: 66). On a more specific level, I adopted and adapted pedagogical practices suggested by Wallace, as I discuss in greater detail in section 1.3.1.2.

However, as CLA deals with issues that are fundamental in people’s relationships with themselves and with the world, such as social reality, human agency, and especially individual identities and sociohistorical place in social realities (Fairclough 1999 and Males 2000), CLA practices do not always go without problems in the classroom settings. These problems manifest themselves as student resistance, and student resistance to CLA is not an uncommon issue. I shall return to this issue and consider the related role of motivation below, but first I shall look more carefully at specific CLA principles and practices which informed this study.

1.3.1 Principles and Practices of CLA Used in This Study

1.3.1.1 Reading as a Social Process

As argued in the Introduction, the general approach to reading in EFL reading classes in Turkey, indeed in Turkish reading classes too, is the traditional approach, i.e. linear and meaning-extracting oriented. Therefore, there was a need to raise students’ awareness of reading as a social process.

As already discussed above, a framework for emphasising reading/writing as a social process is needed as opposed to reading as a linear process (Clark 1992, Butt et al. 2000), and I find Fairclough’s model for “discourse... as (a) social process” very useful as it emphasises the interaction between the text, processes of production and interpretation and contexts of production and interpretation in a discourse (see above for the model).

Within the understanding of reading as a social process, raising awareness of the students’ identities as readers being socially constructed, as well as that of writers,
are essential points of a CLA course as reviewed above. As Gramsci points out, to adopt a critical perspective, one has to become aware of “oneself as a product of power-driven socio-historical forces” (Kincheloe and McLaren 2000: 288). Besides, readers have multiple and sometimes clashing identities (Wallace 1992a) and this model also helps to raise awareness of these identities of students as socially and historically constructed.

Hence, Fairclough’s model of discourse as a social process was chosen to base the critical reading course given in this study on, and in particular the first part of the course was based on raising awareness of reading as a social process, there I aimed at developing understanding for the second part of the course, which included analysis of the texts. I adopted and adapted a number of classroom practices suggested by Wallace, both in the first and in the second part of the course, though more extensively for the analysis of the texts. Let me discuss these in the next section.

1.3.1.2 Critical Reading Practices: Following Wallace

As Wallace points out, CLA approaches texts on two main levels. On a macro level, it is concerned with the “awareness of literacy practices in social settings”, while on a micro level, it is concerned with the “awareness of effects in specific texts” (Wallace 1999: 104-105). The micro level works mainly in the critical analysis of texts, mostly using Systemic Functional Grammar (henceforth SFG). I adopted these two levels of awareness in my approach in this study.

Wallace provides invaluable insight in her studies on critical reading. She provides possibilities for methodology for a critical reading course (e.g. Wallace 1992a, b, Wallace 1999, Wallace 2003). Most importantly she proposes a framework for the use of SFG in the critical reading classroom, which can be a difficult and tedious task both for the students and the teachers without a clear framework (Wallace 1992a). She proposes methodology for both micro and macro levels of reading. Below, I will review the methodology offered by her and adopted/adapted in this study.

Drawing attention to the issues of authorship, or production of the text, and readership, or interpretation of the text, she proposes that we draw the students’ attention to issues concerning the effect of context on reading process. In an activity in her study, the students were asked to group and categorise texts which were
brought to the classroom collectively, asking questions like ‘who produced this text’, ‘who reads it’, ‘for whom was it produced’, and so on I adopted this activity together with the questions she poses as a starting point to the course and to developing understanding of reading as a social process, developing an understanding that identities, as well as roles of readership and authorship are produced sociohistorically, as suggested by Wallace (1992a). The questions as offered by Wallace are:

(a) who produces them [the texts]? E.g. public bodies, commercial enterprises, local authorities
(b) for whom are they produced, i.e. who are the consumers or the expected readers of the material?
(c) why has the text been produced?
(d) is this type of text of interest or relevance to you? why/why not?
(e) Choose one text from each category which particularly appeals to you, either because of its style or content and discuss with other members of your group

(Wallace 1992a: 66)

Another suggestion she makes that I found useful on raising awareness of the role of social context, was using different texts by different producers on the same subject, i.e. “parallel discourses” (Wallace 1992b: 119). Hence we read two different newspaper articles on the ‘Kyoto Protocol’, one from a British, and another from an American newspaper. This activity gives the opportunity not only to draw attention to the social context and sociocognitive processes, but also to help students question their identities as readers, and consider both issues of readership and authorship as socially constructed, and the sociohistorical aspect of producing and reading texts.

Wallace also suggests using unconventional discourses in texts, where the traditional discourse is challenged (1992b), such as switching the gender roles in a fairy tale. I adapted this suggestion too. I decided to combine this activity with “parallel discourses” (ibid.: 119) and we read two fairy tales, Rapunzel and Practical Princess, where the gender roles in Rapunzel are reversed.

Encouraging students to “generate statements” on the text is suggested as a pre-reading activity by Wallace, and adopted in this study (Wallace 1992b: 114)). She remarks that in traditional reading the students are encouraged to ask questions about the text to be encouraged to try to find the answers to these questions in the text, and
suggests that in critical reading the students can be encouraged to "generate statements" to draw attention to the possible inconsistencies between the contexts and processes of production and interpretation. This activity is valuable as it draws attention to reading as a social process, making use of the model suggested by Fairclough, as well as providing the students with the opportunity to see such inconsistencies more clearly, through verbalising their assumptions before reading the text.

To address these issues further she suggests using questions, building on Kress’s questions, to be asked in relation to the texts read in the classroom as pre-, while- and post-reading activities:

- Why is this topic being written about?
- How is the topic being written about?
- What other ways of writing about the topic are there?
- Who is writing to whom?
- What is the topic?

(Wallace 1992a: 71)

These questions were valuable for this study as they:
1) Helped to raise awareness of reading as a social process;
2) Facilitated discussions on the textual analysis; and
3) Provided a consistency between two parts of the course, the first part on developing an understanding of reading as a social process, and the second part on textual analysis using SFG.

Another framework adopted from her studies is the framework she suggests for SFG analysis of texts. The value of SFG for a critical reading course is discussed in the next section and Chapter 2, but let me point out here that SFG provides the possibility to link lexico-grammatical choices to the social context (Wallace 1999: 106). As Wallace remarks, the three metafunctions of SFG, ideational, interpersonal, and textual, help us to analyse the text in relation to its content, the relationship it builds with the reader and its rhetoric (Wallace 1999: 106).

However, the application of SFG, and CDA to the EFL classroom is not an easy task. Wallace provides a framework for this:
Field
Experiential meanings
(How the writer describes what is going on)
participants: What/who is talked about?
predicates: How is X talked about?
i.e. what adjectives and nouns collocate with X?
What verbs (states, actions, mental processes) co-occur with X?
agency: What/who initiates an action?
Effect of the writer’s choices?

Tenor
Interpersonal meanings
(How the writer indicates attitude to self, subject and reader.)
mood: What mood is selected? -affirmative?
-imperative?
-interrogative?

Modality: What kinds of modal verbs are selected?
Person: What personal pronouns are selected?
How does the writer refer to self, subjects and reader?
Effect of the writer’s choices?

Mode
Textual meanings
(How the content of the text is organised)
theme: What information is selected for first person?
Voice: When is active or passive voice selected?
Cohesive relations: What kinds of connectors are used?
Effect of the writer’s choices?

(Wallace 1992a: 77-78)

This framework was also adopted for the second part of the course to facilitate the analysis and group discussions that followed the analysis. It is a valuable framework since it manages to apply SFG analysis to classroom procedures and to link the analysis to the broader discussion of the relationship of discourse and ideologies.

I will return to these activities, adopted from Wallace, in Chapter 4, The Course.

1.3.1.3 Critical Language Awareness and Systemic Functional Grammar
As noted above, CLA uses CDA and SFG is at the centre of CDA, hence of CLA. Firstly, SFG “takes a view of context to move beyond the immediate textual environment in order to take account of the cultural landscape” (Wallace 2003: 31). As reviewed above, CLA and CDA take the view of language as a social practice. Therefore, there is a need for a grammar that can account for wider social context of the language practice: if the aim is to raise consciousness of the role of language in reflecting and reproducing dominant ideologies in language practices.

*Functional grammar offers the possibility of looking at whole texts in their social context. The ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions of language ... are linked to the features of the social situation in which the text arises, its content, the relationship between producer and receiver, and the overall functional rhetorical mode of the text, whether descriptive, narrative, or expository.*

(Wallace 1995:337)

Besides, as Wallace points out, SFG provides both “breadth” and in “depth” analysis of texts (2003: 32). It provides breadth analysis as its three metafunctions enable to look at the text’s content, its relationship with the reader, and the text as a whole; it provides in depth analysis because it provides a framework to look at the lexico-grammatical choices of the text and through questioning the choices among many other possible ones it helps to link these choices with the social structures and ideologies through which the text is produced and read (Wallace 2003).

The value of SFG in relation to CDA, together with the use of SFG in CDA will be explored further in Chapter 2.

1.3.2 CLA Practices: Emancipation and Empowerment vs. Student Resistance

As reviewed above, CLA aims at not only challenging the dominant ideologies through discourse analysis but also at changing the social structures through consciousness rising. Clark states that raising the learners’ consciousness will result in empowerment, as the learners will be aware of the conventions used in discourse to reflect and reproduce unequal power relations. The next step, Clark argues, is empowering students to act and transform the socially constructed reality (Clark 1992).
However, although the theoretical implications of recognising inequalities, leading to emancipation is well accounted for (see for example Males 2000), it is hard to find clearly defined definitions of empowerment or clear definitions of the expected behaviour as a result of empowerment, for several reasons: Firstly, studies in this area are fairly recent and more research on this area is needed to provide more detailed data on what might be expected to be achieved with empowerment in a diversity of contexts.

Another reason is the ever changing nature, or rather, condition, of human beings, hence, societies and power relations. As Torfing points out, it is highly questionable to claim that power inequality will cease to exist so what is left to do is to engage in a constant struggle against power inequalities in the forms they are to take (1999).

A consensus seems to be emerging among criticalists that power is a basic constituent of human existence that works to shape the oppressive and productive nature of the human tradition.

(Kincheloe and McLaren 2000: 283)

Besides, the expected outcomes of behavioural change as a result of emancipation and empowerment are not immediately observable ones, relating to the complexity of human nature and the difficulty of evaluating behavioural changes according to some external criteria. This is especially the case if the changes expected are fundamental like the ones CLA aims for. Even when the expected change is an immediately observable one, it is difficult to establish the extent to which emancipation and empowerment take place (Morgan 1997), as the aim is to transform the learner and the social reality in the long term.

My position in relation to emancipation and empowerment is that emancipation will provide the learner/s with an option to transform social reality, having adopted the claims of CLA that texts are inherently ideological, and that unless challenged, they will reproduce existing power inequalities, i.e. there is a need for “expos[ing] the forces that prevent individuals and groups from shaping the decisions that crucially affect their lives” (Kincheloe and McLaren 2000:282). Hence, the critical reading course given in this study is expected to provide the learners with the necessary tools for being aware of such impositions on a wider scale and resisting
these impositions, and for “gain[ing] some distance from one’s own identities, experiences, and circumstances in light of greater understanding of those of others” (Wallace 1999: 104).

As for taking action, the students are not expected to take immediate action, nor is this the aim of the course. It is aimed that the course should encourage the students to challenge the dominant ideologies in the long run but as Wallace points out:

_classrooms need not be some kind of dress rehearsal for supposed real life beyond them, if we believe that education has inherent rather than utilitarian value._

(Wallace 1999: 103).

Yet, I recognise that such consciousness will not necessarily result in a choice of transforming the social reality, as what is at stake is people’s identities, worldviews, and perspectives.

As reviewed in Section 1.1.2, Freire argues that students can be resistant to adopting a critical approach to reading, since a critical approach might mean rejecting the only world one knows. Studies on classroom practices of developing Critical Language Awareness do show that students’ resistance to CLA can be due to the friction between their world views, or additionally between their experiences as members of certain social groups and CLA as well as the friction between their experiences as members of certain educational traditions and CLA.

Males points out that raising consciousness will result in a tension between the student’s existing experience and the new experience provided by the CLA course and that it is in the moment of this tension that the student will become critical, i.e. adjust to the new experience (Males 2000). It is possible to see this claim in action in Janks’s study on CLA. Janks gave a 14-week module on CLA as part of an Honours and Masters degree in South Africa, and asks the students to keep CLA journals, where:

_It is possible to see the students approaching and withdrawing, exploring the power of the new discourse and then retreating from it. They move confidently, hesitantly, suspiciously, questioningly, courageously. Reading the journals is a process of watching students try on the new discourse as if it were a costume that does not fit properly._
But unlike clothes, which can be altered, it is they who have to change to fit the discourse, if they hope to acquire it.

(Janks 1999:115)

Males further argues that one’s existing experience functions to limit him/her and that gaining new experiences will not save him/her from the boundaries of experience, but can enlarge the boundaries since “there is no vantage point from which a situation can be viewed impartially” (Males. 2000):

In fact, it is only in an openness to new experiences that an individual confronts the limitations of his historicity and can move beyond them, not to some absolute knowledge, but to new awareness to these limitations; i.e. to a new understanding of his prejudices and the possibilities or impossibilities for such prejudices.

(ibid.: 150)

Undoubtedly, dealing with issues such as people’s identities and limitations not only in terms of their relationship with the social but also in terms of their “historicity” are very personal issues, which are very likely to cause frustration, especially if these are brought up in a relatively artificial classroom context rather than from the person’s own search and need.

However, it is not my intention to argue that student resistance is a necessary part of all CLA courses. On the contrary, there are studies, where the students, with diverse backgrounds, identities, and experiences, share these diverse experiences as means to adopt critical approaches (Wallace 1999, Wallace 2003). However, student resistance in CLA courses is not exceptional and I would like to look at the studies reporting student resistance more closely as a basis for my study.

Granville, for example, voices Simon’s argument that a “pedagogy of possibility” will cause “processes of reorientation, redefinition and revisioning” which will result in a “feeling of disempowerment as old certainties are abandoned” among other factors (Granville 2003: 11). In fact, it is not uncommon to see student resistance in the studies done on CLA. The resistance stems from two sources in these studies: 1) social conventions, or 2) educational conventions. For example Janks’s study on teaching CLA to Honours and Masters students in South Africa shows that as students notice the practices of power inequalities, in their immediate social
context, as a result of the course, they react to it by questioning the benefit of the course. One student involved in Janks's study, for example, in spite of being from a 'disadvantaged' group, states that she would rather leave the issues raised by CLA not dealt with (1999: 121). In this incident the student is aware of the source of her reaction to the course, i.e. the unease it creates by providing knowledge on issues in daily life, but not all students, whether they are at the receiving or giving end of the power inequality, will necessarily be as aware as this student.

For example, Granville reports two CLA courses, the first course given in South Africa right before fundamental changes in the social context of South Africa, i.e. the first election after the release of Nelson Mandela, where there was an “intense excitement”. The second course was given after the election, which “was a period marked by euphoria, relief, and joy” (Granville: 2003: 3).

Some of the students involved in the first CLA course in Granville’s study were observed to experience a discomfort caused by this unease of noticing the problems with the ‘old certainties’, and reflected this feeling on the course itself. In other words, the students projected the feeling of unease on the procedures of the course and showed a preference to go back to previous educational practices. In the second CLA course such discomfort was expressed to a lesser extent (Granville 2003).

I would like to take a moment here to note that social tension played an important role in this study too. The intervention was given right after the Iraq war started and this tension was visible in some students' approaches to the texts used for analysis, although none of the texts were actually about the war in Iraq directly. However, some students still expressed their unease suggesting they would rather not read newspaper articles, which we analysed, about the USA, which were about Kyoto protocol, or about NATO, which was about a dispute in NATO over sending missiles to Turkey in case there was a war in Iraq. I will be looking at these responses in greater detail in Chapter 6.

Similarly, adopting the CLA methodology offered by Wallace, Fairclough, Fowler, Hartley and Reah, Zinkgraf gave a critical reading course to Spanish speaking EFL students at academic level, in “English Teacher-and Translator- Training programmes” (Zinkgraf 2003: 3). While the students involved in this study showed greater awareness of power and language at the end of the course, they reported that the course caused an “overwhelming feeling of distrust” (Zinkgraf 2003: 10).
Students also mentioned that they found the module time consuming and repetitive, with fifty per cent of the students expressing that they found the module actually "boring" (Zinkgraf 2003: 9) and that the analyses were demotivating for them. Other problems emerging were the lack of the knowledge of intertextuality in EFL learners along with the metalanguage proving to be too complicated.

This is an important finding, as metalanguage is an important aspect of CLA, not only because CLA makes use of the instruments offered by CDA in form of textual analysis, but also because metalanguage provides a systematic and "detached, rational enquiry" (Wallace 1999: 106). At the same time, as Wallace suggests, L2 learners are expected to have knowledge of grammar, that is some degree of metalanguage (Wallace 1992).

It is true that textual analysis requires a significant amount of metalanguage, and the detailed analysis of texts, which is the basis of the critical reading and writing courses offered by CLA, can bear the risk of being repetitive and, hence, "boring". However, again, we do not have enough data to see whether or not these outcomes are actually inherent side effects of the methodology offered, or rather are in interaction with the classroom dynamics and procedures; nor whether or not we can find ways to overcome these outcomes through adaptations for different contexts or if we can make adaptations in classroom practices, dynamics, and procedures. For example, we need more research to see the impact of metalanguage on student motivation. This study, therefore, aims at adding to the understanding of CLA and critical reading in these areas.

Another source of frustration caused by CLA can be the educational traditions from which the students come. Kramer-Dahl's study of a critical reading and writing course given to undergraduate Arts faculty programme students in Singapore shows that students can feel trapped between old educational habits and the new educational experiences offered by CLA (Kramer-Dahl 2001). Kramer-Dahl reports that the students fail to recognise the possibility of being both analytic and personal. The questions whether or not CLA is a western approach and whether or not it is suitable for non-western countries arise at this point, as Kramer-Dahl claims.

Being carried out in a "non-western country", for such a tension between the current educational conventions and CLA might be expected in my own intervention. The context in Turkey is very similar to that of Singapore in the senses that the students in both contexts "have been disciplined too well to read and write in ways
that in authoritarian situations have brought them success” and that school education means learning whatever the textbooks and/or the teacher offer, without questioning, as fast and effectively as possible to be evaluated in the exams (Kramer-Dahl 2001: 17).

However, the shortcomings of such an educational system usually do not go unnoticed by the professionals or the public. As indicated in the Introduction, the current educational system in Turkey has been under criticism for some time for merely promoting spoon-feeding. It fails to promote creative and critical thinking to a great extent and needs in this area have been recognised (İrfan Erdoğan 2002, Sultan Erdoğan 2005).

Although in İrfan Erdoğan’s study ‘critical thinking’ is used as an indicator of a liberal approach rather than a CLA approach, it still shows the shortcomings of the current system. Teachers who participated in Sultan Erdoğan’s study on teacher’s personal theories, for example, are unhappy about the lack of critical reading practices in schools. One teacher remarks that he would like to adopt a critical awareness, and “not just language awareness” in the reading classroom but he cannot actualise this approach in the current educational system (Sultan Erdoğan 2005: 165).

Besides, I find the claims raised in Kramer-Dahl’s study on the ‘appropriacy’ of CLA practices in non-Western contexts highly problematic; even more problematic are generalisations like ‘non-Western contexts’ to refer to a diversity of contexts.

There is not enough data for such claims to be made. As remarked earlier, most studies on CLA or CL have been conducted in what is generalised as ‘Western contexts’ i.e. Britain, Australia, United States. Research in other contexts is fairly recent and more rare and we need more data to be able to make claims on the appropriacy of CLA in ‘non-Western contexts’. Leal’s study, for example, is an example of CLA that did not encounter problems of appropriacy in Brazil. If the assumptions of CL and CLA are that discourse reflects and reinforces power inequality and dominant ideologies, questions of appropriacy of CLA disregard that power inequalities and power struggle exist regardless of context. As a matter of fact, educational practices themselves might be an arena where power inequality, exclusion and exercise of dominant ideologies can be seen at work. Therefore, rather than dismissing critical pedagogies as part of the educational agenda, we should aim to try to find ways of adapting the agenda of CLA to a variety of contexts.
Leal reports a study conducted with high school students in Brazil in developing CLA skills in L1 as part of their grammar lessons (1998). The findings of this study show that CLA resulted in an increase in the students’ interest in the native language lessons, where the CLA course took place (Leal 1998). Leal reports that the educational system in Brazil does not provide the students with the texts that are related to the students’ own reality, resulting in propaganda of the “legitimate knowledge” presented by the dominant groups, which in turn, “establishes a distancing between school and reality, which increases the pupils’ alienation” (Leal 1998: 5).

Put another way, the educational system and those teaching in it do not strive to develop the pupils’ intellectual capacity (Gramsci, 1971), that is their capacity to criticise, to participate, to act.

(Leal 1998: 5)

Leal’s study shows that the students showed greater interest in the course compared to traditional courses. The students find CLA meaningful in a way that their traditional grammar courses were not:

(e) ‘I think like when the subject’s a bit boring, then the pupil comes to school feeling sort of: “Oh, I’m not going to need to know what a subject, predicate is for my life. I already know how to write. I’m not going to need to use that. So psychologically it’s a real drag. When class is over, the test’s gone, it’s over ...’
...
(c) ‘That is it, folks. That boring stuff ... texts like “The cat jumped off the roof” ... The text’s got to be up-to-date and be directly related to our reality.’
...

(Leal 1998: 4)

The increase in students’ interest in Leal’s study was a result of CLA’s providing the students with meaningful texts and knowledge, i.e. knowledge that they would need in their real lives, their social realities, knowledge about the discourse and about the relationship between language and power.

The studies on CLA practices reviewed above share one thing in common: CLA’s impact on the realities of the students. In some cases, the students are
frustrated (Granville 2003, Kramer-Dahl 2001), and in others they are motivated (Leal 1998). However, we do not yet have enough data on the effects of CLA on student motivation: as in Leal’s study does CLA result in increased motivational levels or as in Zinkgraf’s study, for example, do students find CLA “boring” (2003)?

Based on the studies on student resistance or motivation to CLA, I decided to investigate any changes in the students’ approach to the course, in form of resistance or increased motivation. The educational context in Turkey is very similar to that of Brazil with regard to the absence of students’ realities from school; and very similar to that of Singapore with regard to the educational conventions. Therefore, based on Kramer-Dahl’s study, I inquired throughout the course for resistance that could be caused from students’ being socialised into the educational settings too well; based on Leal’s study, I inquired into any positive changes in the motivation of the students for reading course; and based on the studies regarding resistance from the students as individuals (Granville 2003), I inquired any feeling of unease or frustration due to the issues dealt with in the course.

Thus, based on the studies reviewed above, the critical reading course given in this study in an EFL context, in which metalanguage and textual analysis were used as extensively as was used in the study of Zinkgraf (2003); where the educational system is very similar to that of Kramer-Dahl (2001); and where the educational traditions ignore students’ realities, as is the case of Leal (1998), my inquiry into resistance or motivation towards the course aims at adding to the understanding of these issues in relation to CLA.

1.3.2.1. Motivation

I shall now review literature on motivation, as motivation is an important issue emerging from the previous section.

Studies on CL and CLA suggest two main fundamental principles in relation to motivation. The first one is the use of authentic materials. Although authentic materials are also used in traditional reading classrooms, CL and CLA approach these authentic texts in a different way, that is, they problematise these texts in ways relating to the students’ own realities.

Secondly, related to the point above, CL and CLA practices typically give more control to the students in classroom practices. In other words, the students are
expected to contribute with their own experiences, opinions, criticisms, while in the context of this study, in traditional reading classes student contribution is limited to language practice.

Based on these points, CLA suggest relating the learning experience to the students’ own realities, which affects text selection, student involvement and classroom communication. In other words, CLA practices provide an environment for genuine two-way communication in the classroom, where the students can teach the teacher as much as the opposite, as Freý re argues.

Below, I describe and evaluate theories on motivation in relation to their relevance to the context of this study with regard to CLA.

1.3.2.1.1 Reinforcement Theory

The literature on motivation reflects different perspectives on humankind at different historical stages. The earliest studies on motivation were based on “Reinforcement Theory”, where all human beings are seen as comparatively more predictable beings, who are assumed to react in certain ways to their environment given that the conditions are equal (Stipek, 2002: 19). Deriving from Skinner’s studies, this theory suggests that through the use of “positive reinforcers” and “negative reinforcers”, target behavior can be achieved (ibid.). Today, the use of positive and negative reinforcers is very common not only in classrooms but probably also in other interpersonal areas, either consciously or unconsciously. However, this theory fails to grasp the complex and unpredictable nature of humans, and this being a human feature, the nature of motivation. Indeed, Stipek reports Graham and Weiner’s criticism, as well as others’, that this theory was considered “mechanistic’ because no reference is made to such unobservable variables as choice, beliefs, expectations or emotions” (ibid.: 21). Hence, the main criticism of this theory is its neglect of human agency.

1.3.2.1.2 Integrative vs. Instrumental Motivation

A distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation stems from Gardner’s studies in Canada in French immersion contexts, (Gardner 1985). Integrative
motivation is constructed as an interest in the language, the culture, and the people who speak that language, whereas instrumental motivation refers to the motive to learn a language for practical and economic advantages (Gardner 1985), e.g. finding a job. It was claimed that for language development integrative motivation is superior to instrumental. Further research suggested that in some ESL contexts instrumental motivation could bring better results than integrative motivation (Lukmani in Brown 1994: 154)).

Hence, the dichotomy of integrative vs. instrumental motivation does not always capture the complex nature of motivation nor does it account for all the reasons and contexts of learning a foreign language. The students who participated in this study too, for example, were highly motivated to learn and study English as a result of high instrumental motivation, as I discuss in Chapter 6.

1.3.2.1.3 Cognitive Approaches to Motivation

Unlike Reinforcement theory, cognitive approaches emphasise human agency. Social Cognitive Theory, for example, emerges as a result of the understanding that humans are conscious, and hence, the external conditions that they are exposed to are subjective by nature. In other words, the same stimuli may result in different outcomes in different individuals, as these individuals will have “cognitions (thoughts, beliefs)”, which “are assumed to mediate the effects of the environment on human behaviour” (Stipek 2002: 39). Therefore, this theory claims that the reinforcement and punishment proposed by the Reinforcement Theory do not always have a direct effect on motivation. These cognitions result in: a) people’s ability to adapt themselves to new environments without having to be reinforced to them, sometimes merely transforming others’ experiences into their own context; b) a shift in the definitions of reinforcers and environment. Stipek voices Bandura’s claim that self-respect, in some cases, is “valued more highly” than any external, “material reward” (2002: 40-41).

Based on the principle that humans are capable of transforming reality into signs and signs into reality, as in the case of transforming someone else’s experience to their own context, this theory proposes that encouraging individuals to set goals for themselves will provide effort for the goal without the need to be reinforced externally on regular basis (Stipek 2002: 41).

According to Stipek (2002), Bandura suggests that one’s own perception of their capability of a specific task in a specific context, i.e. “self-efficacy” is an important factor in motivation. Self-efficacy is determined as a result of people’s judgements of their own capabilities to do a specific task, which in turn shapes these judgements (Dornyei 2001, Stipek 2002, Alderman 1999). ‘Self-efficacy’ is based on four different sources according to Bandura, one’s “actual experience”; “vicarious experiences” where observing a peer doing a task provides a sense of high ‘self-efficiency’; “verbal persuasion”; and finally “psychological arousal” (Stipek 2002: 42-43, Alderman 1999: 61). Self-efficacy refers to people’s judgements on a specific task rather than a generalisable judgement (Stipek 2002).

Similar to Social Cognitive Theory, Atkinson proposes Achievement Theory where the motivation is determined by the learner’s “expectancy of success” (Dornyei 2001: 10). He proposes a linear model where the tendencies to achieve and avoid failure exist as opposite poles (Atkinson 1966, Stipek 2002). He proposes that on the unconscious level we have “motive for success” or “need to achieve” on the one end and “motive to avoid failure” on the other (Stipek 2002: 56). Also, that on the conscious level we have beliefs about the situation, are reflected in forms of “subjective/perceived probability of success”, “incentive value of success”, “subjective/perceived probability of failure”, “incentive value of failure”, “achievement motive”, and “the motive to avoid failure” (Atkinson 1966, Stipek 2002: 57, Feather 1966: 35). If a person’s motive to success is greater than his motive to avoid failure, they will approach the task regardless of the difficulty level of the task. On the other hand, if their motive to avoid failure is stronger than their motive for success, they will try to avoid the task, again, regardless of the difficulty of the task but will show higher anxiety in tasks with intermediate difficulty (Atkinson 1966, Atkinson and Litwin 1966). Atkinson further suggests that the motivational level of an individual can be expressed quantitatively through a mathematical formula (Atkinson 1966). However, transforming “motive for success” and “motive to avoid failure” into mathematical figures is not an easy task. Indeed, it is considered as one
of the weaknesses of this theory (Stipek 2002: 58). Besides, the dichotomy of motive for success and motive for failure is not enough to explain motivation on its own, as was the case in this study (Chapter 6).

According to Dornyei (2001), Brophy, Eccles, and Wigfield have a similar approach to motivation. They claim that the greater the "expectancy of success" and "the value the individual attaches to success on that task", the higher the motivation (Dornyei, 2001: 10). However, their emphasis is on the expectancy of success and the individual’s expectancies from the achievement rather than tendency to avoid failure. Again, this approach finds its place in the motivation of the students involved in this study.

Rotter (in Stipek 2002: 59), on the other hand, takes Atkinson’s concept of value beliefs and broadens it: the value one attaches to the success of the task or a similar behaviour’s being rewarded in the past is not enough on its own unless the person believes that being successful on that task is related to that person’s "personal characteristics or behaviour" (ibid.). For example, Student A may believe that his effort will result in success on a task, the success of which should also be seen as valuable to the student. Rotter also claims that these beliefs do not stem only from individual situations, e.g. in the case of Student A, she should believe not only that her efforts on a particular task in her maths class will result in success but also that her efforts in maths tasks result in success.

Thus, Rotter makes a distinction regarding whether the individual finds the basis of the outcome of a task in "internal/ contingent", or "external/ not contingent", introducing the idea of “locus of control” (in Weiner 1974: 5 and Stipek 2002: 60). Further research has revealed that locus of control is context and domain-dependent; that people might have both contingent and non-contingent beliefs depending on the domain of their belief. (Stipek 2002: 60). What is also important from an educational perspective is that these beliefs are already shaped by the individuals’ past experiences when they come to the classroom (for studies on the role of these beliefs on persistence and effort, see Stipek 2002: 60).

Skinner in Stipek (2002) also makes a further distinction: “strategy (means-ends) beliefs” and “capacity (agency) beliefs”. The former looks into the strategies used for the task, whereas, the latter is about whether or not the individual has the capacity and skills to perform the task (ibid.: 61).
Attribution theory takes the contingent – non-contingent distinction further. The main difference is that it emphasizes humans’ being conscious and it claims that people analyse their past experiences to figure out what caused success or failure (Ushioda 1996). In other words, it focuses on individuals’ “perceptions of the cause of events that occurred in the past”, whereas, Rotter, Skinner and other researchers studying the role of beliefs in motivation focus on “people’s expectations related to future events” (Stipek 2002: 63).

Attribution theorists claim that the internal – external distinction is not enough on its own to understand the complex nature of beliefs, and thus, Weiner proposes two more categories for distinction: “stability” and “controllability” (Weiner 1974: 6) (Stipek 2002: 64, Ushioda 1996: 15-16, Alderman 1999: 27). For example, effort is contingent / internal, unstable, and controllable; on the other hand, ability is contingent, stable, uncontrollable; and luck is non-contingent / external, unstable, and uncontrollable according to these distinctions. As Ushioda points out, such an approach offers a recursive pattern; motivation can be the “cause or product of learning success” (Ushioda, 1996: 9). Yet, these distinctions can be empowering to increase student motivation through giving appropriate feedback and intervention (Alderman 1999).

Self-Worth Theory suggests an account of why in some cases individuals make the effort necessary to achieve and some do not, based on the value and belief systems reviewed above. This theory suggests that human beings have a tendency to develop and maintain “a sense of self-worth” (Stipek 2002: 79). Hence, if the possibility of failure is considered by the individual to be higher than the possibility of achievement, the individual is more likely to find ways of avoiding that task to maintain their self-worth (ibid., Dornyei 2001).

I believe these different approaches to motivation can be both complementary and overlapping with each other depending on the social context, and the educational settings. For example, the students involved in this study were anticipated to be highly motivated to study English, as they had chosen to study in the English Language branch themselves at the end of Grade 9, hence they were expected to have a high self-efficacy, as they had consciously decided that this is the subject they are good at.

Moreover, the reward they expect to gain as a result of their efforts was anticipated to be a very strong one, i.e. passing the university exam and attending the university. Therefore, the ‘motive for success’ or ‘need to achieve’ was expected to be
much higher than the 'motive to avoid failure', as having chosen to study in that branch, they had decided consciously that the 'perceived probability of success' and 'incentive value of success' is much higher than the 'perceived probability of failure' and 'incentive value of failure'.

Similarly, the students' beliefs were expected to be that they do have the required ability to learn a foreign language / foreign languages. This attribute's being contingent, stable, and uncontrollable means that the students would feel less need to be motivated by an external agent. Therefore, these theories can be complementary and overlapping, and indeed can be moulded into each other so much that any distinction between them becomes fuzzy and artificial since human are dynamic beings with the ability to reflect and adapt, as proved to be the case in this study (Chapter 6).

1.3.2.1.4 Intrinsic Motivation

[Intrinsic motivation theorists] claim that human beings are innately inclined to develop skills and engage in learning-related activities; external reinforcement is not necessary because learning is inherently reinforcing.

(Stipek, 2002: 120)

[White proposed that] people have a need to be effective in their interactions with the environment. This need is a basic motivational propensity that is persistent and energizes such things as exploration, attention, thought and play.

(Deci 1980 as cited in Ushioda 1996: 21)

What the theories overviewed above, i.e. cognitive approaches to motivation, have in common is that they put more emphasis on human agency compared to reinforcement theory, but what still lies at the basis of these theories is that the individual reacts to external forces, in this case learning; and these theories look deeper into the ways the individuals react to these forces and why they react the way they do. Intrinsic motivation, on the other hand, suggests that humans, being active and in need of autonomy, have an innate tendency to learn (Deci and Ryan 1985, Deci and Ryan 1992, Ushioda 1996, Ushioda 2003).
Ushioda points out four important features of intrinsic motivation:

1. it is self-sustaining because it generates its own rewards;
2. it leads to voluntary persistence in learning;
3. it focuses on skill development and mastery;
4. it is an expression of personal control and autonomy in the learning process.

(Ushioda 1996: 19-20)

Intrinsic motivation provides a perspective that is complementary with the principles and practices of CL and CLA. As argued in 1.3.2.1, CL and CLA aim at providing an educational setting where the control of learning is shifted towards learners and where the learners are expected to be the agent of their learning. Below, I discuss arguments regarding intrinsic motivation in greater detail in relation to the principles and practices of CL and CLA.

1.3.2.1.5 Competence Motivation

As reviewed above, intrinsic motivation theory is based on the assumption that human beings have a natural tendency to learn. The earliest studies in this area take the biological features of human beings and argue that human beings have a natural tendency to learn without existence of reinforcers. This can be seen in infants’ persistent behaviour in learning to interact with their environment and they do so without external rewards and in spite of constant failure and sometimes punishment, usually from the environment they are learning to interact with (White in Deci and Ryan 1985, Stipek, 2002). The developed competence in interaction with the environment is the reward for the learner, which is self-sustaining (Deci and Ryan 1895). However, the learner experiences feeling of boredom in engagement with task after developing competency in that specific task (ibid.)

Therefore, this approach claims that, there is a need for an “optimal challenge/arousal” in the tasks we do to be motivated to be engaged in them and also, in the first place, to achieve mastery in that task (Deci and Ryan 1985, Deci and Ryan 1992, Stipek 2002). Intrinsic motivation theory also claims that we need the optimal challenge, and achieving mastery to experience a feeling of pleasure which is very often associated with intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan 1985, Ushioda 1996, Stipek
2002). Stipek, for example, points out that most students do not enjoy school work due to its failure to promote competence and mastery, (as proved to be the case in this study).

However, theories of self-efficacy, self-worth, attribution are also in interaction with intrinsic motivation. As Stipek (2002) argues, as the nature of the tasks change in time: children need adult feedback as the tasks get more complicated and the nature of the task does not allow direct feedback from the environment the child is interacting with. And depending on the nature of the feedback, not only the definitions of achievement on various tasks can be changed but also self-efficiency can be affected, leading to decrease in intrinsic motivation. As Stipek points out:

\[
\text{People don't enjoy working on tasks that make them feel incompetent.}
\]

\[
\text{... Many studies have demonstrated that students who believe that they are competent academically are more intrinsically interested in school tasks than those who have a low perception of their academic ability.}
\]

(Stipek 2002: 124).

Stipek also reports studies that show that people are more interested in the subjects about which they already have some knowledge (2002). However, as the Novelty approach suggests, a degree of novelty is also important. The Novelty approach claims that human beings need a degree of “surprise, incongruity, complexity, or discrepancy” to be able to get a degree of pleasure from the task. (Stipek 2002: 125). Stimuli that are not at all discrepant or novel will not arouse interest and stimuli that are too discrepant from the individual’s expectations will be ignored and will cause anxiety (Berlyne, 1966. p.30)

CL and CLA aim at developing critical awareness, i.e. students’ competence which is relevant to their realities (Sections 1.1.2, 1.2.4, and 1.3.1). Similarly, students involved in Leal’s study expressed the value they attach to critical awareness as developing competence (Section 1.3.2). Therefore, I find intrinsic motivation and competence motivation valuable in explaining the potential role of CLA courses in developing student motivation.

Students who participated in Leal’s study also expressed lack of motivation for their traditional reading classes (Section 1.3.2). I would like to argue that lack of development of competencies in educational practices inevitably result in a mismatch
between students’ own lives, interests and school education, eventually leading to alienation from school practices. This can be seen in a study on Turkish Anatolian High School Students’ motivation for reading (Tercanlioglu 2001). Tercanlioglu investigates Grade 7, 8, and 9 students’ motivation for reading but does not make a distinction between reading as a school and as an extracurricular activity, and between reading in L1 and L2, which, I think, is a weakness of this study.

Her findings point out that students show high intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for reading, while social reasons and work avoidance have low influence, however, the definition and attached role of social reasons is not clear in her study. Again, it is possible to see different theories and approaches to motivation as moulded together in this study. However, one important point raised by this study is that the students showed high intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, as mentioned above, but relatively little reading involvement (Tercanlioglu 2001). As Tercanlioglu does not differentiate between reading in L1 or L2 and reading as a school or extracurricular activity, we do not have much data on the reasons for this discrepancy. However, I would like to note here that the students involved in this study also showed a similar motivational approach as I discuss in Chapter 6, due to the alienation from the reading practices at school as a result of school practices’ failure to promote competencies, among other reasons.

1.3.2.1.6 Self-Determination

*Intrinsic motivation implies self-direction; thus, if people think that the directing must be done largely by the teachers, then they are placing other values above the value of having children be intrinsically motivated to learn.*

(Deci 1978: 198, as cited in Ushioda 1996: 21)

Deci and Ryan (1985) among other motivational theorists, agree that people have an innate need to develop competence but also add that we need to feel that that we are doing a task not because we are obliged to but because we choose to (Stipek 2002: 126).

Deci and Ryan (1985) argue that to be intrinsically motivated, people must feel free of external rewards or pressures. It is important that the people feel that the “locus of control”, as in Attribution Theory, is within themselves rather than an external factor (ibid.). Thus, students who feel that they have control over school
settings and their own learning experiences are more likely to be intrinsically motivated (Ushioda 2003).

Research shows that intrinsic motivation is desirable for a number of reasons some of which are related to autonomy. Again the educational aims and goals and the nature of the educational settings come into play. For example, Stipek reports that intrinsically motivated students are more likely to be involved in learning outside school, where external reinforcement may or may not exist (Stipek 2002: 127; Ushioda 1996: 20). This, I believe, is an important outcome that should have high importance in the context of this study, as the current exam system results in connotations that school education is only a means to university education (and careers, mostly via university education).

Also, intrinsically motivated students are more likely to choose challenging tasks, where they do not feel the need to secure an extrinsic reward (ibid.: 128). Another point raised by the research, as briefly mentioned above, is that intrinsic motivation is related to feelings of pleasure and increased participation (Ushioda 1996: 20).

Miserandino (1996) found that students who engaged in schoolwork for intrinsic reasons reported more involvement, persistence, participation, and curiosity along with less boredom in school activities than students who reported being extrinsically motivated.

(Stipek 2002: 129)

The Self-Determination Approach suggests that extrinsic rewards have a negative effect on the intrinsic motivation in the long term (Deci and Ryan 1985). In the short term, extrinsic rewards result in an increased involvement with the activity compared to those with no extrinsic reward; however, when the extrinsic reward is withdrawn the involvement of those who had extrinsic reward previously decreases to a lower degree than those who were never offered an extrinsic reward (ibid.). This, of course, has important implications related to learner autonomy and the role of education. If among aims of education is helping the learners to become self-sufficient individuals, the role of extrinsic rewards should be considered very carefully.

However, at the same time it should be born in mind that the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic is sometimes unclear. It is very likely that if the
individual is involved in an activity purely for an extrinsic reward, they will find intrinsic reasons as well. Or even if the individual is intrinsically motivated and is offered an extrinsic reward, e.g. attending the university, they will not withdraw from the activity after (all) the extrinsic reward(s) have been obtained, e.g. university degree, a job, etc. because meanwhile they might have developed a sense of “self / identity” from that activity, or “a feeling of pride”, as Ushioda puts it (1996: 49). In other words, extrinsic rewards may lead to intrinsic motivation in the process of engagement of the task.

However, this does not undermine the importance of intrinsic motivation, as this motivation promises desirable outcomes reviewed above. Besides, such correlation between extrinsic rewards and intrinsic motivation seems context-bound and needs further research.

Stipek reports that intrinsic motivation is usually measured by “whether people voluntarily choose to engage or persist in an activity or by their ratings of their interest in or enjoyment of a particular activity” (2002: 134). Hence, I choose to ask whether the students enjoyed the reading lessons we had in the questionnaires seeking for the reasons as well. Because of the reasons stated above, my main concern in this research related to motivation was whether or not the students’ intrinsic motivation had increased at the end of the course.

The next step, according to Deci, Ryan, and other motivational theorists is the internalization of the values related to the tasks they are engaged in (Stipek: 2002: 141). Once this is achieved, the individual will be involved in the activity with a feeling of self-determination regardless of the enjoyment they get from that activity.

However, before the individual reaches this point, the reward they draw from intrinsic motivation is “usually defined in terms of positive feelings, such as enjoyment, pleasure, satisfaction, self-indulgence” (Ushioda 1996: 20).

Ushioda points out an important aspect of motivation in language learning, i.e. “communicative success” (ibid.: 32). She argues that the students will have a sense of “self-confidence, satisfaction and a sense of real progress in one’s learning”, which will be more meaningful than the objective evaluation of the teacher or exams (ibid.: 33). Hence, she suggests creating opportunities for the students to use the language in the classroom is important.

She also proposes for such communicative tasks that language be used not as the end but as the means to access activities that the students are interested in (ibid.).
She remarks that such activities make it possible for the students to relate to the learning experience more as such activities are related to "areas of life that are personally meaningful" (ibid.: 35, Ushioda 2003).

Besides, as Ushioda argues, students are not only individuals but are members of the classroom community. Therefore, students' interaction with each other and with the "social learning setting" is as important as the individual students' beliefs, perceptions, needs, etc. (Ushioda: 2003: 92).

Making learning meaningful for the individual in terms of their interaction with the world is especially important for language learning due to the fact that school education is likely to involve breaking a skill into its components, causing a very blurry link between what is learned in the language classroom and what is experienced outside the classroom: "Learning becomes abstract and removed from the reality..." (Ushioda 1996: 42). This is a point that bears even greater importance in a context such as the context of this study, where school learning is separated from personal life with a broad line, not only through nature of language learning but also through the role of the university exam.

In order to engage intrinsic motivational processes and foster autonomous learning behaviour, language learning in the classroom must cater for the meanings students want to express and the things they want to do that are relevant to them in their lives. In this way, students will quickly perceive that the foreign language is not merely an abstract object of study or a system of rules, but a further means of expanding their own behavioural repertoire in terms of how they interact with the world, indulge their own passions and interests, access new sources of information and materials, appropriate new ideas and experiences, develop worthwhile skills and knowledge bases, etc. (Ushioda 1996: 43-44)

Ushioda also suggests that the use of real-life materials in the classroom instead of materials manufactured for language learning will help to carry students' life outside the classroom into the classroom. Another point she draws our attention to in terms of developing and sustaining intrinsic motivation is the use of "collaborative learning" (Ushioda 1996: 46). She remarks that collaborative learning hands the "learning initiatives and control" over to the students, minimising external control, effects of which in relation to motivation have been reviewed above (ibid.).
In my study, I use real life materials and group activities, in the expectation that these will foster intrinsic motivation. Besides, based on the studies reviewed in 1.3.1.1 and on motivation, the assumption of this study is that the critical reading course would provide a link between the students’ lives and educational practices, which is usually missing to a great extent in the context of this study, through providing challenge through novelty and competency.

1.4 Conclusion

The relationship between language and power, or language and ideology has been the focus of research in social studies, after attention was turned to the role of discourse in reflecting and reproducing social realities. This ontological and epistemological shift has had direct implications in education and gave rise to critical pedagogy and a shift in the understanding of literacy education. As reviewed above, this shift led to recognition of discourse as a social and historical practice and to developing CL and CLA.

This study shares assumptions of CLA, and adopts the principles and practices suggested by CLA, as discussed above. At the same time there is a need for further research in CLA to provide data on issues like resistance and motivation. Therefore, this study, giving a critical reading course in an EFL context, aims at contributing to knowledge in the field of CLA.

The critical reading course in this study is based on two main claims of CLA, that reading is a social process and that analysis of individual texts will enable an understanding of these processes at work. Therefore, I accept Wallace’s (1999) suggestion regarding micro and macro levels of awareness. To help develop these two levels of awareness, I also adopted and adapted critical reading practices suggested by Wallace, as discussed above. While reading as a social process was the focus of the first part of the course, individual analysis of the texts, where reading as a social process was supported by the textual analysis, was the focus of the second part. Now, I would like to review and discuss CDA and SFG in Chapter 2, as they form the theoretical framework for textual analysis in CLA, and hence, for this study.
CHAPTER 2 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In this chapter I discuss critical discourse analysis, the approach to analysis of texts which I adopted in the critical reading course. First I discuss the seminal ideas of Whorf regarding the link between language and thought and provide examples from Turkish (2.1). I then move on to consider critical discourse analysis with respect to links between language and ideology, considering examples particularly relating to gender and ethnicity (2.2). I then consider the important role of systemic functional grammar (SFG) in CDA, with examples relating to the three metafunctions of language identified by Halliday (2.3).

2.1 Language and Thought

In this section I briefly review studies by Whorf (2.1.1) to discuss the relationship between language and thought, as his studies are important to point out the dialogic role of language on thought. Although his studies are different than those on discourse and ideology in vitally important ways, i.e. his studies are concerned with language as a homogenous system while for CLA and CDA discourses within languages are of concern, his understanding of the relationship between reality and language are similar to those discussed in Chapter 1.

I then move to a discussion of a main grammatical difference between English and Turkish, both as an example of linguistic determinism and relativism and to familiarize the reader with the linguistic background of the students involved in this study with regard to the relationship between language and thought (2.1.2).

2.1.1 Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis

On the assumption that language and thought are interrelated, Whorf's comparative studies of Native American and European languages demonstrate how different perspectives and different cultures are reflected in languages.

Whorf argues that there are important differences between Native American languages and "SAE", i.e. "Standard Average European", languages (1974c: 138) and that these differences are both lexical and grammatical. For example, Hopi has only
two nouns for flying objects, one of which is for birds and the other for all flying objects other than birds (1974b: 216).

Whorf's main emphasis, however, is on differences in the grammatical structures of languages. His most famous example concerns the concept of time in Hopi (1974a, 1974b). He claims that Hopi “can be called a timeless language” from the perspective of SAE (1974b: 216). In SAE, time is perceived in a linear fashion in which one moves forward. In other words, time is divided into three: past, present, and future. On the other hand, Whorf claims that Hopi does not follow the same continuum. It has three tenses, which are: 1) past and present together, 2) future, and 3) general (laws of nature or the truth) (1974b: 217). He also argues that the future tense in Hopi is different from that of SAE as a result of Hopi speakers’ perceiving the “cosmos” as a whole including the future in it in the present time (1974a: 60). As a result, Whorf argues, what is to happen does not move from future to present, neither does the speaker move towards it from present to future, as it is in SAE. Rather, what is to happen is “already with us” and just starts to “come to” the Hopi or the Hopi starts to “come to” it (ibid).

Furthermore, the division between nouns and verbs is also due to the worldview (1974b). He suggests that the division is based on the words denoting “temporary event” or “stable event” and gives examples of “hit, run” as verbs and “house, man” as nouns (ibid. 215). Nevertheless, his comparison of SAE with Hopi shows us that these divisions do not have their roots in the outside world as “lightning, wave, flame, meteor, puff of smoke, pulsation” are nouns in English, although they denote temporary events, and verbs in Hopi (ibid.).

Another argument by Whorf is that due to the difference in the way Hopi perceive time, segments of time are not countable. In other words, it is not possible to say “ten days” (1974c: 140).

The distinction between countable and uncountable nouns does not exist in Hopi. All nouns have both singular and plural forms (ibid). In contrast to English, in which uncountable nouns sometimes require other linguistic devices such as *a bar of chocolate*, Hopi use the plural form of the same noun without any further linguistic device.

Based on these examples, Whorf argues that different languages carve up reality in different ways:
We are thus introduced to a new principle of relativity, which holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated.

(1974b: 214)

In other words, he claims that languages reflect the traditional worldview of their speakers and differ from each other based on the differences in the worldviews, which is known as linguistic relativism.

Whorf also suggests that linguistic relativism results in the speakers' perceiving the world in the way their language suggests. Although scholars like Gumperz and Lewinson (1996) disagree with the theories of linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism the study on Dyirbal by Dixon, as mentioned in Lakoff (1987) is another example of linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism.

Thus, Lee (1992) notes a study by Dixon on Australian Aboriginal language Dyirbal. Unlike SAE, which has three sub-classes of nouns at most, Dyirbal has four classes: “Class A: Male entities, Class B: Female entities, Class C: Edible substances, Class D: Residual class” (ibid: 35). SAE has two (masculine, feminine) or three (feminine, masculine, neuter) sub-classes. Considering the environment Australian Aborigines have to live in, it can be asserted that Class C is an example of linguistic relativity, i.e. what is edible and what is not is, or was, of high significance for the Dyirbal speakers’ survival in that environment. He suggests that the distinction between what is edible and what is not is effective in the way the child learns to perceive and react upon the world in a certain way, which, in return, is an example of linguistic determinism (ibid.).

A study by Salzmann (1998) shows that another Aboriginal language in Australia, i.e. Pintupi, has more than ten words for different types of holes. And in a similar study by Carrol and Casagrande (reviewed in Salzman 1998) Navajo speakers, Navajo-English bilinguals, with different degrees of fluency in both languages, and English speakers were involved (Ibid.). Navajo makes a distinction between objects on the basis of their shape. The study shows that the Navajo dominant subjects did make a distinction between the objects, as a result of linguistic determinism, whereas English dominant subjects did not. As I shall show below, there is a similar effect of
linguistic determinism on Turkish speakers based on the distinction made for reporting past events/phenomena.

2.1.2 The Case of Turkish

From an epistemological point of view, the studies reviewed above emphasise the subjective, context-bound nature of knowledge and from a linguistic point of view they demonstrate how language can affect the way we perceive the world. As a speaker of Turkish, a non-European language, I do experience this subjective nature of language in reflecting and interpreting reality in my everyday life. Perhaps the most well known and most influential aspect is the distinction Turkish makes in the use of past tense.

In Turkish, there are two main past tenses: Witnessed past tense (constructed by adding -di suffix to the verb) and learned past tense (constructed by adding -mış suffix to the verb).

Witnessed past tense is used for the past events or phenomena that have been witnessed by the speaker/writer consciously and the past tense with -mış is used for the past events that have been learned from another source, i.e. person, book, etc., in other words, when the speaker/writer is the secondary source, e.g. ‘Mektubu o gün yazmışım’ (I wrote the letter that day) means that the speaker/writer does not remember that they wrote the letter that day and that they learned it from another source. On the other hand, ‘Mektubu o gün yazmışım’ (I wrote the letter that day) means that the speaker/writer remembers writing the letter that day and is the first source of information.

Therefore, unlike English speakers, whose main criterion in using a past structure is the distance from the present time, the Turkish speakers have two main criteria: the distance from the present time (realised by -di) and the distance from the source of information (realised by -mış).

The source of information has a priority in that the speakers of Turkish have to decide first whether to use –di or –mış. Based on these two main past tenses, it is possible to realise more past structures, e.g. -diydi, -mıştı, and -mışmiş.

The structures -diydi and -mıştı are used to indicate that there is a greater distance from the present time than –di; and –mışmiş is used when the speaker wants to distance themselves even more from the present point of speaking/writing or from...
the source of information, depending on the context. In other words, the speaker can use this sometimes to indicate that they are the third source and sometimes to imply that they do not think the information is reliable. For example, 'Otobüsünü kaçtırmışım' (s/he missed the bus) as an answer to the question 'why didn’t s/he come yesterday?' means that the speaker does not find the information reliable as opposed to ‘Otobüsünü kaçırdı’ (s/he missed the bus), which means that the speakers believes or knows that the person genuinely missed the bus. Therefore, the speaker, by using the witnessed tense for an event that they might not have witnessed, shows that they believe the information, or claim, is true. When the speaker wants to denote that they are the third source of information, they can still use the same structure without asserting truth-value to the information.

As Slobin (1996) points out, for speakers of a language that does not make such a distinction between past tenses, it is still possible to indicate whether or not they have witnessed the event or learned it from another source, but speakers of Turkish have to make such a distinction. As a result, such a distinction is compulsory in the perception of Turkish speakers whereas it is optional in the perception of, for example, English speakers (Slobin 1996). Hence, my early experiences as a learner of English were marked with unease caused by this difference in the past structures. Using past tense to express past events, I felt that I was liable in relation to the information I was giving, as such a distinction is not readily available in English. Even now, I find myself and some other English-speaking Turkish friends using structures like ‘apparently’, ‘I heard’, ‘I am told’, etc. very heavily.

Since the past tenses in Turkish are based on the two points stated above, one of the biggest problems that speakers of Turkish encounter while learning English is to learn the perfect tenses, particularly present perfect and present perfect continuous tenses. The criteria used in the witnessed past tense in Turkish are: a) near past, i.e., something that has happened at a point in the past, and b) far past, i.e., something that has happened at a point in the further past. Hence, present perfect tense and present perfect continuous tenses always cause confusion. And very often students’ objections or endless questions are answered by the teacher saying ‘you have to learn to think in the language you are learning’.

Hence, the distinction Turkish speakers make between witnessed past and learned past is a result of linguistic determinism and it is an example of the relationship between language and thought. However, there is definitely a need for
further research on the effect of such a distinction on the speakers of Turkish in a number of areas including ELT. As students in my study all speak both English and Turkish any comments from the students related to the influence of Turkish on their reading will be welcome.

2.2 Language and Ideology

The dialectical relationship between language and ideology is discussed in relation to critical pedagogies and social theories in the previous chapter. As reviewed, both critical pedagogies and social theories acknowledge the dialectical role of language in representing and reproducing dominant ideologies. Therefore, the need to build a model of language in interaction with the social formations and institutions arises. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) undertakes this task, exploring the way discourse(s) are shaped by and, in return, shape social reality.

Kress and Hodge (1979: 5) remark that “there is no ‘pure act of perception’, i.e. all perception is affected by the individual’s previous experiences and expectations. Likewise, Trew (1979) argues that all perception involves ideology. Kress and Hodge also suggest that languages are “systems of categories and rules” which have their basis in “fundamental principles and assumptions about the world” and that these assumptions are “learnt through language, and reinforced in language use” (ibid). Similarly, Trew (1979) claims that the concepts in a discourse are related to each other and that this relation reflects a particular point of view/ideology (cf. Lillis and McKinney 2003).

Fowler and Kress claim that languages can code a “world-view” which results from the individual’s involvement with social institutions (1979: 185). This imposition does not necessarily have to be through using force or through conscious effort (Kincheloe and McLaren 2000; Fairclough 1989). As Habermas points out language is a form of human production and it has an important role in reinforcing and reproducing ideology (Lunn 1995).

The fundamental assumption of CDA, therefore, is that discourse is a social practice and that it is sociohistorically situated. Therefore, “discourse analysis is analysis of how texts work within sociocultural practice” (Fairclough 1995: 7).

Fairclough’s model of discourse as a social process (Section 1.3) forms the fundamental “three-dimensional conception of discourse”, where a discourse is seen
simultaneously as: "(i) a language text spoken or written, (ii) discourse practice (text production and text interpretation), (iii) sociocultural practice" (Fairclough 1995: 97).

Discursive conventions and formations are shaped by hegemony to a great extent, although this is a two-way interaction; and unless there are alternative discursive formations or conventions present, these discursive formations can appear independent of the dominant ideologies, as part of how the ‘world’ or the ‘social world’ is (Fairclough 1989, 1995). In other words, the discourse, which is shaped by the dominant ideology, becomes “naturalized” (Fairclough 1989: 33, Goatly 2000: 50), as a result of which these discourses appear to be “commonsensical” rather than sociohistorical discourses (Fairclough 1995: 35).

Based on works of Foucault on exercise of power and of Gramsci on Hegemony (Foucault 1969, Fairclough 1989, 1995), ‘naturalisation’ and ‘common sense’ are greatly emphasised in CDA. To avoid a possible clash between the dominant and the peripheral ideologies, it is effective to convince the peripheral groups to act in a certain way through discourse (Jones and Wareing 1999). The appearance of certain discourses as independent of ideology makes it harder for them to be questioned (ibid.).

Therefore, Trew (1979a) argues that, for the sake of the continuity of the ideology, any fact or event that is not consistent with the ideology is awkward and should be dealt with immediately, i.e. any gap between the ideology and reality should be made invisible, through the use of language mostly, to avoid possible confrontations towards the ideology. However, it is also acknowledged that some texts, and discourses will be more transparent than others (Fairclough 1995, Wallace 2003).

Fairclough uses the term opacity rather than invisibility, and I adopt this term too as it denotes human agency, as opposed to ‘invisibility’. Human agency is central to CDA as it acknowledges the dialectical relationship between social formations and institutions, between discourse and social reality, i.e. they shape each other mutually, and discourses are sites of struggle (Fairclough 1995). Thus, “denaturalisation” is the aim of CDA (ibid.: 94, Pennycook 2001), or “de-familiarizing” of what appear to be everyday practices (Lunn 1995: 8).

*Naturalized discourse conventions are a most effective mechanism for sustaining and reproducing cultural and*
ideological dimensions of hegemony. Correspondingly, a significant target of hegemonic struggle is the denaturalisation of existing conventions and replacement of them with others.

(Fairclough 1995: 94)

Based on the understanding of the “three-dimensional conception of discourse”, Fairclough suggests a “three-dimensional method of analysis”, which takes account of:

... linguistic description of the language text, interpretation of the relationship between the (productive and interpretative) discursive processes and the text, and explanation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the social processes.

(Fairclough 1995: 97, emphasis original)

Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is a valuable instrument for this method of analysis as SFG is meaning oriented and deals with the relationship between “language and other elements and aspects of social life” (Fairclough 2003: 5, Halliday 1978). In this respect, SFG is a valuable source for CLA too. As discussed in section 1.3.1.3, Wallace points out that, SFG provides the necessary resources to help develop an understanding of texts as “social artefacts” and reading “as social practice” (Wallace 2003: 31).

Before moving on to a brief review of the SFG structures I used in the intervention, I shall, again briefly, review some CDA studies of use of discourse in relation to power inequality in gender (2.2.2) and ethnicity (2.2.3), preceding this by consideration of the notion of ‘ideal reader’.

2.2.1. Ideal Reader

Pennycook argues that naturalization is partly achieved through synthetic personalisation, where the text suggests that the text producer knows the reader (2001). Such a suggestion obviously makes it harder for readers to distance themselves from the text and to adopt a sceptical approach. One way to achieve synthetic personalisation is through “simulation of two-way conversation” (McLoughlin 2000: 68). As a result of the simulated two-way conversation, the
readers are assumed to share the presuppositions of the text producers, in other words, such presuppositions are based on ideal/model readers who share the same perspective with the writer (McLoughlin 2000, Wallace 1992a, Talbot 1992). These subject positions offered by the texts to the readers can result in either marginalisation of the reader or the tendency to take the presuppositions of the text for granted and as natural, as argued above. Therefore, I decided to emphasise the notion of ideal/model reader and the interpersonal function of language to raise awareness of this aspect in the intervention.

As reviewed above, the ideologies are to appear as “common sense” to make any gap in the ideology opaque (Fairclough 1989: 84). Kress and Fowler (1979) similarly argue that the speakers of a language use structures that embody ideologies unconsciously and that if they were not used unconsciously, they would not have the desired effect. Therefore, it is important that a critical reading course, aiming at raising consciousness on the existence of various perspectives, challenges this opacity aspect.

The opacity aspect of the ideologies in language means that they have to appear in the background rather than being directly imposed on the language users. Therefore, readers should be helped to become aware of the ideology appearing in the ‘background’ as it is not directly visible. As Kress and Fowler put it “ideology is linguistically mediated and habitual for an acquiescent, uncritical reader who has already been socialized into sensitivity to the significance of patterns of language” (1979: 185). Examples of this will be given in the areas of gender and ethnicity below.

Due to the issues explored above, and due to CLA’s focus on CDA (Chapter 1), in the intervention that I provided I chose to draw on CDA to provide the students with a framework which they can make use of through analysing the texts and consequently challenging the ‘invisibility’ of the ideologies underlying those texts. I will discuss the issue of unveiling the underlying ideology in further detail in relation to emancipation and empowerment.

Although originally class struggle was the central struggle examined whilst talking about contesting ideologies, with the effect of post-structuralism, fragmented identities, and multiple and shifting standing points with regard to socially constructed realities, came into focus as well as reviewed in Chapter 1. Thus, understanding various forms of power and, thus, power inequality, e.g. gender, ethnicity, religion,
physical capability, etc., and understanding discourses in relation to power is essential (Kincheloe and McLaren 2000). Hence, I will review studies conducted on gender and ethnicity briefly below, as these are the areas most commonly identified and studied. They are also areas relevant to my intervention.

2.2.2 Language and Gender

Power inequality regarding gender issues has been explored in detail for a long time (Pennycook 2001) and the most common forms of language practices reviewed in CDA relate to: markedness, generic terms, lexical gaps, and the way women are presented in the texts.

2.2.2.1 Markedness

The first aspect, markedness, points to the fact that the male is considered to be the norm in the society, i.e. “male-as-norm-bias” (Graddol and Swann 1989: 99). In other words, because the expected audience or the producer of the discourse is male, male terms are semantically unmarked, whereas female terms are semantically marked, e.g. ‘waiter’, ‘waitress’ (ibid., Goatly 2000). Semantically marked terms are formally marked as well, they argue, i.e. waiter, waitress. Besides, they suggest, male terms are used as “neutral terms” unless otherwise stated (Graddol and Swann 1989: 99), i.e. they constitute the norm since they are better representatives of the categories they belong to (Goddard and Patterson 2000).

For example, the word “dog” is used to refer to the whole dog family and the female term for dog is used to refer to only female dogs and not dogs in general, unlike the male term (Ibid.). It can be argued that as well as showing “male-as-norm-bias”, markedness also means that the concern of the speaker/writer is male rather than female. Not being addressed in the text directly, it is likely that the female will feel left out of the issue being discussed, even marginalized, as markedness shows exception to a rule/norm.

"Anybody who wishes to have power over his fellows should be regarded with some suspicion. It is unusual. Most people don’t feel like
that. They want a good job, a nice wife, pleasant children, friends and a bit of fun”

(Walden, TV Times, 29 September 1990 as cited in Simpson 1993: 159)

2.2.2.2 Use of Generic Terms

Another aspect of the relationship between language and gender is the use of generic terms used as gender specific terms; and the use of gender specific terms as generic terms. In the example above, generic terms like people and they are used as gender specific, referring to men.

Graddol and Swann (1989) and Lee (1992) point out that gender specific terms like ‘he’ and ‘man’ are claimed to be used as referring to both sexes but that the image the readers/listeners create is different from the intention of the writer/speaker. Research done by Silveira (reported in Lee 1992) shows that the use of generic masculine terms, i.e. he, man, result in male images in the minds of readers/hearers although they are used as generic terms. The use of generic terms referring to male and generic masculine terms as generic terms is another aspect of ‘male-as-norm bias’. It can be asserted that the rule that ‘the concern being male unless otherwise stated’ applies here as well.

2.2.2.3 Lexical Gaps

The lack of lexical items to refer to women’s experiences is another issue that studies on language and gender refer to. Spender suggests that women have to find ways to articulate the experiences they have, as there are no lexical items for some of these experiences (Graddol and Swann 1989, Goddard and Patterson 2000). Kramarae (1981) remarks that the women in the early days of the women’s movement called themselves radical women, which was not sufficient to describe the movement, as the word sexism was not used then.

An objection to these claims about lexical gaps is that it is always possible to find ways to articulate the experience as language offers infinite ways of expression, including creating new words and that dominated groups develop their own “anti-languages” (Simpson 1993). Although it is true that language enables the speakers/
writers to express the message they want to convey through a number of ways, it should be kept in mind that communication is a two-way continuum (Kress and Hodge 1979). It will take time to establish the continuum for the newly created word so that the listener / reader has a corresponding concept / category. Another aspect is that women are not just members of the female community. They are also members of different socio-economic, ethnic and religious societies, with which they might identify themselves. Therefore, it is hard to say that all women share the same experiences and same problems. Hence, developing anti-languages might not always be possible as adopting anti-languages means defining oneself on the bases of the features of a definite group/society (Fairclough 1992, Thomas and Wareing 1999).

2.2.2.4 Presentation of Women

"Crazed dog bites off a wife’s ear"

(Daily Mirror 17 November 1983 as cited in Simpson 1993: 172)

The last aspect that I would like to explore is the way women are represented in texts. There are two main features that determine the way a woman is represented in texts: her physical appearance and her relationship to a man (marital or family wise) (McLoughlin 2000, Graddol and Swain 1989, Goatly 2000, Goddard and Patterson 2000, Lee 1992).

Ward (in Lee 1992) argues that a woman's physical appearance is always worth mentioning and that her relationship to a man is enough to define her identity. The example above shows that although the event is about the woman and that it has nothing to do with her husband, she is still defined as 'wife'. This practice is similar to the practice of markedness as it marginalizes women as well since defining a woman in relation to a man means considering men at the centre and women at the periphery. She is related to the centre only through her relation with men.

There are three different explanations offered about language and unequal power relations between men and women, and these explanations, not surprisingly, reflect the approach of structuralist and post-structuralist paradigms as reviewed in Chapter 1: 1) that language merely reflects actual relations, 2) that language creates them, and 3) language reflects and maintains them. The first explanation approaches this subject as a matter of difference in the male and female culture (Maltz and Borker
1998, Graddol and Swann 1989; Lee 1992). As Graddol and Swann (1989) point out, this theory, however, fails to explain the link between unequal power relations between the two genders both in the language and in society. The second perspective asserts that language is the means to create such unequal power relations (ibid.). The last explanation suggests that language reflects unequal power relations already existent in the society and the use of the structures that reflect the unequal power relations helps to maintain the inequality between men and women, i.e. there is a dialectical relationship between language and power. This last perspective is adopted in this study, as discussed in the previous chapter.

2.2.2.5 Implications of these Studies for the Present Research

The power inequality between the two genders in Turkey is probably the most visible form of power inequality shared by the largest number of various clashing identities. People are becoming more and more aware of power inequality in this area with a change in women’s role in the society. However, the role of language in relation to this inequality, whether it is reflecting or reproducing it, is not an issue at the moment. However, gender inequality being the most visible, and the widest, form of power inequality in Turkey, the students were expected to have developed an awareness in this area prior to the research.

Furthermore, gender, as part of the multiple identities constructing the human as a social being, is probably the most visible identity individuals adopt. Hence, the students were also expected to be relatively aware of their gender identities and the possible problems arising from this. I chose to focus on the issue of gender as part of a wider understanding of power and language. However, I should note here that the issue of gender was also expected to give the students a starting point, for they practise it in their daily lives more visibly than other forms of power struggle, such as age, and it is a less delicate subject compared to issues like ethnicity, religion, class, etc.

2.2.3 Language and Ethnicity

"President Bill Clinton has denied having oral sex with work experience girl Monica Lewinsky, who visited him 37 times, and of lying about it
under oath. He claims Monica’s a friend of his black secretary, Betty Currie.”

(Daily Mail, 12 March, 1998, as cited in Singh 1999a)

The main issues in the relationship between language and ethnicity are very similar to those of language and gender. In other words the most common language practices found in relation to the unequal power relations between ethnic minorities and ethnic majorities are the uses of markedness and stereotypes.

2.2.3.1 Markedness and Stereotypes

In the example above, the ethnicity of the secretary is marked whereas the ethnicity of the others is not. Similar to “male-as-norm-bias” that this is due to the fact that white ethnicity is the norm and that giving information on the ethnicity of a black participant in a context, where her ethnicity is not relevant emphasises that she does not correspond to the majority, or the norm (Singh 1999a). The dominant groups have power over the minorities, Singh claims, therefore, their perspective becomes the norm and the minority groups are defined as “outsiders” by the majorities as long as they fail to conform to the norms defined by the dominant ideologies (1999: 87).

Similarly, Talbot et. al. argue that markedness shows that something is different from the norm, whereas, unmarkedness means that it is in accordance with the norm (2003). The majority defining norms is related to what has been discussed in the section about the phenomenon of language and ideology, i.e. dominant groups’ ideologies become the norm due to a necessity of making all groups conform to these ideologies without even being aware of it.

Through markedness, ethnic minorities can be easily labelled as “they/them” versus “we/us” (Singh 1999a: 87, Van Dijk 1993: 34). Similar to the argument about the relation between language and ideology, Van Dijk claims that the members of different ethnic groups share similar “interpretations, inferences, categorizations, comparisons, and evaluations” and it is with the help of this shared knowledge that the members of different ethnic groups hold ideas about other groups and their own group (ibid: 37).

Similarly, Singh claims that the marked structures used in discourse to refer to minority group members, which reinforce the use of “us” versus “them”, enables
Another reason for the marked structures enabling ‘negative labelling’ is that, Singh argues, being unmarked, the dominant ideology becomes “invisible”, whereas the minority is visible (ibid: 88). The ‘negative labelling’, as Singh calls it, or the ‘overgeneralization’, as Van Dijk calls it, results in the creation of stereotypes about the ethnic minorities.

Van Dijk also suggests that the discourse about the ethnic minorities is persuasive, which is what Jones and Wareing (1999) and Trew (1979a) suggest as discussed in the section on Language and Ideology above.

2.2.3.2 Implications of these Studies for the Present Research

Turkey is a multicultural context, where different cultures and ethnicities co-exist. For the co-existence of these cultures it is essential that individuals from different ethnic groups are tolerant and open to other cultures. Therefore, it is also important that the studies on language and ethnicity are included in this research.

Based on the studies reviewed above, I decided to emphasise the use of markedness in language in relation to ethnicity in the critical reading course that I gave. As there are numerous lexico-grammatical structures used to achieve and analyse the markedness, below I will be looking at ways suggested by CDA to analyse such use of language.

2.3 SFG in CDA

As argued above and in Chapter 1, SFG has an important role in both CDA and CLA. CDA heavily relies on SFG in analysis, as Fowler and Kress (1979:185) argue “syntax can code a world-view without any conscious choice on the part of a writer or speaker”.

They also claim “social meanings exist in a language, which are distinguished in its lexical and syntactic structure” (ibid.). Therefore, it is not only syntax but also lexicon of a language through which these meanings are realised. Similarly, Halliday states that language is a “complex semiotic system” at the centre of which lies the grammar (1994:15). He states, however, that, it includes both grammar and vocabulary and calls this system “lexicogrammar” as, he remarks, “grammar and vocabulary, are merely different ends of the same continuum- they are the same
phenomenon as seen from opposite perspectives" (ibid.). Thus, I use this term to refer to both lexical and grammatical structures.

Hallidayan lexicogrammar focuses on language as “system of meaning” (Bloor and Bloor 1995: 1) and is developed around “the threefold pattern of meaning”, i.e. “clause as message”, which focuses on textual meanings, “clause as exchange”, which focuses on interpersonal meanings and “clause as representation”, which focuses on experiential meanings (Halliday 1994: 35). Bloor and Bloor voice Halliday’s claim that “all adult language” is built around these three metafunctions. In what follows I highlight those features of particular relevance to CDA, and to my course.

2.3.1 Representation and Transitivity

Trew (1979) remarks that ideologies offer representations of social beings’ acting on other entities and interaction between social beings and between social beings and other entities. It is these representations, he argues, that form the “ideological determinations of social discourse and effect as a perception of the social”. Therefore, he claims, a linguistic analysis of discourse should be based on these relationships in terms of “categories of process and causation” (1979b: 154). Similarly, Goatly (2000) emphasises the role of transitivity textual analysis.

Causality is also analysed in relation to agency. Lee, for example, argues that agency is a universal concept and that it is basic to the “human world-view” (1992: 7). However, he remarks, the fact that a situation can be coded “as an agentive or as a non-agentive event” is due to the point of view of the writer/speaker (Ibid.). Thus, inclusions and elusions are essential parts of textual analysis in CDA, as Fairclough argues, since they provide data on discourse processes and social processes as reviewed above (1995).

Before moving on to the other examples, I would like to provide a brief explanation of the lexicogrammar of transitivity. Human beings make use of “processes” to have a representation of the external reality (Halliday 1994: 106). Transitivity, Halliday says, is the system which “construes” the world of experience into a manageable set of process types” (ibid.). Martin states that
Transitivity's purpose is to construct processes, the participants involved in them and the circumstances in which they take place. In English language the most critical variable has to do with whether or not a process is brought about by an impending agency.

(Martin 2000: 276)

Processes are representations of experiences of people. There are three main categories of processes: material, i.e. “processes of doing” (which may be done to “some other entity”) (Halliday 1995: 110), mental, i.e. “processes of sensing” (Ibid.: 112), and relational, i.e. “processes of sensing” (Ibid.: 119). Material processes are related to the objective world, whereas mental processes are related to the subjective world of consciousness, and relational processes to the world of abstract relations (Ibid.: 108). Besides these three main processes, behavioural, verbal, and existential processes exist.

2.3.2 Agency

Based on transitivity and the importance of the representations of causation and agency in discourse, the “frequency” of references to the participants, the way these references are distributed among the participants, and “the distribution in particular of references to participants as agents or affected, as active or passive” are examined in textual analysis (Trew 1979b: 122, 123). Transitivity, causation and agency in clause as representation relate to elision as well as representations, and provide data on the relationship between different levels of discourse, societal, text, production/interpretation.

Trew provides an example from two newspapers

The Times: “RIOTING BLACKS SHOT DEAD BY POLICE AS ANC LEADERS MEET
Eleven Africans were shot dead and 15 wounded when Rhodesian Police opened fire on a rioting crowd of about 2,000.”

The Guardian: “POLICE SHOOT 11 DEAD IN SALISBURY RIOT
Riot police shot and killed 11 African demonstrators and wounded 15 others.”

(1979a: 97)
In the first representation, the agent of the process (Rhodesian Police) is stated indirectly as the circumstance of the process, ('when Rhodesian Police opened fire on a rioting crowd of about 2,000'). On the other hand, in the second text, the agent is in the actor position, ('Riot police'). Lexical choices are also very important and differ in both texts. The first text uses the term 'rioting' to refer to one of the participants, and the second one uses the term 'demonstrators'.

Moreover, in these two different representations of the same event, different lexicogrammatical choices are visible. In the heading of the first representation, a passive structure is used, whereas, in the second one an active structure is used noting agency.

I would like to discuss three linguistic structures commonly used in relation to agency in CDA, i.e. passivisation, nominalisation, and ergative structures.

If a process has a 'goal' as well as an actor, it is possible to have both active and passive structures. Lee (1992) remarks that using a passive structure means choosing to focus on one aspect of the process rather than the other. He claims that the act of selecting one linguistic feature rather than another possible one is influenced by the perspective of the speaker / writer (1992). Therefore, selecting to focus on one element rather than the other is also affected by the point of view of the speaker/ writer. Likewise, Kress and Hodge argue that focusing on a particular element causes the listener’s/ reader’s focus to be “altered” (1979: 21).

Furthermore, using passive realizations, an event/situation can be expressed without expressing the actor of the process, i.e. deleting the agent of the process. As Lee points out, agent deletions can occur when the speaker/ writer thinks that the hearer/ reader already has the information (1992). However, Kress and Hodge claim that by removing the agent, the hearer’s/ reader’s attention is moved away from the agent, which is similar to the claim by Trew that the deletion of the agent means distancing the process from the agent (1979a).

Another structure that enable the elision of agent is the “ergative/ non-ergative pair” (Halliday 1994: 163). Halliday remarks that some verbs might function as actors although they are goals in the process, e.g., he closed the door, the door closed. The door, which is the goal of the process acts as the actor in the second example. One participant is required for ergative / non-ergative structures, i.e. “medium”, and structures can exist as “agent + process + medium” or as ‘medium + process’. (Ibid: 164). He also remarks that in the case of medium + process, the process is represented
as having been self-caused” (ibid.). He suggests that medium + process structure is “middle in voice” (ibid: 168). Halliday and Simpson (1993) also state that it is possible to ask the question by who(m)? in the case of passive structures even if the actor is deleted, whereas it is not possible to ask this question to a medium + process clause as the answer will be ‘the medium’.

Another structure that is referred to commonly in CDA because it can evade agents is ‘nominalization’. Nominalization is making “any element or group of elements ... to function as a nominal group in the clause” (Halliday 1994: 41). The beginning of the previous sentence is an example of nominalization, i.e. ‘Nominalization is’ vs. ‘Halliday defines nominalization as ...’. Lee suggests that the use of nominalizations might result in the representation’s being perceived as a “thing” rather than an event (1992: 6). Kress and Hodge also claim that: a) the hearer/ reader can be aware of the original form from which the nominalization is derived, or b) the hearer/ reader can perceive the nominalizations as “abstract entities” and that he can “(create) a world of thinglike abstract beings or objects, which are capable of acting and being acted on”, or c) the interpretation of the hearer/ reader can be a combination of both. This aspect also is very important in terms of the role of actor and causal transaction in reflecting the perspective of the speaker/ writer.

2.3.3 Interpersonal Systems, Mood, Polarity, Modality and Appraisal

Interpersonal metafunction, i.e. clause as exchange or tenor of the text, focuses on the relationship between the writer/speaker and the text and the reader/listener (Martin 2000: 280, Halliday 1978: 64, Halliday and Hasan 1989: 30). On the other hand the ideational function of the language concerns the speaker/ writer’s expressing his “experience of external world, and of his own internal world” (Halliday 1978: 45).

The interpersonal metafunction is based on two main variables, i.e. “giving” and “demanding” (Halliday 1995: 68) while there are two variables in speech roles: 1) “giving” and “demanding” together and 2) “goods &services” and “information”. (ibid.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in exchange</th>
<th>(a) goods &amp; services</th>
<th>(b) information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) giving</td>
<td>‘offer’ would you like this tea pot?</td>
<td>‘statement’ he’s giving her the teapot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) demanding</td>
<td>‘command’ give me that teapot!</td>
<td>‘question’ what is he giving her?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Halliday 1994: 69)

According to Halliday (ibid.), “These two variables, when taken together, define the four primary speech functions of OFFER, COMMAND, STATEMENT and QUESTION” (Ibid.). The listener/reader’s response to these functions would be “accepting an offer, carrying out a command, acknowledging a statement and answering a question.” (Ibid.).

Based on the distinction between ‘giving’ and ‘demanding’, SFG builds on the interpersonal metafunction with analyses mood, polarity and modality, person and appraisals.

MOOD

- indicative
- imperative

- declarative
- interrogative

(Bloor and Bloor 1995:45)
Mood is also connected to polarity:

![POLARITY Diagram]

(Bloor and Bloor 1995: 46)

Mood signals the speech roles undertaken by the participants (Halliday 1994: 68). In other words, the speaker/writer adopts a certain role and this in turn makes the listener/reader adopt another role that the speaker’s/writer’s role demands. This is even more the case in reading as the reader does not have the opportunity to negotiate the expected role the text demands, whereas the expected role can be negotiated in oral interaction.

Mood consists of the “subject” (S) and “finite” (F) and the rest of the clause is called the “residue” (Halliday 1994: 72, 74). S + F (Mood) is “indicative” (Ibid: 74). Within the indicative, S + F is “declarative”; F + S is “yes-no interrogative”; WH-element/ S +F, if the WH-element is the subject; and WH-element + F + S if the WH-element is not the subject (ibid.: 74).

The finite of the clause is not only crucial in determining mood, but also provides a reference point by providing either a time relevant to the time of speaking/writing, i.e. using a tense relative to the time of speaking/writing (temporal aspect); or the speaker’s writer’s “judgements of the probabilities, or the obligations, involved in what he is saying”, i.e. modality (ibid. 750).

Polarity is a part of the finite element, i.e. “the choice between positive and negative” (Ibid: 88). If polarity has a linear nature with negative at the one end and positive at the other, modality is the space in between these two ends. Halliday suggests two different aspects of modality based on two different variables, i.e. “propositions” and “proposals” (ibid: 89).

He suggests that in a proposition, two types of possibilities exist: a) “degrees of probability” and b) “degrees of usuality”, which he refers to as “modalization” (Ibid.). In a proposal, he remarks, the possibilities are based on the “speech function, whether command or offer”, a) “degrees of obligation” and b) “degrees of inclination”, which he calls “modulation” (ibid.).
Another aspect of interpersonal metafunction is the person:

*The personal pronoun represents the world according to the speaker, in the context of a speech exchange. The basic distinction is into speech roles (I, you) and other roles (he, she, it, they)...

(Halliday 1995: 189)

Therefore, personal pronouns are an important aspect of ‘synthetic personalisation’ and it is important to analyse them in relation to notions of ideal reader, authorship, readership, etc.

Martin suggests another system related to the tenor of discourse, which he calls “appraisal systems” (2000:142). This system concerns the speaker’s / writer’s judgements expressed by the lexis. He also suggests that the speaker’s / writer’s expressing his own judgements is not merely expressing his own perspective but asking for solidarity from the hearer/reader, therefore, it is a matter of interpersonal meaning and not of ideational meaning. He justifies this theory according to polarity: “The relevant resources all involve grading, which is to say that the meanings involved can be adjusted by degree to reflect the strength of the evaluation” (Martin 2000: 145). There are three systems within the appraisal system, i.e. “affect, judgement, and appreciation” (ibid.). Affect, the most basic of the three, is concerned with “construing emotional responses” (ibid.). Judgement concerns “moral evaluations” and appreciation is about the “aesthetic quality of text/processes and natural phenomena” (Ibid: 145-146).

Martin suggests that affect is the basis of both judgement and appreciation (2000: 147):
The subsystems of affect are:

a) unhappiness
b) insecurity
c) dissatisfaction

(Rothery and Stenglin 2000: 239)

As can be seen above, the affect has a positive and a negative dimension. These three systems are further classified according to whether the emotion is felt "by the participant or … directed at someone" (ibid.)

Judgement, on the other hand involves ‘moral evaluations’. As Rothery and Stenglin express, this is a “highly culturally specific domain” (2000: 236). There are two main variables in the judgement system that define the subsystems: “Social Esteem” and “Social Sanction” (Martin 2000: 156).

The judgements of esteem are: 1) normality, “how unusual someone is”; 2) capacity, “how capable they are”; and 3) tenacity “how resolute they are” (ibid.: 156). Judgements of social esteem indicate judgements on the basis of social norms. The judgements of social sanction, on the other hand, indicate often legal actions. The subsystems of social sanction are: 4) veracity, “how truthful someone is”; and 5) propriety “how ethical someone is” (ibid.). All these judgements have negative and positive evaluations.

Appreciation, on the other hand, concerns aesthetic judgements. The subsystems of appreciation are: 1) reaction, “the emotional impact of the work on the reader/ listener/ viewer”; 2) composition, “the texture of a work in terms of its complexity or detail”; and 3) valuation, related to the “message” of the work.
Modality can be realised in the finite verb or in the predicate or by a modal Adjunct (ibid.).

2.3.4 Theme

The last metafunction, i.e. textual metafunction, clause as message, or mode, is related to the organisation of the text. Thematic structure can function to put the focus on one element of the message. Halliday defines Theme, as “the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is concerned” (1994: 37). In English, theme is “indicated by position in the clause” (Ibid.). Hence, deciding on the information to be given in the theme and rheme positions is important with respect to what the speaker/writer wants to focus on.

Use of connectors is important, as well as the thematic structure of the text, as they realize cohesion. Besides, thematic structure realizes the overall organization of the text, i.e. how the writer organizes their arguments.

2.4 Conclusion

CDA holds the view that discourse is sociohistorically situated. Based on this understanding, critical analysis of texts needs to be situated within broader discourse and social processes. SFG is used in CDA since SFG allows the language to be analysed in terms of its social meanings. In this chapter, I reviewed some common patterns found in discourse reflecting and reproducing unequal power relations in relation to gender and ethnicity, which I used as departure points in the critical reading course implemented in this study.

Besides these common phenomena, I also looked at SFG structures analysed in CDA and CLA. SFG is a threefold system based on three metafunctions. These three metafunctions are related to the experience of the speaker/writer in relation to the world, the text, the listener/reader, and to the organisation of the text. This threefold understanding of language provides the basis “to interpret the social context of a text” (Wallace 2003: 32), as well as providing the basis for “depth as well as breadth” analysis (Ibid.). Thus, in the intervention given, the students are introduced to the lexicogrammatical structures reviewed in section 2.3 I adopted as tools for classroom analysis. I discuss the classroom procedures in detail in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODS AND QUESTIONS

3.1 Research Context

As argued in the Introduction, in Turkey there is a gap between the curriculum aim of developing critical thinking skills and educational practices, where reading lessons are based on the traditional linear approach to reading. Therefore, there is a need to develop specific theories and practices to meet this curriculum aim for the Turkish educational system. This research aims to add to these theories and practices. Secondly, as has been argued in Chapter 1, there is a need for further studies of CLA in EFL High School settings in a variety of contexts. In this respect, this research aims to contribute to the studies on CLA.

3.1.1 Aim of the research

The specific aim of this research is to find out whether or not a critical reading course leads to changes in the students’ approach to reading and to reading lessons in Turkish Anatolian High School context. That is, I investigate changes in the students’ motivation for the reading lessons and in students’ approach to reading.

To meet this aim, a 17-week reading course was given to students. Before, during and after the course, the students were given questionnaires and interviews along with a repeated reading activity at the beginning and end of the course.

3.1.2 Research Sample

The population of this research is Anatolian High School foreign language branch 10th grade students with the high level of English proficiency required for the critical reading course given in this study. Although 11th grade students have the required level of English proficiency too, the 11th grade, final year, students are more pressured by the university exam. Therefore, the school attendance rate among the students of 11th grade is very low, as discussed in Introduction. Besides, due to ethical concerns, it was not desirable to use the time of these students for research purposes.

The sampling strategy used in this study is “accessibility sampling” (Lynn 1996: 131), or “convenience” sampling (Nunan 1992: 142) for several reasons.
Firstly, as the target population is quantitatively and geographically large, and as the research requires an intervention, it would be impossible to do random sampling.

Besides, considering practical issues such as accommodation and finance, I had to give the intervention in Antalya where I had access to these. Having narrowed the research sample to Anatolian High Schools 10th grade foreign language students in Antalya, I narrowed down the research sample further into two classes in two schools, from among five Anatolian High Schools in this city, based on having access to the schools and the availability of at least one foreign language branch class in each of these schools at the time of the research.

Although accessibility sampling or convenience sampling is questioned in terms of its accuracy in providing a representative sample, (Nunan 1992, Lynn 1996, Munn and Drever 1990), the educational background of all the 10th grade Anatolian High Schools foreign language branch students is expected to be similar due to the centralized educational policy of the Ministry of Education of the Turkish Republic, which means that any Anatolian High School 10th grade can be representative in this respect of the whole population for the purposes of this study. Although the question of the role of different institutional traditions in these schools and of different classroom dynamics remains, the intervention was given to two classes in two different schools to increase representativeness of the sample.

3.1.3 Access to Schools

Despite the relevance of my proposed course to the curriculum, and in spite of my study’s being funded by the Ministry of National Education, it was difficult to be granted access to the Anatolian High Schools. The Ministry of National Education of the Turkish Republic has a centralized policy and all the teachers teaching in state schools must be appointed by the Ministry. Furthermore, the curriculum for all the lessons and the lesson plans are prepared and distributed to the schools by the Ministry of National Education and all the teachers must strictly follow these lesson plans, to ensure that all students cover the same subject matter. Although it is not uncommon to abandon these lesson plans in the final year of high school education to prepare the students for the university exam, the teachers cannot decide on a new curriculum to follow. Upon my application to give a critical reading course to two Anatolian High School 10th grade classes, I was told on numerous occasions by the
Ministry that I had to be appointed by the Ministry as an English teacher to be able to teach in these schools; and that the teachers are to follow the curriculum. Nevertheless, I was finally granted permission to give the intervention following rigorous checking of the materials and lesson plans.

3.2 Research Paradigm

Before moving on to the research questions and the discussion of the research methodology, I would like to clarify the ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying the research methodology used in this study.

As discussed in sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.2, the fundamental ontological and epistemological assumptions of this study draw upon structuralism and post-structuralism. Therefore, the research methodology adopts hybrid assumptions too, a mixture of “nominalism” and “realism” (Cohen et.al. 2000: 7). In other words, it adopts the view of realism that there is an external reality, i.e. a shared social reality, while recognising that subjectivity has a dialogic role in this reality.

As a result, the epistemological assumption adopted is of hybrid nature too. A nominalist approach is adopted as it recognises:

- People are deliberate and creative in their actions, they act intentionally and make meanings in and through their activities.

  (Blumer 1969 in Cohen et. al. 2000:21)

- People actively construct their social world. They are not the ‘cultural dopes’ or passive dolls of positivism.


- Events and individuals are unique and largely non-generalizable.

  (Cohen et. al. 2000:22)

However, nominalism is not the only methodology used as some of the claims of this approach are in conflict with the aim of this research. The last claim stated above, for example, is valuable as it recognises the importance of subjectivity and context but at the same time it denies possibility of generalisation, which is an important element not only for this research but also possibly for an important number of other educational studies. Similarly, the anti-positivist claim that “the social world
should be studied in its natural state, without the intervention of, or the manipulation by, the researcher” is hard to adopt if the aim of the research is to introduce an innovation in an educational system or to propose changes. If we accept that we cannot make generalisations, the possibility of improvement in an educational system will be very hard to achieve. On the other hand, generalisations should not be made at the expense of the individuals, social contexts, and social realities.

It should be clarified, though, that ‘generalisability’ is used here in a different way from traditional empiricism as the subject of this study is human beings, who are dynamic. Unlike a pure scientific method, which claims to uncover laws about the world, generalisability in this research is rather ‘temporary’, as the dynamic nature of the students and the teacher will change the specific circumstances this research will be conducted under. For example, a subsequent group with similar educational and socio-economic backgrounds might have a very different set of identities or experiences related to power relations due to, say changes in the society or in the world, in which case more research will be required. Such research, however, could build on the findings of this study.

The research paradigm this study adopts is also a “critical paradigm” with regard to certain fundamental assumptions (Cohen et al. 2000: 28). Firstly, the critical paradigm involves a socio-historically situated ontological approach, which focuses on social reality; secondly, its epistemological approach is based on a dialectical understanding of the people and the reality (Guba and Lincoln 2000, Kincheloe and McLaren 2000, Cohen et al. 2000). Therefore, the critical paradigm meets the needs of this research in establishing a paradigm where intervening as much as explaining, and agency as much as generalisability finds a role (for principles of the critical paradigm see Cohen et al. 2000: 35; and for its position on practical issues see Guba and Lincoln 2000: 112).

In correspondence with the critical paradigm, the methodology adopted is action research, as action research is used widely in the critical paradigm due to its emancipatory interest.

*The aim (of action research) is not a pseudo-neutral description and explanation of reality and technological control of reality in the sense of the analytical-nomological tradition, but a theory based modification of reality which is initiated in the exploratory phase and often involves a practical-emancipatory interest...*
I discuss the research methodology in greater detail in 3.4, but first I shall present the research questions.

3.3 Research Questions

The research questions this study seeks answers for are determined under the light of the studies reviewed in Chapters 1 and 2. Firstly, I decided to investigate whether or not the students adopted a more critical approach to reading at the end of the course. Hence, the first research question is:

1. What is the impact of the critical reading course on students reading?

Again as discussed in Chapter 1, due to the complexity of assessing such socio-cognitive changes in students, I decided to investigate specifically to what extent the students acknowledge reading as a social process and to what extent the students can use SFG analysis to point out the dominant ideologies in texts, in accordance with the two strands of CLA as discussed in Chapter 1, i.e. micro and macro levels of awareness (Section 1.3.2.2)

In other words, the students were expected to show awareness of reading as a social process, i.e. awareness on a macro level, through acknowledging processes and contexts of text production and interpretation (Section 1.3) as opposed to a traditional linear model of reading. On the micro level, the students were expected to show awareness of the effects of the process and context of text production on specific texts through SFG analysis.

In the light of the studies reviewed in 1.3.1.1, I also decided to look out for any changes in students' motivation. Thus, the second research question is:

2. What is the impact of the critical reading course on student motivation?
As discussed earlier, the role of the students’ personal experience plays an important role in the process of accommodation and resistance (section 1.3.1). Resistance can be due to the student’s experiences as individuals in social reality (Janks 1999, Granville 2003, Zinkgraf 2003) or can be due to students’ experience as students within a specific educational system (Kramer-Dahl 2001). I was sensitive to any possible negative changes in the students’ motivation as a possible sign of resistance, the nature and cause of which would then be explored further.

3.4 Research Methodology: Using Action Research Cycles

As discussed in section 3.2, this research adopts the critical paradigm, and adopts action research as a research methodology. Action research meets the needs of this research as it gives a role to intervention, and to possibility of change in the participants and in educational settings, as well as recognising the need for a different understanding of generalisability together with an emphasis on socio-historically situatedness of the research.

Action research offers the use of intervention as “a small-scale intervention in the functioning of the real world and a close examination of the effects of such an intervention” (Cohen and Manion as cited in Cohen et. al. 2000:226-227). Actually concepts such as ‘changing’ or ‘manipulating’ are not uncommon in the studies conducted in this area: “Action research is concerned equally with changing individuals, on the one hand, and on the other, the culture of the groups, institutions and societies to which they belong” (Kemmis and McTaggart as cited in Cohen et. al. 2000: 227; emphasis mine); similarly, Greenwood and Levin emphasise the role of action research as “manipulating material and social factors in a given context” (2000: 95, emphasis mine; see also Burns 1999). As can be seen in this quotation from Greenwood and Levin, action research accepts manipulation of or intervention in social contexts while accepting at the same time the principle that the social context bears significance in research in such a way that it should and cannot be controlled but taken into account at every level of the research; and that no social research can be stripped of its social context.

As a result of adapting different principles of different paradigms, action research is not a pure research methodology form but a mixture of normative and interpretative/ antipositivistic and positivistic/ nominalistic or realistic paradigms. A
further distinction between research types, based on the extent to which the research type is controlling is made by Van Lier (as cited by McDonough and McDonough 1997: 47):

Van Lier positions action research as less structured than experiments, quasi-experiments, surveys, coding, and systematic observation, and more controlled than surveys, coding, systematic observation, observation, case study, protocols, stories, and diaries.

Pring reviews action research in relation to generalisability:

Action research, according to Elliot, is to be contrasted with research, as it is normally understood, in this way. The goal of research is normally that of producing new knowledge.

... By contrast, the research called 'action research' aims not to produce new knowledge but to improve practice – namely, in this case, the 'educational practice' which teachers are engaged in. The conclusion is not a set of propositions but a practice or a set of transactions or activities which is not true or false but better or worse. By contrast with the conclusion of research, as that is normally conceived, action research focuses on the particular. Although such a practical conclusion focuses on the particular, thereby not justifying generalisation, no one situation is unique in every respect and therefore the action research in
one classroom or school can illuminate or be suggestive of practice elsewhere.

(Pring 2000: 131)

Similarly, Reason and Bradbury remark that the aim of the action research is to both produce "practical knowledge" and add to the "wider ecology of the planet" through the practical knowledge it produces (2001:2).


```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>planning</th>
<th>reflecting</th>
<th>acting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reflecting</td>
<td>observing</td>
<td>acting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(McNiff 1988: 22)

However, this is not the whole process. Each cycle gives rise to another cycle based on the findings.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plan</th>
<th>reflect</th>
<th>act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reflect</td>
<td>observe</td>
<td>act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(Ibid: 23)

Some claim that this model is not complex enough to capture the nature of action research in a classroom (McNiff 1988), and based on the context, the needs of the practitioner or the students, and the findings, these cycles can expand or multiply.

For example McNiff suggests that in a classroom situation extra cycles may emerge from the main cycle, i.e. the main concern of research:
Other researchers, on the other hand provide other models, expanded versions of the model proposed by Lewin. However, all these models share the four basic steps, i.e. planning, acting, observing, reflecting. These four stages are also what is suggested by Kemmis and McTaggart (Burns 1999:32). Below is a table comparing action research cycle stages suggested by Burns, Nunan and Elliot:

**Table 3.4.1 Action Research Cycles Suggested by Burns, Nunan and Elliot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exploring</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>identifying and clarifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying</td>
<td></td>
<td>the general idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td>preliminary</td>
<td>reconnaissance a) describing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collecting data</td>
<td>investigation</td>
<td>the facts of the situation, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysing/reflecting</td>
<td></td>
<td>b)explaining the facts of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypothesising/speculating</td>
<td>hypothesis</td>
<td>constructing the general plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervening</td>
<td>intervention</td>
<td>developing the next action steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observing</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting</td>
<td>dissemination</td>
<td>implementing the next action steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing</td>
<td>follow up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As different educational settings have various needs, these different action research cycle models can correspond to this variety of needs depending on the nature of the educational setting and the nature of the problem. As can be seen from the stages reviewed above, however, the first stage(s) in an action research cycle is the identification of a situation that the researcher considers to be a problem and wishes to improve as a result of the very nature of action research that it is “problem-focused” and aims at improving praxis (Wallace, M 1998: 15). Going back to the four stages-based cycle, as mentioned above, this stage also includes planning for the action to be taken to improve the situation. Another common stage in all these models is the implementation of a plan designed to improve the current situation which is seen as problematic by the researcher, i.e. acting. In all these three models, this stage is followed by observing/evaluating, which ideally should be complemented by reporting and distributing the results. And the final stage is following-up the research. Although this is not stated explicitly in Burns’s (1999) stages, her model requires that the final stage of her model be followed by the first, in other words, the follow-up stage exists in her model as well.

As argued above, these different models can fit different educational and research needs. The purposes and context of this research, however, required a different model, a model that expands further on the four basic cycles of action research. As my action research is part of a PhD study, a substantial literature review was anticipated and my preliminary investigation took the form of a literature review and discussions with colleagues in the UK, including fellow Turkish teacher-researchers. The emphasis on literature review is reflected in Macintyre’s model, which shaped my study:
Reflection and analysis of current practice

General idea of research topic and context

Narrowing down the topic, planning the action
Redefined topic - selection of key texts, formulation of research question/hypothesis, organisation of refined action plan in context

Scanning the literature, discussing with colleagues
Tentative action plan, consideration of different research strategies

Take action, Monitor effects - evaluation of strategy and research question/hypothesis. Final amendment.

Evaluation of entire process

Conclusions, claims, explanations
Recommendations for further research

(Macintyre 2000: 1)

My second reason for choosing Macintyre's model is that although other models are also based on cycles, this model provides a better understanding of the recursive nature of the action research.

In this case the problem set in this research is lack of a critical approach to texts in reading lessons in the Turkish High School context. Following the steps of literature review, redefining the research questions, research methods and instruments, I took action, i.e. gave an intervention in the form of a seventeen-week critical reading course, which is followed here by discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The stages of action research cycles used in my study are presented in the Introduction in relation to the form they took in this study.

3.5 Research Instruments

The research instruments used in this study are questionnaires, interviews, and repeated reading activity. Semi-structured questionnaires (Appendix 1) were given three times to the students to find out about:

1. Students' motivation for learning English, for studying in English language branch, their reading habits, their approach to and expectations from reading lessons and grammar lessons in (Questionnaire 1).
2. Students’ approach to and expectations from reading lessons and grammar lessons, and any changes in students’ approach to reading lessons and to reading (Questionnaire 2).

3. Students’ approach to and expectations from reading lessons and grammar lessons, any changes in students’ approach to reading lessons and to reading, and students’ evaluation of the course (Questionnaire 3).

The interviews were conducted twice as an in depth exploration about students’ experiences regarding the course with each class. The interviews are focused/semi structured as this type of interview enables gathering relevant data while making it possible for the students to bring new issues into the agenda, as semi-structured interviews give greater control to the interviewee and “flexibility” to the interviewer (Nunan 1992: 150).

I should note here that questionnaires, as well as interviews, bear the risk of having low reliability as they depend on peoples’ self-report (Munn and Drever 1990, Foddy 1993). I am fully aware that self-report data is limited by its nature, i.e. it relies on students’ own accounts of their attitudes and their self-report can be distorted due to a number of reasons, consciously or unconsciously (Grotjahn 1987).

Also it is always possible that the respondents might fail to give an accurate account of what goes on (Gillham 2000). However, what I am exploring in this research is necessarily about the students’ feelings, opinions, and cognitive activities. That is, whether there is a difference in their approach to the reading lessons and to reading, what they think about the intervention, whether they are frustrated, or are welcoming it. In other words, I needed students’ own self-reports on these issues as they are not easily observable, or measurable (Cohen 1987). Besides, students’ self-reports provide rich qualitative data on these issues, despite their drawbacks.

However, being aware of the shortcomings of these instruments, i.e. the ones stated above and the problem of data completeness and accuracy (Gillham 2000), I repeatedly explained to the students that this course and the data collection are a part of a research that I am doing, that there are no right or wrong answers, what I need is to know how they think and feel and that their honest responses were essential for the further development of the study.

Also the course had no impact on their marks nor did it have any assessment such as exams or assignments attached, nor was I a permanent member of staff of the
schools involved. Therefore, students' participation was on voluntary basis and they did not have reasons to worry about their participation and feedback affecting their grades or about establishing relationships with me. Although these factors and my explanations helped me to build a confidential relationship with the students, the risks stated above still remain. Hence while preparing the questionnaire, I tried to avoid any wording that might give clues to the students as to what I might have been interested in as a response (Cohen and Manion 1994: 283).

On the other hand, a personal relationship with the respondents had its advantages as well. As I asked the students to fill in the questionnaires during the lesson, I did not have problems of unreturned questionnaires, motivating the respondents, misunderstandings, or lack of seriousness especially in the first two questionnaires (Gillham 2000).

The questionnaires and the interviews were given in students' L1. The literature generally does not provide much insight into the choice of the language in the use of these instruments. I chose to give these research instruments in Turkish because firstly, I wanted the students to express their opinions, experiences, and feelings without the possible anxiety of using L2, and without being restricted in their answers with the proficiency of their language. Secondly, using L1 helped to establish a more natural environment for investigation. And finally, I did not want the students to feel that the research tools were for assessing their English proficiency and that their answers would be evaluated in any way (i.e. neither the contents of their answers nor the accuracy of the language they used) and I attempted to establish the understanding that these research instruments were important for their reflections only.

However, giving the questionnaires and the interviews in Turkish has the disadvantage of translation. I translated students' responses and this bears the risk of researcher bias. Therefore, I asked a fellow Turkish teacher-researcher to check the original student responses and the translations.

Repeated reading activity, on the other hand, was conducted in English as my focus in this research instrument was on the language, students' awareness of the use of language, and SFG analysis.

Table 3.5.a shows the chronological order of the research instruments used:
Table 3.5.a

Research instruments used in chronological order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>Week 15</th>
<th>Week 16</th>
<th>Week 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire 1</td>
<td>Repeated Reading Activity 1</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.5.1 Questionnaires

Although questionnaires are mostly used for quantitative research, they were beneficial in this research since they are very economical ways of eliciting self-reports from the students. As this study explores changes regarding the students’ approach towards reading and reading lessons; i.e. to what extent they become critically aware in their daily lives and any possible resistance from students due to their past experiences, I used questionnaires to gather data:

1. About the students themselves,
2. About their approach towards the English lessons,
3. About their approach towards the reading lessons,
4. About their approach to reading, and
5. About their approach to the intervention itself.

I gave three questionnaires to the students (Appendix 1). The first questionnaire was given at the beginning of the term, the second in the middle, and the last questionnaire at the end. The first questionnaire has four sections. The first section explores information about the students themselves, i.e.

- Their reasons to study in an English language focused class (to find out about their motivation to study English),
- Their reading habits (to find out what they read in their daily lives, what they expect from reading, how they approach reading, etc. to:
  1) adapt the course materials accordingly, and
  2) to see if there is any correlation between their reading habits and their approach to the intervention.

The second section explores their approach to different areas of English language covered in the school curriculum, i.e. speaking, listening, reading, writing, and grammar to provide a baseline about their motivation levels for these areas.

In the third section, which is about their reading lessons, I asked what they think the aim(s) of their usual reading lessons is/are, what kinds of texts they normally read in their reading lessons, which ones they find enjoyable, what the factors that make a reading lesson good are, and what kinds of texts they would like to read in their reading lessons. I asked these questions to explore what their expectations from reading lessons are to be able to find out whether or not this has an effect on why and how much they find reading lessons enjoyable and beneficial. The questions regarding
texts inquire about the relationship between their motivation and the texts, to see whether or not the authentic texts that they normally would read in their daily lives, such as newspaper articles, magazine articles, poems, etc. provide a state of cognitive and emotional arousal as opposed to the textbook texts or paragraph questions they normally read in their reading lessons. The question regarding what makes a good reading lesson was asked to see a) what they expect from a reading lesson, and b) if there are any changes in their understanding of the reading lessons throughout the intervention as these questions were also asked in the other two questionnaires.

The second questionnaire has four sections as well, the same sections as the first questionnaire. However, the first section has only one question, i.e. for how many extracurricular hours they study English. The section on the English lessons is the same as the first questionnaire to be able to detect any changes by comparing the students’ answers. The section on reading lessons has the same questions plus some more questions inquiring about the students’ ideas and feelings about the intervention so far. These questions ask the students to compare their previous reading lessons with the intervention and state the differences and their opinion regarding the differences. This section also seeks to find out about the students’ feelings and ideas about the texts and activities to find out whether or not they are influential in any possible increase in their motivation for the reading lessons.

In the last questionnaire the first two sections, i.e. sections about the students themselves and the English lessons, and the section on grammar, are the same as the second questionnaire. The section on reading has the same questions and eight more questions asking about the students’ attitude towards the reading texts, the reading lessons about how they feel as a reader, and whether or not they would prefer to have reading lessons to prepare them for the university entrance exam. This questionnaire also has a fifth section about the intervention itself. In this section I asked two questions. The first one inquiring about what they think they have learned from the intervention and the second question asking for two points they liked and two points they did not like about the intervention.

I used semi-structured questionnaires with open-ended questions, closed-ended questions, scaled response questions, and factual questions in the questionnaires depending on the nature of the data sought (Frankfort-Nachimas and Nachimas 1996, Foddy 1993). I used factual questions to learn about the students themselves in the first questionnaire along with the other kinds of questions to learn
about their approach towards reading lessons and reading. The data from this questionnaire serves as a simple form of baseline study showing the students’ general approach towards these issues.

In all the questionnaires closed-ended and scaled response questions are used to provide data for comparison purposes, i.e. comparing with the answers of the other students and with the answers to other questionnaires; and for frequency analysis (Foddy 1993). Open-ended questions are asked to enable the students to come up with any points they feel the need to raise as well as to give a detailed account of reasons for any changes, as open ended questions “allow the respondents to express themselves in their own words” as well as allowing the respondents to come up with their own categories and perceptions without providing them (Foddy 1993: 128). As I wanted to learn about the students’ feelings, opinions, and experiences, in terms of their motivation and reading, I made use of open-ended questions heavily, to avoid directing the students in their answers and to get a fuller account of their feelings, experiences, opinions; and to be able to see what the students themselves consider to be important (Foddy 1993).

In general I used the closed-ended and scaled response questions to explore about the pre-determined areas of research, i.e. motivation and critical reading, Open ended questions were used to get more detailed data about these two areas as well as to enable the students to come up with their own points as open-ended questions “permit greater freedom of expression” (Wilson and McClean 1994).

For methodological triangulation I used interviews, and a repeated reading activity.

3.5.2 Interviews

The two semi-structured interviews followed, and were based on the data from, the questionnaires. The interviews were conducted in Turkish due to the reasons discussed in the previous section. I used them to get more in-depth data from the students or to clarify any ambiguous points in their responses to the questionnaires. The students interviewed were chosen according to their responses to the questionnaires. For example the responses of three students from Class A to the question on the aim of the reading lessons was “to understand what one reads”. As this response is too vague I had to interview these three students to clarify their
responses. As well as students whose responses to some questions were not clear enough, I chose students whose responses required further inquiry on that subject. However, in both schools I interviewed all the students who volunteered for it in the last interview as some of them explicitly asked to be interviewed. All the data from the interviews proved useful.

I used "focused interviews" as they give more freedom for both the interviewer and the interviewee (Cohen and Manion 1994:273). While enabling the interviewer to focus on the points that the interviewer has analysed prior to the interview, it gives freedom to change the focus depending on the responses to the questions (Ibid., Frankfort-Nachimas and Nachimas 1996). As my aim in interviewing was partly to get in depth responses from the students on the issues raised by the data from the questionnaires, focused interviews gave me the focus and the freedom I needed to gather the data I needed.

The problem of reliability and validity exists with this research instrument as well. For the problem of validity, I will be using other research instruments as stated above for methodological triangulation and I asked a Turkish research colleague to go through the coded data to decrease the interviewer bias, as she will have no expectations from the interviewees and is much less likely to misinterpret the responses due to any possible expectations (Cohen and Manion 1994). Although Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) suggest going back to the respondents and either re-interviewing them or checking the data with them, it was not feasible for this study as the respondents are in Turkey and most of them have left Antalya for university education.

As the interviews have been conducted by myself, who had become a participant by then, as Cohen and Manion argue, the validity is more likely to be higher than it would be had the interviews been conducted by an outsider as the students could have felt uncomfortable discussing issues such as their priorities in the classroom with a stranger (1994). However, being a participant also raises questions regarding reliability since the interviewer-interviewee relationship is not unproblematic unless the interview is highly structured leaving little space for interviewer bias (Hitchcock and Hughes 1995). Similarly, reliability issues arise with translation. As stated in the section below, I also asked a Turkish researcher colleague to check the original transcriptions of the interview in L1 with the translations to decrease researcher bias. The interviews were all simultaneously translated and
transcribed. I listened to the interviews many times during transcription to familiarise myself with the student voices, and to check the accuracy of the translations.

The problem of reliability, for this study, has the same roots for interviews as the questionnaires, i.e. the responses might be misleading to please the interviewer, the teacher. Yet, the same principles regarding the confidential relationship with the students in this study apply for the interviews, as well as paying effort in wording of the questions not to give clues to the respondents on what I was looking for. Besides, the variety of the responses from the interviewees also shows that they were not hesitant to point out issues that are typically not expected or desired by the teacher of a course. For example Semih pointed out both in the second and third questionnaires and in the second interview that he preferred a lesson focusing on the university entrance exam. Betul mentioned her unease regarding the use of group activities, while Özlem criticized the selection of texts.

However, it is recognised that the responses of the students might still be affected by the interviewer effect, especially as a result of me becoming a participant. Questionnaires and interviews, which involve self-report of the students, are used to inquire about the students’ motivation for the reading lessons; their approach to reading; and about how they feel about the course.

I also used a repeated reading activity, along with these instruments, to inquire into the students’ approach to written texts before and after the course to see whether or not the course had any impact with regard to adopting a more critical perspective.

3.5.3 Repeated Reading Activity

As discussed above, to see the effect of the intervention on the students’ attitude, I relied heavily on students’ self report. However, to see the effect of the intervention on the students’ reading regarding adopting a more critical approach, I also used a repeated reading activity.

I gave a text to the students to read and answer the questions regarding that text in the first week of the course before any intervention. I gave the same text with the same questions at the end of the intervention to see if their approach to the text had changed to a more critical one by exploring the differences in the answers to the questions.
The motive behind using this instrument is first of all to see to what extent they actually have adopted a critical approach to reading and secondly to use an instrument on which I can build methodological triangulation. As this activity does not bear the risks of reliability and validity the way questionnaires and interviews do, not being an introspective instrument, the data from this instrument will be helpful to see the degree of validity and reliability of the other instruments.

However, this instrument also has shortcomings as well. Traditionally this method is called pre-post test and it has its roots in the positivistic paradigm. But as discussed above, this paradigm is not the paradigm shaping this research. Thus, a quantitative data analysis will not be adopted, as a result of which the pre-test post-test design is not desired in this study. However, the ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying this research is a hybrid one, therefore the instruments used are of hybrid nature too. Yet, coming originally from a positivistic approach, pre-post reading activity still fails to recognise the complexity of human behaviour. In other words, any difference between the students' answers in this activity does not necessarily have to stem from the intervention but from any event that might have happened in the students' lives during the seventeen-week period. This weakness comes from the fact that the positivistic approach is actually designed for completely controllable laboratory environment. I used questionnaires and interviews to compensate for this aspect.

3.6 Methods of Data Analysis

The analysis of data on the first research question “what is the impact of the critical reading course on students' reading?” involved searching for themes in students’ responses to the questionnaires and interviews and frequency analysis of these responses. For example the answer “I compare writer’s and reader’s perspective” has the theme ‘perspective’ and is categorised under the category ‘perspective’ with answers with similar themes pointing to acknowledgement of perspectives involved in reading, e.g. “I consider the writer’s opinions and feelings”.

Having established initial categories, I realised that these categories are recurrent in both classes’ responses to the questions about critical reading and used the same categories in the analysis of students’ self-reports with regard to critical reading.
Then, I looked for these categories emerging from students’ self-reports in the analysis of repeated reading activity. Comparing students’ answers to repeated reading activity before and after the course, I explore whether or not there are any changes and if there are, whether or not the changes are in accordance with the categories emerging from the students’ self reports (Chapter 5.).

Data for the second research question, “what is the impact of the critical reading course on student motivation?”, is also analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Quantitative analysis includes frequency analysis, e.g. how many students answered ‘yes’ to the question “Is there any difference between our lessons and your previous reading lessons?”. Frequency analysis is done predominantly with close-ended questions. For the analysis of open-ended questions, I looked for themes in the students’ responses. For example, in the answer “It is positive, we participate more” (to the question “If there is (a difference between our lessons and your previous reading lessons), please state if you find the change to be positive or negative and explain the nature of the change”), the theme is ‘participation’.

Next, I looked for recurring themes. For example, the answer “We are more active” is taken as a recurring theme of ‘participation’. And I categorised these themes on the basis of the categories emerging from the literature review on motivation, section 1.3.1.1.

Finally, based on students’ answers and these categories, I analysed the components of the critical reading course in relation to these categories.

In relation to student resistance, the analysis used includes frequency analysis, i.e. how many students would prefer a university entrance exam oriented course, and finding similar themes, for example, the answer “The fact that the exam system is like this, forces us to study things for the university exam” has the theme ‘being forced’ and is categorised, among the answers with similar themes, in the category “University entrance exam as an imposing agent”. I then try to explain the reasons of resistance based on these categories (Chapter 6).

3.7 Validity and Reliability

3.7.1 Validity

As Cohen et al. argue validity is a key factor in any research (2000). They also remark that validity has taken new forms recently whereas earlier it meant the extent to which
the research instruments measure what they intend to measure. However, as understanding in the qualitative research has changed, the forms of validity also changed. Cohen et al. provide some examples of validity:

- content validity
- criterion-related validity
- construct validity
- internal validity
- external validity
- concurrent validity
- face validity
- jury validity
- predictive validity
- consequential validity
- systemic validity
- catalytic validity
- ecological validity
- cultural validity
- descriptive validity
- interpretive validity
- theoretical validity
- evaluative validity

(2000: 105-106)

I would like to state that descriptive validity, i.e. “the factual accuracy of the account, that is not made up, selective, or distorted”, is a concern for this research (Cohen et al. 2000: 107). Students’ responses to the questionnaires, interviews, and repeated reading activity, hence, are analysed bearing this in mind. However, as it is possible that I might still be selective in analysing data, therefore, I might distort the information provided by the students without being aware of it, I asked an impartial researcher, Sultan Erdoğan, to go over the data. Comparison of her analysis with that of mine was helpful in increasing the descriptive validity. I asked her to go over students’ responses to the questionnaires and interviews and to check the categories I came up with.

Some of the types of validity reviewed above are not of concern to me as they rely on the type of paradigm one chooses, for example, although evaluative validity is an important aspect of qualitative research, it is not my aim in this research as my aim is not to evaluate or judge but to explore the impact of the critical reading course on students’ motivation and reading.
Internal validity is important for this research as it involves the accuracy of the data in providing an explanation to a situation, event (Cohen et al. 2000: 107). As I have discussed earlier, subjectivity of the researcher can be a threat to the internal validity as well as descriptive validity. Actually, I think it is not always easy to draw clear-cut boundaries between these different types of validity. In certain types of research, one type of validity might include or complete another. For example, in this research, a high degree of descriptive validity will help to increase internal validity as well. As the threat of misinterpretation of the data by the researcher decreases by involving peer examination, and as the data are viewed more objectively, the degree of internal validity will be easier to see, i.e. whether or not the causal relationships I seek to find exist or not.

The issue of external validity, i.e. “the degree to which the results can be generalised to the wider population” (ibid: 109) is also a main concern for this research as I hope that the findings can be useful in relation to adopting a critical reading course in the curriculum. The process of sampling is important in achieving external validity and, the sample I have chosen is taken to be representative of the grade 10, Anatolian High School foreign language branch students, as discussed above.

However, to reduce the possibility of “setting effects” and “construct effects” I gave the same course in two different Anatolian High Schools (Lincoln and Guba 1985: 189, 300). Lincoln and Guba also point out “history effects”, “where the situations have been arrived at by unique circumstances and, therefore, are not comparable” (as cited in Cohen et al. 2000: 109). It should be noted that it is not the claim of this research that the changes taking place in the history of the general context are a threat to the validity. On the contrary, it is a presupposition of this study that human beings are dynamic, and that changes in the educational system and wider social context might take place affecting the context in which this research is conducted, in which case further and continuous research will be required.

Finally, I would like to mention concurrent validity. Cohen et al define this kind of validity as: “To demonstrate this form of validity the data gathered from using one instrument must correlate highly with data gathered from using another instrument” (2000: 102). The effective way to increase concurrent validity is triangulation, which I discuss in section 3.7.3.
3.7.2 Reliability

As previously mentioned, one possible threat to the reliability is my role as a teacher while demanding information from the students as a researcher at the same time. In other words, the danger was students’ possibility of distorting the reality to please me as a teacher. Especially in Turkey, where the teacher is an authority figure, this threat is even bigger. It is not a part of the educational traditions for the students to challenge the teacher by any means. Although it is not included formally, grading system and disciplinary procedures work informally to ensure the status of the teachers and the students.

However, as stated in Section 3.5, an introduction session on the course at the beginning of the term was helpful to clarify the aim of this course and research. Therefore, I provided a detailed explanation on the aim of the research. I did my best to assure the students that what they think and feel was important and that there was not any predicted or desired outcome of this course but that it was important for the research to find out if the course has any effects on the students and if there was, in what ways. Regular emphasis of this point was made to help students realise that it is the information that they can provide about themselves that is important.

To support this point, students were also ensured about confidentiality. That is, any information that they provided both as a response to the research instruments and in the classroom during the lesson were to be confidential and not to be used for grading, nor passed on to other teachers.

Another possible threat to reliability is the instruments themselves, especially the questionnaires and the interviews, as they might lead the respondents to respond in a particular way. Questionnaires were piloted to decrease this threat.

Finally, the problem of the specific qualities of the teacher can be counted as a threat to reliability especially for the research questions related to motivation. Any changes taking place in motivation as a result of the course might be due to the teacher herself, her attitude to teaching, and the novelty of the course. However, the questionnaires and the interviews, especially the interviews, were used to detect such reasons. That is, if the student response was unclear on what caused the change, interviews or questionnaires were revised to investigate the point further.
3.7.3 Triangulation

As human behaviour is highly complex, in order to grasp different aspects of this complexity accurately, triangulation is essential (Cohen et al 2000). Besides, if the data received from all the different methods are similar, the researcher can be more confident about the findings of the research (ibid).

Triangulation is commonly used in action research (see Elliot 1997, McNiff 1988, Macintyre 2000). The use of triangulation in action research is often based on collecting different accounts from different sources so that the researcher can “compare and contrast accounts of teaching acts in the classroom from one’s own, the pupils’ and an observer’s point of view” (Elliot 1991: 82). However, it is not uncommon to find triangulation being used to compare and contrast different methods and data in action research either, i.e. “comparing different kinds of data (e.g. quantitative and qualitative) and different methods (e.g. observation and interviews) to see whether they corroborate one another” (Silverman as cited in Burns 1999:163).

Different types of triangulation are reviewed in the literature (see for example Cohen et al, Burns 1999, Grotjahn 1987). I adopted methodological triangulation (Cohen et al 2000: 113) and data triangulation (Grotjahn 1987: 72). In other words, I used questionnaires, interviews, and repeated reading activity in my research as different research methods.

Use of multiple research methods is useful in three aspects. First, if one method fails to get sufficient information, another method can be used to compensate for it. For example, interviews were given after the questionnaires due to the reason that if/when the questionnaires fail to provide information about a specific point investigated, interviews could be used to get more detailed information on this matter.

Secondly, use of multiple methods gives the researcher the chance to clarify the information provided by one method through comparison with the other. For example, a response to the questionnaires 2 and 3 that the student is more enthusiastic about the reading lessons provides information about the motivation of that student. However, if she does not provide further information on the reasons of this change, interviews can be used to find out if the reason of this change is actually the intervention or any other reason.
To find out about the changes in critical reading, in relation to and in complementation with methodological triangulation, I used data triangulation, i.e. I compared and contrasted data from these different research methods to see to what extent the students’ attitude and behaviour corroborate with each other. I used data from questionnaires and interviews to find out about students’ attitudes in relation to critical reading; while the data from the textual analysis of repeated reading activity, and to some extent the questionnaires, were used to see the students’ behaviour in relation to this topic, the discourse they actually use.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

First of all I would like to point out that the students gave consent for their responses to questionnaires, interviews, and repeated reading activity to be used in this study.

Another ethical concern for me was using school hours for intervention. English language branch students have four hours per week allocated for reading lessons. I used two hours of this slot for the intervention. The students who participated in this study had chosen to receive extensive English language education and my concern was that the course, focusing on critical reading, would be relatively less directed at improving their English skills. Therefore, I chose authentic texts, suitable for their level of English, which I believed would be beneficial for them to improve their reading skills as well as their vocabulary. The permission from the Ministry of National Education, to whom I sent the copies of the texts to be used and the lesson plans, along with my proposal, meant that to some extent the students could be expected to benefit from the course.

However, approval of the course to be beneficial was on a relatively abstract level since the Ministry granted the permission without having information about the classes that participated in the study. Thus, I provided the copies of the texts and the lessons plans to the reading teachers of both classes at the beginning of the term and informed them about the study throughout the term, whenever I had the opportunity. Both teachers stated explicitly that they believed the students would benefit from the course with regard to their reading skills.

And finally, students’ responses on the course, and on reading, in the middle and at the end of the course, point out that the students also believed they benefited from the intervention. I discuss students’ responses in detail in Chapters 5 and 6.
The importance of the university entrance exam, as discussed in the Introduction, was another concern in this research related to using school hours of the students for intervention. Therefore, the study is conducted with the 10th grade students, who had another academic year before taking the exam, rather than the 11th grade students.

Finally, I would like to state that all the students who participated in this study gave their consent to use their real names.

3.9 My Role as a Teacher-Researcher

As Cohen et al. note (2000), action research is influenced by the works of the Frankfurt School, Habermas (1984) in particular, and draws from the works of Luke and Foucault, which suggest that knowledge is power. As a reaction to dominance of the academy in the field of social sciences, action research was developed to empower practitioners. In other words, action research aims at empowering the practitioners through enabling them to produce knowledge, which was argued to be in monopoly of academia (Reason and Bradbury 2001). This notion, as Cohen et al point out, is based on a desire for a more democratic community where practitioners are not ‘oppressed’ by ‘experts’ but have access to and control over knowledge, where both practitioners and experts are “equals” (2000: 232).

Although much educational action research gives place to the possibility of involvement of an outsider researcher, in collaboration with practicing teachers, involvement of outsider researcher in action research is more strictly objected to in studies in other areas of social science, such as sociology, anthropology, etc. (see for example Kemmis and McTaggart 2000, Greenwood and Levin 2000 for objections to the involvement of ‘academia’ in action research). This, I believe, is related to the fact that education is relatively practice oriented. It is hardly new that practitioners and researchers work together in this field, and that the academic field of education is already practice-oriented by its very nature. Thus, the claim that academia solely produces theories that are far from practice is questionable in education.

As a result, action research has an extra role in classrooms, i.e. bridging the gap between theories and the very context, classrooms, the practitioner works in, as well as involving the practitioners, teachers, in the production of knowledge (Cohen et al 2000, Pring 2000, Macintyre 2000, Burns 1999).
However, an outsider researcher doing action research is hardly visible in the literature. Hence, this research might be subject to criticism that it is contaminating the very nature of action research:

*Kemmis (1997:177) suggests that the distinction between the two camps (the reflective practitioners and the critical theorists) lies in their interpretation of action research. For the former, action research is an improvement to professional practice at the local, perhaps classroom level, within the capacities of individuals and the situations in which they are working; for the latter, action research is part of a broader agenda of changing education, changing schooling and changing society.*

(Cohen et al 2000: 233)

Kemmis and McTaggart also argue that action research should not be done by other people but should be done by the insiders themselves. Perhaps at this stage I should restate my motivation for doing this research. Coming from the educational context, which is the same educational context of this research, the lack of a critical aspect in the school curriculum was a problem for me. Hence, the concepts of researcher, outsider, practitioner are muddy in this respect.

As stated above, it is not uncommon that researcher(s) and teachers work together in education. However, this research has a disadvantage that I did not have the chance to collaborate with the practitioners, i.e. teachers. Granting access to the schools to teach a course that is not part of the national curriculum is not a normal policy of the Ministry of National Education. The permission was granted for me to do so, as I am a research student sponsored by the Ministry of National Education, after long negotiations. Teaching a course that is not in the curriculum, which is not a common practice, left me somewhat isolated from other teachers. Besides, asking other teachers to participate in this research was not a possibility as the teachers have to follow the curriculum, and they do not have the authority to give a course that is not part of it.

Finally I would like to say that my experience conducting the research has been empowering. I have not only been able to develop and teach the course in critical reading, but have also been able to translate this experience into knowledge. It is hoped this knowledge will give me power to continue to influence the English curriculum in Turkey.
CHAPTER 4 THE COURSE

The critical reading course was given to two groups of English-focused 10th grade classes in two Anatolian High Schools between the dates of 14-02-2003 and 13-06-2003. The course took place in the second term, which lasted 17 weeks, for two lessons each week, a lesson being 45 minutes, although occasionally in some weeks I had to give the last lesson up for the sake of the common exams they had to have as part of the school regulations.

There were initially fourteen students in Class A, eight girls and six boys. However, in the middle of the term a transferring student arrived to this class making the number of boys seven. In Class B seventeen students participated in the study, twelve girls and five boys. The English proficiency of the students was intermediate to upper-intermediate.

4.1 Developing an Understanding of Reading as a Social Process

The importance of discourse as a social practice has already been discussed in Sections 1.3 and 1.3.2.1. As argued in the Introduction, the general approach to reading in the context of this study is a traditional model. Hence I decided to dedicate weeks 3-6 to introducing the concepts of different identities, different social realities, the influence of social context on these differences, and the role of these variables in the process of reading and writing. This period would also serve as the foundation to be followed by individual text analysis by SFG, where the students would be expected to analyse texts to see at play the role of contexts and processes of production and interpretation, in interaction with the text; and to be able to distance themselves from the text recognising that the perspective offered by the text is affected by these contexts and processes, which in return shapes them.

4.2 Text Selection

Before going back to Turkey to teach the course, I had prepared provisional lesson plans for the whole term (see Appendix 2) and the texts to be read in the classroom (see Appendix 3 for three of these texts). The importance of using authentic texts that
relate to the students’ lives in critical pedagogy and CLA is discussed in Sections 1.1.2 and 1.3.1. Accordingly, the texts chosen were authentic texts that included up-to-date issues such as Turkey and a disagreement in NATO about the Iraq war, which in fact started shortly before the course, the Kyoto Treaty, as well as texts from teenage magazines, leaflets, advertisements, literary works, textbooks, etc.

Secondly, the texts were chosen from a variety of genres, i.e. newspaper and magazine articles, “community texts” (Wallace 2003) (leaflets, advertisements, etc.), literary texts (poems and stories), and textbooks, as not providing the students with a variety of texts would bear the danger of the students limiting their approach to reading to (a) specific genre(s).

Thirdly, the texts were chosen so that they would allow themselves not only to be analysed in the classroom setting with limited time, but also to set exercises for SFG analysis. For example, texts with a high use of personal pronouns, appraisals, etc., were chosen for analysing with a focus on the interpersonal metafunction.

And finally, the methodology suggested by Wallace was influential in my selection of the texts: Two sets of texts on the same subject from different perspectives were selected.

Both classes wanted to bring their own texts towards the end of the course to be read and analysed in the classroom. Hence, I decided to abandon the texts I was planning to analyse in the classroom as long as the students brought the texts they would like to read and analyse to the classroom a week before we were to read them. Class A brought texts on SARS disease, which were used in Week 15 in this class. Also one student from Class B brought a text on Turkey but the other students in Class B preferred to go on with the original text so with this class we followed the original lesson plan. With Class A we still did the activities and analysis as intended.

Students had difficulty accessing authentic texts. Although they were eager to bring their own texts, they did not have much opportunity to come across a text they would like to have analysed in the classroom. The main source for authentic texts is the Internet for them and not every student had immediate access to the Internet. One school had a library with books and various magazines in English but the magazines were issues of the past years. Hence, although they had the chance to bring their own texts to the classroom theoretically, they did not have so much opportunity in practice. However, this was an anticipated difficulty as Turkey is an EFL context and the
development of the course was not based relying on the students bringing their own texts although room was left if they wished and had the opportunity to do so.

4.3 Phase 1: Reading as a Social Process, Following Wallace

Week One

The first week was dedicated to an introduction as shown in Table 4.3.a. I explained to the students that we would be reading authentic texts from newspapers, and magazines as well as stories and poems. I told them that the course is part of my research and that similar courses had been done in contexts such as the UK, and South Africa and that I was interested in seeing how it would work in the Turkish context.

To be able to detect the how the course would work, I explained, I would have to ask them to complete three questionnaires, to take part in two interviews, and to participate in two sets of activities one before and one after the course. I told them that my aim was to find out how they thought and felt about the course. Therefore, I said, it was very important that they were honest about their responses. I repeatedly emphasised throughout the course that what I wanted to find out was how such a course would work in high schools in the Turkish context, and that their responses would determine that.

I did not explain the aims of the research or the research questions, as I suspected that it could affect the outcomes of the research. However, I told the students that I would be happy to discuss with them the specific research questions I had at the end of the term, if they wished.

Following this brief introduction to the course the students were given Questionnaire 1 to complete. In the second lesson we discussed the students’ reading habits both in English and in Turkish, i.e. what they usually read, what they enjoyed reading at school and outside the school, why, what differences there were for them between reading in English and in Turkish. I also asked the students what they expected from a reading lesson both to get an early insight about their opinions and to emphasise that their views were important both for the development of the course and for the outcomes of the research. Their responses are discussed in Chapter 6.
In the first lesson we had the first repeated reading activity.

In the second lesson, to draw students' attention to the context-bound nature of discourses, I adapted an activity suggested by Butt et al. (2000) and I gave students different situations (i.e. a student/students and a teacher greeting each other in the classroom before the lesson starts, a parent and child greeting each other after the child returns home from school, themselves greeting an elderly neighbour, two friends greeting each other as they meet to go to the cinema, greeting someone they have met just once before) and asked them to discuss how they would normally greet someone in each situation both in Turkish and in English, as my focus was language as a system not English as a foreign language only. Students' responses led to a discussion on the reasons of the differences of language use and the different language roles the participants assume in different settings. At this initial stage the issue of power was discussed in relation to, a) the immediate context of language use, b) participants' age, this being an influential factor in Turkey, and c) the relationship between the participants.

I found this activity useful as it helped to bring into play the issues of the role of context in language practices, power relations, and the dynamic structure of these power relations between the participants.

This activity was followed by another activity adapted from Wallace (1992a). I brought various texts from different genres to the classroom and gave these texts in sets to the students in groups. I asked the students to categorise these texts considering the questions posed by Wallace, as discussed in Section 1.3.2.2:

(a) who produces them (the texts)? E.g. public bodies, commercial enterprises, local authorities

(b) for whom are they produced, i.e. who are the consumers or the expected readers of the material?

(c) why has the text been produced?

(d) is this type of text of interest or relevance to you? why/why not?
Week Three

Next, as discussed in Section 1.3.2.2, I used comparing different texts on the same topic, as Wallace suggests, to draw the students' attention to the discourse as social process (Wallace 1992b). Each text was preceded by a pre-reading activity that required either brainstorming on the subject (ibid.) or answering questions like, what can this text be about?, who might have written this text for whom?, 'why do you think this text has been written?', to emphasise the students' own expectations from, approach or perspective to the issue before encountering the text. This activity proved useful as it helped the students to see the differences between their approach and that of the text. I also believe that giving space for the students' own perspectives or expectations in the classroom created an atmosphere where their ideas were not expected to be kept silent and to be replaced by that of the text or the teacher but where they were supposed to be compared with the text while and after the reading. Such an approach is a step to the understanding that multiple interpretations are possible and that the texts are not expected to be considered as the ultimate source of
information, about which the students are only supposed to answer comprehension questions, find synonyms/antonyms, or get the main argument as accurately and quickly as possible.

The first text to be read was Rapunzel. Before reading the text, I asked the students whether or not they knew the story, and asked them to tell it to those who do not remember. Next, we discussed the questions Wallace poses, as discussed in section 1.3.2.2 (Wallace 1992a: 71):

- What is Rapunzel about?
- Who are mentioned in this story?
- How are they mentioned?
- Who wrote this story?
- For whom is it written?

After reading the story, I asked the questions again this time adding two more questions:

- Why is it written?
- How else can this story be written?

These questions, were asked before and after reading a text in every lesson for three main reasons: Firstly, they were very helpful for the students to reflect on discourse as social practice, in which the text, processes of production and interpretation, and the contexts of production and interpretation are in constant interaction, as discussed in detail in Section 1.3. Secondly, when we moved to individual analysis of the texts using SFG, these questions provided the ground to link the results of the analysis with the understanding of reading as a social process. And finally, their repetition helped develop a habit of questioning the text and helped foster critical reading strategies.

Having read Rapunzel, the students discussed these questions in groups of four and then each group reported their responses to the class. We discussed the characters in the story in great detail. Each group did brainstorming on the characters and reported their responses, which were listed on the board as they reported. We also worked on the last question in great detail, as the next text was a re-written form of classical stories including Rapunzel. The students were then asked to re-write the
story in groups and report them back to the class. In neither of the classes were the roles assigned to the characters in relation to their gender questioned or altered in students’ alternative stories. Although the students enjoyed the story and the activity, they were more concerned with adapting the story to some genre they are familiar with through television or films but surprisingly, the inequality of the gender roles in the story went unmentioned in their re-written stories.

Week Four

In the following lesson, we read the re-written version of Rapunzel, i.e. The Practical Princess. As a pre-reading activity, again I asked the questions:

- What do you think The Practical Princess is about?
- Who do you think the characters are in this story?
- How can they be mentioned?
- Who do you think wrote this story?
- For whom can it be written?
- Why do you think it is written?

After reading the story, we answered these questions again and added the last question:

- How else can this story be written?

Following the post-reading we compared the two stories and the characters in Rapunzel and The Practical Princess on the basis of these questions and we discussed the possible interpretations of these stories by people from different eras.

This activity aimed at building up towards developing a model for the process of reading at the end of the sixth week. As The Practical Princess challenges the gender roles in a number of stories including Rapunzel, reading and comparing these two stories was useful as a) it drew attention to gender roles, and these three weeks aim also at providing an understanding that readers and writers are socially constructed beings; and b) to the context and the processes of production and interpretation, i.e. texts are read differently depending on the context of interpretation,
in this case changes in the social structure, which also affects the process of interpretation.

**Week Five**

Next, we read a poem, *Rain.* I asked the students to read the poem and to answer the set of questions stated above in groups of four. The students in both groups agreed that the poem was about love, disappointment, loneliness, hopelessness, separation, and death. Next, I told the students that it was written during World War I and asked them to re-read it and answer the questions again according to this new information. Next we discussed why their interpretations changed and what was influential in their readings. Whether or not people from this era with different social conditions and social identities, such as age, would read it differently was also discussed. This time, the students came up with a list that consisted of age, social conditions, background knowledge, time as factors that influenced their readings.

Similar to Week Four, this activity aims at emphasising the role of social context and socio-cognitive processes while reading and writing.

**Weeks Five and Six**

The final part of the first phase of the course included reading two different texts on the Kyoto Treaty, one from a British newspaper, criticising the USA and Bush government for not signing the treaty, and the second from an American newspaper, questioning the efficiency of the treaty. This is also adopted from Wallace’s suggestion of using “parallel discourses” (Wallace 1992b: 119), as discussed in 1.3.2.2.

Following pre-reading activities, which consisted of class discussion on global warming, greenhouse effect, students’ positions regarding these issues, what they know about the Kyoto treaty, and answering the questions posed above, we read first the article from a British newspaper. Following this the students answered the set of questions stated above as a post-reading activity.

Having read the second article, we discussed the same set of questions and the role of possible factors in producing and reading a text. Adding to the gender of the writer/reader, and immediate social context, i.e. the historical and cultural location,
which were raised by the previous texts, the students mentioned nationality and culture in both groups.

As the students came up with nationality as a factor influential in the process of reading, I asked what other possible identities they could think of and the students came up with a list, which consisted in both groups of gender, age, ethnicity, religion, the area one lives in, i.e. provinces of Turkey, and occupation.

Next I asked the students to prepare a poster on the process of reading based on the texts we read so far, i.e. what influences the process of writing and reading, in groups of five and six.

After the students completed the posters and discussed on them, I presented two different approaches to reading. The first one, the traditional model, is a linear one that disregards the role of social context:

Author has an idea or experience → Author expresses the idea in the text → The text reaches its readers → Readers find author’s meaning

(Moon 1990: 30)

Following this model I gave Fairclough’s model of reading as a social process, Section 1.3. I wanted to provide these two models explicitly as the first one shows a structuralist approach and reflects the traditional approach to reading in the context of this study. Making these two approaches explicit also helped sum up what we had been talking about up to this point. This stage of the course, focusing on the possibility of multiple readings and contesting meanings via sociocognitive processes and social context to make existence of different identities and interpretations more explicit, concludes with the comparison of and reflecting on these models.

4.4 Phase 2: Analysing the Texts

The next phase included analysing individual texts using SFG and the set of questions provided above. We started with the interpersonal meanings, as I thought that starting the analysis with the relationship the text/ writer builds with the students as readers
would be a good and relatively less abstract point to start with, a point, which they could relate to their own reading habits easily. The SFG structures emphasised and used in the analysis of the texts in this study are chosen to reflect the structures focused on in the studies in CDA (see Chapter 2).

Week Seven

In week seven, I introduced the interpersonal meanings. We started with discussing what effects the use of personal pronouns could have on readers, what effect could use of “we”, “us”, “they”, “them” etc. could have on the students while they were reading a newspaper article, an advertisement, their textbooks, etc.

Next, I presented appraisal systems, as discussed in 2.3. Again, we discussed how the use of appraisals could be influential in the way the text builds a relationship with the readers. Presentations of mood and modality were followed by similar discussions where the students were asked to reflect on the possible effects of uses of these structures on readers. We also discussed the issues of presentations of participants in texts and markedness. Presentations of these structures and the discussions were followed by the introduction of the concept “ideal reader”. Again, the students were asked to discuss how these structures could be used to construct an ideal reader.

Week Eight

The following week was an introduction to both interpersonal analysis and to grammatical analysis that we would be doing for the rest of the term. I brought a number of texts from different genres, including newspaper and magazine articles, poems, leaflets, stories, advertisements, and textbook instructions, to the class and asked the students to analyse these texts in terms of the use of mood and group them. Finally each group had to report their analysis to the rest of the class.

Following this activity, we read *Glory of Women* and analysed it in relation to the writer’s choice of personal pronouns. This activity aimed at exploring the relationship the writer builds with the readers, i.e. who the writer is, what his identity is, what his context, worldview is, what the expected identity, context, worldview of the reader is, and whether or not this influences the way he writes this poem / we read
this poem, etc. Having answered these questions we also discussed the effect of writer’s choices on readers, adopted from Wallace, other possible ways of writing this poem, and the effect such alternative ways of expression would have on readers. The students were given a worksheet to fill in during their analysis of the poem. This worksheet is adopted from Wallace too and is used in all the following analyses of the texts in the coming weeks (Appendix 4).

In the second lesson we explored interpersonal meanings further. We read a newspaper article “Join our Asylum Campaign”. As a pre-reading activity we answered the set of questions as usual. Next we went on to reading the text. Having read the text the students were expected to do the grammatical analysis based on interpersonal meanings again. This text demonstrated use of personal pronouns as well as different strategies in introducing participants. I asked students to pay special attention to these two aspects and after the analysis we discussed the set of questions again under the light of the analysis, which the students did in groups. Next we discussed the effect of the writers’ choices on readers in the light of both the analysis and the discussions of the questions.

Answering the same set of questions both before and after the analysis proved to be useful at this stage as the analysis and discussions caused considerable change in students’ answers to these questions on these two different occasions. Before the analysis the students expressed that they believed the text was “objective”, asking the views of people from various backgrounds. After, a closer look through the analysis of the way the participants were presented, and the personal pronouns, they were surprised to see how much the grammatical analysis could reveal.

In the second lesson both groups were given the second questionnaire.

Week Nine

In the ninth week, we read a newspaper article about Belarus. This text had examples of use of personal pronouns and appraisal systems. Analysis of the appraisal systems helped the students to explore the writer’s attitude towards the topic and the way this positions the reader. The students, again, were asked to answer the set of questions. Followed by reading the text, analysing it, based on interpersonal meanings, and finally, re-answering the questions based on the analysis, became the routine of our discussions on the texts due to the reasons stated above.
All the activities were done in groups for three reasons: 1) this gave the students an opportunity to discuss their ideas in their group first, providing an opportunity for more students to express their ideas and be involved in the discussions, and providing the students with some time to decide on their answers before reporting them back to the class 2) working in groups gave the students the time and confidence to assert themselves more in the classroom discourse, and 3) SFG analysis of the texts in groups was less time consuming.

**Weeks Ten and Eleven**

In the tenth week, I introduced the experiential meanings to explore what is being talked about in greater detail, i.e. which processes are used, who the participants are, the distribution of processes to the participants, etc.

And in the following week, the first lesson, we re-analysed the text on asylum seekers, building on the analysis of this text regarding interpersonal meanings. We focused on the distribution of the processes to the participants. In other words, building on the analysis of interpersonal meanings in this text, we explored which participant was using which process to talk about the topic and what effect this would have on readers. As a post-reading activity we discussed the set of questions considering these analyses.

In the second lesson, we re-analysed the poem *Glory of Women* this time focusing on experiential meanings through the same stages. Again we looked at which participants were associated with what kind of process and what kind of effect this would have on readers.

Having the routine where the students answered the questions, analysed the text and answered the same questions again was also helpful for the students to answer the last question “What other ways of writing about this topic are there?”. Using the analysis the students found it easier to pinpoint writer's/producer's choices in relation to what is talked about, by/to whom and how, which made it easier for the students to answer this question.

**Week Twelve**
In the twelfth week we re-read *Rapunzel* and *The Practical Princess* and analysed experiential meanings in these two stories. Again we discussed which processes were assigned to which participants in which story after the analysis. We compared the results of the analysis with students' comparisons of the two stories in Weeks 3 and 4. We did not answer the set of questions for these stories again as we had done before. However, the analysis and the discussion was built up as a follow-up of their discussions on these two stories in the previous weeks and provided ground for their earlier character analysis. Analysing the processes, they came up with explanations on why they perceived the characters in a particular way previously. Hence, this was followed by the effect of the writers' choices on readers.

The analysis showed that the processes used for *Rapunzel* and *Princess Bedelia, The Practical Princess*, were very different. Student discussions suggested that the heavy use of the relational processes for *Rapunzel* meant that Rapunzel was presented in terms of her appearance or her physical abilities, i.e. she had long blonde hair, a beautiful voice, etc., whereas, the heavy use of material and mental processes for the *Practical Princess* presented her as an active agent.

**Weeks Thirteen and Fourteen**

In the thirteenth week and in the first lesson of the fourteenth week I introduced the textual meanings.

In the second lesson in the fourteenth week, we discussed some headlines from the newspapers, focusing on nominalizations-passivisations, and discussed what effect they create on readers and how else they could have been written to provide examples on how and why analysis of textual meanings can be used.

**Weeks Fifteen and Sixteen**

In the following week, in Class A, we analysed three texts on SARS, and in Class B, we analysed a review of *Matrix Reloaded*. The students themselves brought the texts on SARS. The text on *Matrix Reloaded* was provided by myself, as her classmates did not find the text Gamze brought to the class, on Turkey, interesting and they wanted to analyse some other text.
I gave the last questionnaire to the students in the fifteenth week to be completed and returned to me in the sixteenth week, as a number of students stopped attending school, partly because of the very high temperature and partly because the students were already in a summer holiday mood.

In Week Sixteen, both Classes had common exams and we did the repeated reading activity as our last classroom activity.

**Week Seventeen**

Class A did not have lessons on the day we had our class in the last week, as it was the last day of the term, and having anticipated that there would be very few students in Class B, I conducted the second interview in this week, by taking appointments from the students, due to the unreliability of attendance in the last week of the term.

**4.5 Accountability**

As stated earlier, the work that students did in this course did not contribute to their grades. I was not paid to teach the course and I was simply required to update the reading teachers, and occasionally the class teachers of the students on the activities we did, and the texts we read.

In these respects, the course is not typical. But if students participating voluntarily benefit, then arguably those taking a similar course taught under the usual conditions would too.
Table 4.3.a

Repeated reading activity

Interview 1

Questionnaire 1

Repeated reading activity

Interview 2

Questionnaire 2

Repeated reading activity

Questionnaire 3

Week 1 Introduction
Week 2 Repeated Reading Activity/Greeting
Week 3 Rapunzel
Week 4 The Practical Princess
Week 5 Rain/America the Unbeautiful
Week 6 More Hot Air on Kyoto/Process of reading
Week 7 introduction to interpersonal meanings
Week 8 grouping texts/Glory of women/asylum campaign
Week 9 Belarus
Week 10 introduction to experiential meanings
Week 11 asylum campaign/Glory of Women
Week 12 Rapunzel/The Practical Princess
Week 13 introduction to textual meanings
Week 14 textual meanings/headlines
Week 15 Class A/SARS Class B/Matrix Reloaded
Week 16 questionnaire 2/repeated reading activity
Week 17 interview 2

Focusing on reading as a social process

interpersonal meanings + experiential meanings + textual meanings

Individual analysis of the texts using SFG
As discussed in Chapter 3, to inquire about the impact of the critical reading course on students’ approach to reading I used questionnaires, interviews and repeated reading activity. And as discussed in Section 3.6, first I look at students’ self-reports about their approach to reading and develop categories based on these responses, as reported in Section 5.1 below. Later, I look at their responses to the repeated reading activity to see to what extent their reported approaches to reading reflect their responses in the repeated reading activity (5.2.)

5.1 Student’s Approach Towards Reading: Students’ Self-Reports

I inquired about any changes in students’ approach to reading in Questionnaires 2 and 3 and in the last interview. Students’ self-reports in these questionnaires indicate a shift in their approach to reading to a more critical one, as I will discuss below in detail, but first let me give a brief explanation of the categorisation of students’ responses for the purposes of the analysis.

5.1.1 Categorisation of Students’ Self-Reports

Students’ responses reporting that there is a change in their approach to reading fall into two main categories:

1) On a general level, where the students convey a change in the overall way they approach a text. Such as “I question (the text) more”, “I read more consciously”, and

2) On a more specific level, where the students provide insight into the methods they use that contribute to the change in their approach. For example, “I consider writer’s stance” or “I compare writer’s and readers’ perspectives” denote that these students take perspectives of the writer and the readers into account while reading. Therefore, these particular responses are grouped under the category ‘perspective’.
Students' self-reports in category 2 were grouped into subcategories based on the awareness of:

a) Perspective,

b) Social context,

c) SFG structures.

5.1.2 Students' Self-Reports: How They Approach Texts

In Questionnaires 2 and 3, I asked the students whether or not there was a change in the way they approached texts, and asked those who thought there was a change to explain in what way(s) there was a change:

Chart 5.1.2.a

Is there a change in the way you approach written texts? If yes, please explain in what ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaire 2</th>
<th>Questionnaire 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA*: Non-Attendant

In total, twenty students in Questionnaire 2 and seventeen students in Questionnaire 3 reported that their approach to written texts had changed. Table 5.1.2.a shows their explanations of these changes:
Table 5.1.2.a
Is there a change in the way you approach written texts? If yes please explain in what ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 2</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFG + Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I'm not struggling as much: 2</td>
<td>• I'm not struggling as much: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I spend more effort: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I question more: 3</td>
<td>• I question more: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I read more consciously: 1</td>
<td>• I read more consciously: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I read more carefully: 1</td>
<td>• I analyse more: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I interpret more: 2</td>
<td>• I read in a more detailed way: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I analyse more: 1</td>
<td>• I am more objective: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In a more objective way: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think more: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I consider writer’s stance: 1</td>
<td>• From different perspectives: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I compare writer’s perspective with mine: 1</td>
<td>(I analyse the text) from different perspectives, I read from a broader perspective: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I compare writer’s and readers’ perspectives: 1</td>
<td>• From different perspectives: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I consider the writer’s opinions and feelings: 2</td>
<td>Different perspectives ... Paying attention to writer’s identity: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I look from different perspectives: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I consider both writer’s and reader’s perspectives: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I pay attention to the nationality of the writer: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (I ask) myself when, why the writer wrote it: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (I can interpret more) with the new techniques: 1</td>
<td>• I pay attention to why the text is written and how it is developed: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much the writer knows, to whom he is addressing to, his identity: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I pay attention to what the text is about: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No, I’ve always questioned and criticised the texts: 1</td>
<td>• (I consider) what the writer wants to draw attention to: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No difference: 1</td>
<td>• I used appraisal analysis: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>• Using SFG and trying to find writer’s identity: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I pay attention to the way writer presents things: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No, I’ve always approached in a questioning way: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I don’t know: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses reported in Table 5.1.2.a show that in Questionnaire 2, the specific changes are heavily focused on different perspectives and the role of social context, whereas in the last questionnaire the distribution is more evenly made among perspective, social context and SFG. This is due to the time the questionnaires were given. The second questionnaire was given halfway through the course, after having focused on reading as a social process, while Questionnaire 3 was given at the end of the course, having covered both reading as a social process and SFG analysis.

The answers making reference to the different perspectives are important as they acknowledge the possibility of multiple meanings through recognising reading as a social process, as discussed in Chapter 1, as oppose to linear reading where the reader is expected to decode the hidden meaning.

It can be argued that acknowledgement of multiple perspectives indicates that the students distance themselves from the text through stepping out of their own “processes of interpretation” and “contexts of interpretation”, and recognise possible “processes of production” and “contexts of production”, which, as I argued in Chapter 1, is a prerequisite to challenge a text.

The answers under the category ‘perspectives’ can be further grouped into two. The first group of responses focus on the writer’s perspective: “I consider writer’s stance”; “I consider the writer’s opinions and feelings”. The second group of responses focus on the interpersonal meanings as they emphasize the relationship built between the writer and the reader, “I compare writer’s perspective with mine”; “I compare writer’s and reader’s perspective”; “I consider both writer’s and reader’s perspectives”; etc.

It is possible to see the role of the pre- post-reading questions adopted from Wallace (1992a), i.e.:

1. What is this text about?
2. Who are mentioned?
3. How are they mentioned?
4. Who wrote this text?
5. For whom is it written?
6. Why is it written?
7. What other ways of writing about this topic are there?

These questions were used throughout the term, and are visible in responses, such as “(I ask myself) when, why the writer wrote it”; and “I pay attention to why the text is written and how it is developed”. Volkan says in his interview that the most important thing he found in the course was the role of context the text was written in and explains further, “Well, who the writer is, when the text was written, what the writer’s opinions are... I got to pay attention to these because they can change what the text wants to give to the reader”. The value of these questions will be discussed in Chapter 7, Discussion and Implications.

It is possible to see the integration of these questions with the SFG analysis in responses under the category ‘Social context and SFG’, e.g. “How much the writer knows, whom he is addressing to, his identity”. Here the student is integrating the use of mood and modality (how much the writer knows), with the questions “for whom is the text written” and “who is it written by” (writer’s identity).

There is also a direct reference to SFG: “Analysing appraisals”. This response also bears importance, as it involves explicit use of SFG metalanguage. Soner writes, “I analysed the appraisals (in a text) and it was easier to see the meaning”.

Soner’s position that critical reading practices provide detailed readings of the text is visible in other students’ answers as well. It is not surprising that the students consider reading through the SFG analysis and the questions posed as post-reading activity as relatively detailed. We should remember that “I read in more detailed way” is also among the reported changes in approaches towards reading (Table 5.1.2.a). For example, Feyza writes, “I am analysing the sentences on a deeper level, I think on what the writer wants to give to the reader”.

Another important response came from Merve T., “I pay more attention to the way the writer presents things. For example, when I see something like ‘the university graduate model’ (in a newspaper), instead of finding this (statement) strange, I know that this is a technique”, reflecting on the use of markedness in the presentation of participants in Turkish media discourse.

The question used as part of SFG analysis “What are the effects of the writer’s choices?”, as suggested by Wallace, also proves useful and is traceable in all these
answers, and most explicitly in Gamze’s answer, “I am reading *Crime and Punishment* at the moment and when I read a paragraph I try to find out what the writer wants to draw attention to”.

The responses acknowledging different perspectives can be referring to either group or to other possible perspectives such as the possible perspectives of the participants in the text. Although there is a difference in these groups of responses regarding perspective as to where the students derive these perspectives from, i.e. SFG analysis and/or reading as a social process, what is common, and what is important, is that they acknowledge possible other interpretations and productions of the text. This is an essential component of building an understanding of the relationship between discourse and ideology.

A similar pattern of answers is visible in the responses to the question whether or not the students were feeling more confident as readers in the last questionnaire, in which nineteen students expressed that they did (see Chart 5.1.2.b and Table 5.1.2.b further below).

**Chart 5.1.2.b**

I feel / don’t feel more confident as a reader. Please state why.

![Chart 5.1.2.b]

Table 5.1.2.b, below, shows reasons for answers to this question.
### Table 5.1.2.b

I feel / don’t feel more confident as a reader. Please state why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, new interpretation techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I question more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have learned how to look for the writer’s perspective in the text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have learned to look at the text from different perspectives, (I am not looking from one perspective anymore-Özlem)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can approach the text I am reading from a different perspective (in a more detailed way)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, with the techniques we have learned, I can understand what the writer means better</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it made me see the aspects like why a text is written, how is it written. (To be honest, I was not aware that they could bear importance-Ceren)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly, I can see the time of writing and the writer’s identity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the grammar we have studied showed us what the writer actually wants to say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can come up with more solid examples while reading in English now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have a better understanding on what I read and I have gained information on some subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can see that I am improving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I find myself more effective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the responses in Table 5.1.2.a, the most common reference is made to different perspectives, followed by the role of social context, and finally SFG and social context.

Again, it is possible to see in the answers related to different perspectives / writer’s perspective that the students distance themselves from the text. Özlem’s
answer is the most obvious example of this. She writes that she steps out of her own process and context of interpretation, through awareness of the processes and contexts of interpretation and production.

The answers referring to the social context reflect that the students make use of the post-reading questions while reading, again, in relation to the understanding of reading as a social process: See Ceren’s answer in Table 5.1.2.b.

And finally, two students make explicit reference to SFG. One of these students, Mirac, says that she can come up with more solid examples.

At this point I would like to discuss Mirac further. When asked in the questionnaires whether or not there was difference in the way she approached texts, she stated that she had always been critical while reading. However, in her response to this question she states that the SFG analysis helped her to come up with more solid examples while criticising the texts. Therefore, I decided to ask in her end-of-term interview in what ways the course had an impact on her:

Simla: What do you think the aim of reading lessons should be?

Mirac: It should be to teach techniques to understand texts. I mean, we were reading them (texts) before too, but we understand them better now. Polarity, modals, etc. Systemic Functional Grammar, these work better. I mean, to (have) these is more enjoyable if we need a more complete reading course.

Simla: You wrote that you found the course beneficial. In what way did you find it beneficial?

Mirac: ... We are visiting a lot of web sites in the internet, In Turkish or in English, it helps us to understand better, I think. For example, the use of pronouns... I didn't use to look at them before myself, but now I pay attention to such things.

Simla: You had written in your second questionnaire that you have always been critical while reading. Were there any differences in your critical approach?

Mirac: Yes, there was a change. For example, before, I would just look, and um, see the, um, subject of the text. Like, 'this book is about this or that'. But now, writer’s approach, the way he talks about it, or his examples... I can see them now”.

... After studying Systemic Functional Grammar, we started to look [at the texts] differently anyway. I mean, we studied “Asylum Seekers” before and later we did it with SFG and they were both very helpful.
Hence, it would not be wrong to claim that those students, in this study represented by Mirac, who already have a critical approach to reading can benefit from the SFG analysis, which lies at the core of a critical reading course, as the analysis raises awareness of the role of language structures in reflecting and reproducing dominant ideologies. She states explicitly that she feels she benefited from the course as a reader, saying that she tries to make use of the techniques, in her response to the question whether or not she benefited from the course. Responses from all students to the question were as follows:

**Chart 5.1.2.c**

I think I have/ haven't benefited from this course as a reader. If yes, please state in what ways you benefited.

![Chart 5.1.2.c](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for these answers were as follows:
Table 5.1.2.c
I think I have/ I haven’t benefited from this course as a reader. If yes, please state in what ways you benefited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned to look for the writer’s perspective in the text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, my perspective has changed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can approach the text I am reading from different perspectives (in a more detailed way)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, we have learned analysing techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the grammar for analysis. It was boring but beneficial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I use it while reading newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I try to use the techniques while reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it made me see the aspects like why a text is written, how it is written</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am more sure of myself as a reader now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, It is normal that I have benefited after all that grammar!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can see that I am improving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but I am still having problems with the multiple-choice questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the most common pattern in the answers to this question is emphasis on the different perspectives the students report adopting while reading. One student refers to the writer’s perspective to the subject, one student refers to her own perspective to reading / text and three students acknowledge different perspectives to the text, as already discussed above in relation to Table 5.1.2.a.

The role of perspective in reading is illustrated by Cristina in her interview: “What matters is that you look from a different perspective. I never looked at texts like this before. I never looked to see what pronouns are used for women and men before, for example”. Therefore, it would not be wrong to claim that perspective to the text embodies SFG analysis and social context in it in these responses.

Two students make reference to SFG analysis and one student makes reference to social context. One student makes reference to her changed approach “I use it while reading newspapers”, and one student uses the term “techniques”, hence I took these responses to be a combination of social context and SFG analysis.
These categories are visible in students’ responses to further questions. Let us look at the students’ responses to the questions whether or not their approach to reading lessons have changed and their comparisons of the course with their previous reading courses.

**Table 5.1.2.d**
Is there any difference in your approach to reading lessons? If yes please explain in what way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire 2</th>
<th>Questionnaire 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, before I was just reading but now I <strong>think on it</strong></td>
<td>Yes, before I was just reading but now I <strong>think on it</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to understand and interpret the text</td>
<td>I question more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I analyse more now</td>
<td>I am <strong>exploring the texts in a more detailed way</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read in a more systematic and more conscious way.</td>
<td>Asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My perspective to texts and my interpretations</strong> has widened or I believe that it is so</td>
<td>My <strong>perspective to texts and my interpretations</strong> has widened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My perspective to reading texts</strong> has improved</td>
<td>I approach from <strong>different perspectives</strong> when I read a text now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I interpret English texts from <strong>different perspectives</strong> now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now I can look at what I read from a different perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have learned to analyse using <strong>polarity, modality, etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We <strong>analyse the text</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I started to <strong>not only read but to pay attention to what the text is about</strong> with this lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All the emphases in the table are mine unless stated otherwise.
Comparison of the course with the previous reading courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now we started looking deeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Through criticising the texts) we understand the text better in every aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more about interpreting the text. It doesn’t limit us by giving 4-5 multiple choices. Our aim is to understand the text rather than giving the right answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We criticise reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I analyse more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of taking the text as it is, I comment on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We question, comment on the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We see what the text is about by looking into the meaning deeper. It is more systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We criticise reading texts in this lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and interpreting is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think more on reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at it from different perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look at the text considering the emotions, who it effects, how... this kind of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We concentrate on the way the subject is presented and its methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(We question comment on the text) We even look at the personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We read according to the relationship between the writer and the reader. It may help us to better understand the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We concentrate on different structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As these questions asked the students to express their approach to the course or compare and contrast the course with previous reading lessons, the emphases in the responses is on their approach to reading in both critical and traditional reading courses. For example, when Yağmur was asked in her interview to explain further what she meant by “(looking at the text) from a different perspective”, she answered, “Analysing different things now, I mean, um... Recently I don’t answer paragraph questions (comprehension questions or multiple choice questions) but I look at why it (the text) was written, for example, at different opinions”. Hence, her answer on the
change in her approach to texts is based on the role of social context and acknowledgement of different perspectives.

Besides a change in the students’ general approach, again, the responses in Tables 5.1.2.d and 5.1.2.e show explicit remarks on social context, perspectives and SFG.

In these responses it is possible to see use of SFG terminology: “polarity, modality, etc.” (Table 5.1.2.d), “We read according to the relationship between the writer and the reader”, “We even look at the personal pronouns” (Table 5.1.2.e.).

The comparisons with previous reading courses (Table 5.1.2.e) were made in Questionnaire 2, while we were looking into interpersonal meanings, hence the terminology used in the answers is related to this metafunction. The responses regarding students’ behaviour in reading fall into the same categories as in the tables discussed above in these questions as well.

Finally let me discuss the students’ responses to the question, “What did you learn from the reading lessons we had? Please write the most important thing(s)”.

The students’ answers show that critical reading skills are considered to be the most important thing the students learned in the course by the majority of the students who answered Questionnaire 3:
Table 5.1.2.f

What did you learn from the reading lessons we had? Please write the most important one(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texts: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grammar: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To criticise the reading texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyse the texts in detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned how to criticise texts and what to base the criticism on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyse a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to approach a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned about what is needed to criticise a text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask questions to the texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most important thing I learned is that I need to look at written texts from various perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyse the texts using SFG, (and to comment on the texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, agency, mood, modality, polarity… in short, we learned the techniques to understand what we read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important one was to find agent, process, goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood, participants, agency, appraisals, polarity…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyse the texts using SFG, (and to comment on the texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals; personal pronouns; textual meanings, theme and rheme…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(How to approach a text) points to consider (process, agent, polarity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make the passive-active distinction better for the characters involved, I can get the writer’s ideas, time of writing better, we also learned to analyse the up-to-date events to see if the writer is objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New reading techniques (process…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interpret the texts and grammar was useful. I make use of the interpretation techniques most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the texts are written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 5.1.2.f, the responses to this question are similar to the responses to the questions reported above. Perhaps, the most important differences in this set of responses is the surprising shift in the emphasis given towards SFG analysis away from perspective as compared with the tables above.
In the responses discussed above, acknowledgement of different perspectives and a shift in the students’ perspective to reading is the most common response, whereas, in this set of responses, the focus is on SFG analysis. Considering the complementary nature of the understanding of reading as a social process and SFG analysis in this course, it can be argued that the students value SFG analysis as the means to support such a shift in the perspective. Although there is a recursive pattern in recognizing reading as a social process and SFG analysis, SFG analysis was seen as a systematic way of pulling their arguments together. Feyza says in her interview:

It provided rewards as a reader in both Turkish and in English. [In the traditional reading courses] We were reading and answering the questions in the text. But after this course [one] thinks on things like why the writer wrote that. There were verbs, mental, verbal… Analysing these, it is easier to find the answer. … The thing that stuck to my mind most was the analysis, processes. … And also the sheets you gave… the questions ‘what other ways of writing’... It is easier to understand them thinking on these [questions]... [SFG] helped me to concentrate on it [critical approach] because it was more systematic.

When asked the same question, Ayşegül said, “I think it helped us to see more clearly. It was more beneficial in terms of reading more critically”. Soner says, “The grammar for analysis. It was boring but beneficial” as his response to the question whether or not he has benefited from the course as a reader. Similarly, Volkan writes that he approaches texts more systematically as a result of SFG analysis, and Mirac says that SFG analysis has helped her to base her criticisms on more solid arguments.

Özlem’s answer in her interview reflects the complementary nature of considering different perspectives and SFG analysis:

Özlem: What I liked is, as I said, the perspective to the text. It is a big gain, I believe. Simla: In what way?

Özlem: err... to interpret a text, the way something is presented... It was interesting to learn.

Furthermore, it is possible to find answers referring to both the role of social context and SFG analysis. These responses include integration of these two, “I can make the passive-active distinction better for the characters involved, I can get the writer’s ideas, time of writing better”; “The way the texts are written”; or the use of a generic term “interpretation techniques”, which include both.
In the end-of-term interview, Özlem sums up the course:

*Um... the aim of the reading lessons... at the moment, with the situation we are in, we always think it is the university exam. But... I mean in general... What did I learn from this course? Perspectives in a reading text... I mean not just to answer the monotonous three questions below the text, but how to approach a text, I learned that. I mean, the aim was not just to answer those three questions superficially, I mean it was very good. I mean, how it is written; how else it could have been written, they were very good. Or, we looked at who “we, they” are (in the text).*

In this response she illustrates the general categorising, as well as the three main specific categories of change reported in students’ approach to reading:

1. Change in the perspective;
2. Considering the role of social context; and
3. SFG analysis.

5.2 Repeated Reading Activity: What the Students Do, SFG Analysis

The students were given the text “NATO ‘Bad Blood’ Rocks Alliance” and a set of questions both before and after the course and were asked to answer the questions regarding the text, as the repeated reading activity. Unlike the questionnaires and the interviews, this activity was done in English, as I was interested in students’ readings, not their self-reports.

As discussed in 5.1.1.1 and 5.1.1.2, the students report they are:
Analysing the text more;
Questioning the text more;
Interpreting the text more;
Reading in greater detail;
Criticising the texts;
Commenting on the text;
Thinking on the text / reading;
Reading more carefully;
Reading more objectively;
and
Reading more systematically

Through

- Recognising different perspectives involved, or expected to be involved in the text;
- Recognising the role of social context in the process of reading and writing; and
- Applying SFG analysis

As argued above, SFG analysis, role of social context, and different perspectives are in fact complementary by nature and SFG analysis is seen by the students to be the process that makes their readings more “systematic”.

Having looked at the students’ self-reports on how they approach written texts, I will look at whether or not their self-reports reflect their readings of the repeated reading activity. Their answers to these questions are given in Appendix 5, where the tables show the responses of the students to the questions asked after reading the text in both activities.
The answers to the question “What is this text about?” (Appendix 5, Tables 5.1.3.a and b) show changes in four main areas: degree of affect, role of social context, degree of detail covered, and acknowledgement of different perspectives. These are discussed initially for Group A below.

Koray’s answers in both activities show the most striking difference as in the first activity his answer is strongly affected by his Turkish identity. He answers, “It is about Turkey’s being defended against Iraqi threat and I think also about Turkey’s enemies and friends”. His answer indicates that he chooses to read the text in such a way that Turkey is in the centre and other countries’ policies regarding this issue are related to Turkey itself, rather than their policies regarding the war, or regarding other possible variables in the decision process. In other words, based on the text, he divides the participants of the text into two groups, friends and enemies of Turkey. This reflects not only sensitivity to Turkey’s presentation in the text as a result of ethnocentrism, but also perhaps an affective reading of the text. Therefore, I have labelled it ‘affect’.

His second answer, on the other hand, indicates that his reading the text this time is more detached from his identity. He answers, “First of all, it is about America-Iraq war. And it is about the disagreement about protecting Turkey against Iraqi threat”. He still places Turkey in the centre, and reads the text in such a way that Turkey is denied her right to defend itself, but he replaces “friends and enemies” with “disagreement”. Although “Iraqi threat” and “protection of Turkey” are still strong arguments, possibly still affected by his identity, his second answer shows decreased affect and the division of the participants as friends and enemies of Turkey disappears. This decreased affect is indicated by ‘-a’ in the table of responses in Appendix 5.

Change in the role of social context is visible in Gökhan’s answers. His first answer is “NATO” and is changed into “If Turkey should join the war or not”. His second answer acknowledges the contexts of production and interpretation in his reading. Turkey’s decision on whether or not to join the war was discussed for a long time in the national agenda, hence this student reads this text as a signifier of this aspect.

Similar readings are visible in Betül and Onur’s answers to the second activity. They both answer “If Turkey should join the war or not”. Change in Betül’s answer also suggests a decrease in affect, as her first answer is “NATO and the war
that USA wants against Iraq”, in which USA and Iraq are presented on their own, USA being the agent, and the other participants are invisible within NATO. However, NATO is presented as independent from the war or from these two participants through the use of ‘and’.

An example of the third category, increase in degree of detail, shown by ‘+d’ on the table of responses, is by Özlem. In her first answer she writes “war between some countries” and in her second answer she writes “Relationship and crisis among NATO countries”. Her second answer reflects more specific detail, as she fails to identify both what the text is about and the countries mentioned in the text in her first answer. In her second answer, however, she not only recognises the participants but also presents them in relation to each other, avoiding presenting them in terms of their relationship with Turkey.

Similarly, Yağmur’s answer “War between America and Iraq” becomes “NATO’s stance” noting more detail through inclusion of other participants than the USA and Iraq. “NATO’s stance” also avoids presenting these participants in relation to each other, like the answer of Özlem.

Semih, Mustafa, Merve and Volkan’s answers are more or less the same in both activities. Semih and Mustafa answer that the text is about war, and Volkan and Merve answer similarly that it is about crisis in NATO regarding/disagreement in NATO on whether to send patriot anti missile batteries to Turkey or not.

In Group B, the influence of affect in readings of the text by the students is more visible. Ayşegül says, “Turkey wants to defend itself and wants weapons. Belgium, France, and Germany disagree, Netherlands agrees with Turkey”. Her answer is similar to that of Koray’s, as they both involve judgement and affect. However, in her second answer she writes “Iraq crisis and France’s, Germany’s, Belgium’s, and Netherlands’s opinion about the crisis and Turkey’s situation”. This time, she does not position other participants in relation to Turkey but places all the participants, including Turkey, in relation to the crisis, noting less affect, increased recognition of perspective of the participants, shown by +p in Appendix 5, Table 5.1.3.b, with respect to decreased affect, and more detail.

Similarly, Şeyda says that the text is about “NATO’s decisions and alliance between USA and Turkey, and German and French opposition”, where she presents the participants in relation to their alliances within NATO rather than their policies regarding the disagreement, which involves affect on the position of Turkey. In the
second activity, however, Şeyda answers, “France and Germany’s policies and Washington’s policy for Iraq”, with less affect, increased acknowledgement of perspective of the participants, and more detail, “policies regarding this disagreement”.

This change in the answers of Ayşegül, Şeyda, and Koray bear importance because it shows that the students avoid the pitfall in the first set of answers stemming from their sociocognitive processes of interpretation created through their identities as Turkish.

Such distancing of oneself from possible judgements or affect through recognition of the possible perspectives of the participants is visible in other student’s answers as well. For example, Cristina writes in her first answer, “The disagreement in NATO about the help for defence which Turkey required from NATO during the war in Iraq” notes stronger affect realised through the use of lexicogrammatical structures, “help for defence” and “during the war”, both ‘help’ and ‘defence’ noting positive polarity and ‘during the war’ disregarding the conditional ‘in case of war’. However, her answer later on becomes “The war in Iraq and the attitude of USA and other countries towards Turkey’s getting involved (in the war)”. It is also possible to see acknowledgement of the perspective of other participants through the use of “the attitude of USA and the other countries…” (my emphasis). Furthermore, similar to the answers of Gökhan, Betül, and Onur, she considers the contexts of interpretation and production and suggests that the disagreement is about Turkey’s getting involved in the war.

Miras’s answer is very similar to Cristina’s. Her first answer positions the disagreement around the defence of Turkey whereas her second answer acknowledges other participants’ perspectives through “America’s and other countries’ attitude towards war, in NATO”, marking decreased affect, increased recognition of perspective, and greater detail, through recognition of the crisis being with respect to the war rather than the defence of Turkey.

Ayşe’s answer shows increased detail as her answer “the disagreement in NATO” becomes “(The NATO) countries’ opinions and attitudes towards this war”, giving more detail on the nature of the disagreement.

Önder’s answer is the only one where affect is increased in the second activity. His answer “It is about the war” becomes “The war in Iraq and Turkey’s place in the war” failing to recognise not only other participants’ perspectives but the participants
themselves as a result of placing Turkey in the centre, and this time not only in the centre of the disagreement but in the centre of the war.

Umut’s answer is also important as to how the students read the text with affect in the first activity. He says “the war between Iraq and USA for oil, disguised behind other reasons” in his first answer, showing strong judgement, not supported by the text but actually Umut forcing his view of war onto the text. In the second activity, he answers “Agreements and disagreements with the USA about the war in Iraq”. In this activity, he prefers to answer as reporting a situation in form of nominalization. He is avoiding the strong judgement he had in the first activity. Note, however, that USA is still a participant. Only this time, it has become the sayer not the agent.

Soner, Fulya, Önder, Ezgi, and Güray’s answers to both activities are same or very similar to each other, i.e. either disagreement in NATO or war. Gamze, and Ceren’s answers change to disagreements in NATO in the second activity. Ceren’s answer to the first activity is important as she says that the text gives news and information about the world and the war, as it is the first time a student’s answer indicates that he/she sees the text as ready information instead of adopting a critical perspective to the text.

To sum up, the students’ answers to this question in both activities differ in terms of decreased affect, except for Önder, increased detail, acknowledgement of the perspectives of the participants, and reference to the role of social context.

Despite these changes overall, students’ responses to question 2, “Who is/are talked about?” in the two activities do not change much (Appendix 5, Tables 5.1.3.c and d). In Class A, six students’ responses to second repeated activity are more detailed, while one student’s answer is actually less detailed. Three students’ answers do not show changes. Details are shown in Appendix 5.1.3.c.

Although, there is a trend in Class A’s responses to be more detailed in the second activity, Class B’s responses do not follow this trend in this question. Seven students’ answers are more detailed in Class B, while five students’ answers actually become less detailed. However, I would like to remark that Ayşe’s answer to the second activity shows less affect as her answer “Turkey and countries that disagree with Turkey’s desire” becomes “America, Turkey, Iraq, and some countries, opposing the war”. In her first answer, similar to the answers to the first question, she places Turkey in the centre and the other countries in relation to Turkey, i.e. opposing what Turkey wants, disregarding, those who support Turkey, for example. In this respect,
her response to the second activity becomes more detailed. Also, in her second answer, she does not present the countries in relation, i.e. opposition, to Turkey, but refers to them in relation to war. Again, I would like to argue that this change is due to decreased affect, arguably due to the acknowledgement of possible perspectives of the participants.

However, the responses to this question do not suggest a change on their own, perhaps because this is perceived as a more factual question of literal comprehension.

In contrast, Question 3 “How are they talked about?” shows changes particularly in the use of SFG in the second activity along with increased detail (Appendix 5, Tables 5.1.3.e and f).

In the first activity, in both groups the majority of the students report the countries’ stances as presented by the article, and three students state that the writer talks about them objectively, i.e. Cristina, Soner, and Merve (from Group B).

None of the students, except for Ayşe, gave answers regarding the writer’s approach to those involved or to the disagreement in this question. Similarly, Cristina acknowledges the writer’s stance on this issue but she adds “but I think he’s objective”.

This is partly because this article is taken from the BBC: Soner writes, “They are talked objectively. I mean BBC is not on the side of anyone. They are neutral”. I think it is safe to argue that at this stage Soner does not consider the effect of the writer’s choices on the reader. His statement about BBC credits the concept of production of the texts by an institution, however, ironically, this concept results in ignoring the effect of the writer’s / producer’s choices of language structures. Such an approach is also visible in Cristina’s answer, which is almost contradictory in itself. She acknowledges that the writer is worried about the disagreement yet she decides to express explicitly that he is objective.

The students are still sensitive about Turkey’s situation at this stage and express affect, e.g. “Some (countries) don’t want to send missiles” (Betül); “Turkish territory and airspace against any retaliatory Iraqi threat” (Mustafa); “Turkey-USA alliance” (Seyda); “Turkey wants to defend its territory and airspace, wants weapons, Belgium, France and Germany are against this”(Ayşegül); “Netherlands finally helps Turkey” (Ayşegül); “Turkey will still be defended” (Önder). Turkey is presented in the answers in relation to those who support its request for help and those who do not.
In the second activity, the students focus on mainly two aspects: agency and polarity. They are still sensitive to Turkey's position but the focus has shifted from its request for being protected and some countries' opposition to Turkey's being presented as the goal in the text. Merve writes, “Turkey is used as a rheme and object. Other countries are active”. In a way they are positioning Turkey in the text rather than positioning it among the other countries as argued in the text. In other words, they pay more attention to the way Turkey is presented and its effects. Similarly, Koray writes, “Turkey is just a subject, which is being talked about” meaning Turkey is the goal in the text, whereas other countries are agents and Volkan says, “Turkey is object”. Based on this analysis, three students' answer is “They talk about what Turkey is supposed to do” (Gökhan, Mustafa, and Onur), expressing affect. It is not clear what they mean by ‘they’. Is it the writer or other NATO members? Although they do not use grammatical terms in their answers as the others do, I assume that this answer is based on the fact that, at some level, they pay attention to which participant is active, which one is goal, and which one is agent, as this answer is different from their answers in the first activity. However, this remains an assumption as the answers fail to provide any clues to noticing the choice of lexico-grammatical structures in the text.

Betül looks at the use of modality in the text and says, “They are talked in the events of which are probable. They are talked not in a certain way. Probabilities are more”. Besides, the affect, which was present in her first answer, disappears in the second activity. Merve, also, says that the text is almost negative, referring to the choice of modality and polarity.

Yağmur’s answer does not include SFG but reveals increased detail and acknowledgement of other participants’ perspectives. She writes in her first answer, “Iraq’s policy is clear”, rephrasing the text, and “Showing NATO member’s ideas” in her second answer, in which she distances herself from the text.

Turkey’s position as the goal is also referred to in Group B’s answers, e.g., Cristina, Merve, and Güray. However, the main focus in this group was on the use of polarity with regard to both modality and appraisal systems, particularly the use of expressions: “In practical terms, Turkey will still be defended”; “French and German opposition to Washington’s Iraq policy is clear. But the fact that – along with the Belgium – they have chosen to force this disagreement to the top of Nato’s agenda will have serious consequences”; “These forces … would not be involved in a war
against Iraq, but would **protect** Turkish territory and airspace against any retaliatory Iraqi threat”.

Ayşegül writes in her first answer, “Turkey wants to defend its territory and airspace, wants weapons, Belgium, France, and Germany are against this. Netherlands helps finally”. Similarly, Mirac writes. “It is shown that NATO has ‘bad blood’ and some countries don’t approve the protection of Turkey (like France, Germany, and Belgium). But in spite of this disagreement, Turkey will still be defended, it says...”. Both Ayşegül and Mirac use the expression ‘Turkey will still be defended’ in their second answers. However, this time the emphasis is not on Turkey but on the word “still” and “will”, with a definite decrease in affect in their answers.

Before having them answer the questions I had asked the students to give examples to support their arguments, wherever they could. While answering, Cristina remarked aloud while answering the question that the expression “Turkey will still be defended” has suppositions that other countries’ opinions do not have any influence and that there will be a war whatever the other countries say. Mirac commented further that it almost meant that France and Germany cause a futile disagreement/problem over something inevitable. This activity did not include a class or group discussion so these comments from Cristina and Mirac were not expected. However, I did not silence the students while they were making these comments because I did not want them to interpret this activity as an exam. Besides, I was interested in hearing their reflections, which I was not sure whether or not would be reflected explicitly in their answers. Yet, I did not encourage the discussion, and asked the students to write what they think in their answers, as I did not want these responses to affect the responses of other students.

Similarly, referring to appraisals in the text, Cristina, Gamze, Merve, Güray and Can write that France, Germany, and Belgium are talked about in a negative way, whereas, the USA and Netherlands are talked about in a positive way. Some of them provided the examples of polarity in small notes. For example, Merve, from Class B, referring to the phrases “[These forces... would] protect Turkish territory and airspace against any retaliatory Iraqi threat”; and “French and German opposition to Washington’s Iraq policy is clear. But the fact that – along with the Belgium – they have chosen to force this disagreement to the top of Nato’s agenda” writes in her answer:
She places clear and to force (the disagreement) to the negative end, whereas she puts protect at the positive end.

Likewise, Gamze writes:

“Dutch support USA
German(y) and France oppose the war

Besides, considering the use of polarity and modality, compared to her first answer, “He is objective but his mind is mixed up”, she provides more details in her answer, as a result of the analysis.

Güray writes, “Turkey is the problem country and the goal, France, Belgium, Germany are the negative countries and USA and Netherlands positive”. His answer also reveals more detail compared to his first answer, “America and Netherlands said that they could send patriot batteries but France and Germany refused at first and agreed later”, which, in fact, is a miscomprehension of the text.

Umut only says “in a negative mood” but fails to provide any further explanation and does not give enough clues for speculation about what he means by mood.

And finally, Ceren and Şeyda do not change their answers to this question and report the events and different stances of countries in their answers based on the article.

In sum, the changes in the answers given to this question are: 1) based on SFG analysis, and 2) increase in detail.

Students from both groups answered the fourth question, “What are the writer’s attitudes towards the disagreement? How are they expressed?”, similarly (Appendix 5, Tables 5.1.3.g and h). Their answers to the first repeated reading activity
include “comparing past and present”, “by talking about all the countries”. And their answers to the second repeated reading activity focus on how the writer develops the importance of the current dispute by comparing it to the past disputes. In the second activity again, we see more use of SFG and increased recognition of the writer’s perspective in their answers.

In the first repeated reading activity the students tend to repeat the attitudes of the countries as presented in the article, without acknowledging that these attitudes of the countries reflect the writer’s perception of the situation/crisis. Except for Ayşe, Cristina and Merve, they fail to recognise the lexico-grammatical choices of the writer and do not mention the writer at all although what is asked explicitly in the question is the attitudes of the writer.

Three students’, Ayşegül, Koray and Mirac’s, answers to this question in the first activity denote affect, Koray’s being the strongest one. Koray writes, “Bush administration and Netherlands agreed to defend Turkey. France and Germany don’t want to go to a war. In fact in my opinion they don’t want to defend Turkey’s airspace and territory so that Turkey will lose the war”, denoting strong affect. His second answer, however, becomes “He thinks that the disagreement will suggest serious consequences so he is against the disagreement”, referring to the writer’s choice of the lexical items “serious consequences”. In his answer decreased affect is arguably a result of SFG analysis, i.e. recognition of the choice of lexico-grammatical structures.

Semih, Gökhan, Özlem, and Merve also refer to the same lexico-grammatical choices, quoting “serious consequences” and answer that the writer is against the disagreement or that the writer’s attitude is negative. They evaluate “serious” as a negative judgement. Hence, they are looking at the appraisals and modality once more to answer this question (will and serious consequences).

Volkan says that the writer is against the disagreement through analysis of the modality/polarity. He writes, “His attitude is certain, he uses certain expressions (about hypothetical situations)”.

All these answers, in Class A, also indicate acknowledgement of the writer’s perspective in the second activity. The themes of these answers are “he”; “the writer”; “his attitude”; and “it”, referring to writer’s attitudes; acknowledging the writer as the point of departure of the message in the clause (Halliday 1994) in contrast to the themes in the first set of answers, which are, “Bush administration”; “Germany,
France, and Belgium”; “Some NATO countries”; “three countries”; “France and Germany”; “Netherlands and USA” (Appendix 5.1.3.g).

In Group B, four students, Merve, Ayşe, Cristina, and Şeyda recognise the writer’s stance in the first reading activity, “he (the writer) disagrees/ is worried by the disagreement”. However, the rest of the group reports the stances of the countries in the way they are presented in the article.

Ayşegül notes, “He criticizes other countries’ attitudes” quoting “These forces-mainly air defence units- would not be involved in a war against Iraq, but would protect Turkish territory and airspace against any retaliatory Iraqi threat”. There is a change in her answer to this question, compared to “Some countries agree with Turkey and some disagree. But Turkey will get whatever it needs says Bush administration”. Turkey wants to defend itself”. Not only is the affect decreased in her second answer, but also the acknowledgement of the writer’s perspective is visible in her choice of themes. However, it is not clear which structures she is looking at in her answer.

Cristina’s remark changes only in terms of the use of SFG. She recognises the writer’s perspective in her first answer but provides detailed explanation to her answer in her second response, “the writer seems to be agreeing with the USA and shows other countries as negative and even says that no matter what they say, this war will be and Turkey will be involved. They are expressed in definite sentences”.

Similarly, Merve recognises the writer’s perspective to the disagreement in her first answer but provides support through SFG in her second answer:

She draws attention to the use of lexical items in the text:

\[
\text{Protect} \quad + \quad \text{... clear, but...} \quad -
\]

Use of SFG is visible also in the response given by Ezgi, although she does not give an answer to this question in the first repeated activity.

In sum, the changes in the responses to this question are based on SFG analysis and greater recognition of the writer’s perspective.

Students’ answers to the question “Why was it written?” in the first reading activity can be summarised under two main headings in both groups: to provide
information and to provide news (see Appendix 5, Tables 5.1.3.i and j). Fulya’s answer is probably the only one that is not covered by these categories fully, “It is written to tell the truth and BBC’s ideas about this problem in NATO”. Hence, instead of approaching the text as ready information to be learned, she seems to recognise the subjective nature of the text. However, her answer is not clear and is contradictory as it says “to tell the truth”. With such an argument she is both acknowledging and denying the subjectivity of the text.

Again, there is a considerable decrease in affect in Koray’s answer. “To let us see who is standing by Turkey and who is not” is replaced by, “To show countries’ positions in relation to war”. Hence, there is also acknowledgement of the participants’ perspectives and an increase in detail in his second answer.

Betül’s answer also marks acknowledgement of perspective, but this time it is the writer’s perspective rather than the participants’: “The writer cannot change the official’s minds by writing this text, s/he wants to express his/her own opinions”.

Recognition of the perspectives of those involved is also visible in Onur’s answer, “To express NATO’s attitudes about war”, along with increase in detail, similar to Özlem’s answer, “To comment about this situation”.

Merve is the only student supporting her answer with SFG analysis. Drawing on her answer to the previous question, she writes, “To make people know about these “serious consequences”, Appendix 5 Table 5.1.3.g.

Ayşegül, Şeyda, Ayşe, and Ezgi answer in a similar way: “to show countries’ attitudes/opinions/ideas about the crisis”; and Umut says, “to show people countries’ policies”; about other countries’ oppositions and agreements about Washington’s Iraq policy”, both of which show recognition of the perspectives of those involved, as well as increased detail. The answers to this activity reveal two main points: students approach the text with increased recognition of perspectives and with greater detail compared to the first set of answers, where they suggest that this text is written to provide information.

The changes in the answers to the final question “What other ways of writing about the same topic are there?” are based on two main SFG analyses already used in the previous questions, and recognition of other perspectives (Appendix 5, Tables 5.1.3.k and l).
Betül responds that it could be written “from the eyes of NATO” making reference to the issue of perspective. Similarly, Fulya answers, “Like a French or a Dutch”; and Güray writes, “By someone, from those countries mentioned in the text”.

The answers based on SFG analysis are: “More certain”; “Less certain”; and “With Turkey in the agent position”. In their responses in the first activity both groups are more concerned with the style of the text, for example, “an interview can be done”, “direct speech can be used”, whereas, in the second activity answers like “from the eyes of NATO”; “Turkey can be more active and it can be more certain”; “Like a French or a Dutch”; “By someone from those countries mentioned in the text” are visible as well as answers concerning the style of the text and answers such as “more certain”; “more objective/impartial”; “less certain”. Betül further adds that if the text was written from the eyes of NATO, NATO would be represented “in a more positive way”.

5.3 Conclusion

Students' self-reports suggest that they approach written texts more critically (Section 5.1.2). Students claim that they question the texts more, read the texts more consciously, more objectively, etc. Within this general category of approach, they provide insight into the methods they use to approach the texts more critically, i.e. recognition of: a) perspectives in the text, b) the role of social context in the production of the text, and c) the role of the writer’s linguistic choices.

When we look at the answers to the repeated reading activity, we can trace these categories in the changes of the students’ responses to the questions from the first activity to the second one (Section 5.1.3). The changes in students’ responses to this activity show that the students:

a) Show an increased awareness of the role of social context and perspectives in the text, that is, writer’s perspective and the possible perspectives of the participants. Recognition of social context and perspectives, I shall argue further in Chapter 7, shows recognition of reading as a social process. Recognition of perspectives in the text leads to a complementary impact, i.e. reduced affect/ethnocentrism in the
repeated reading activity. I discuss the relationship between recognition of perspectives and reduced affect further in Chapter 7.

b) Increased awareness of the effect of the writer’s linguistic choices, resulting from SFG analysis.

In this respect, the categories in students’ self-reports are visible in their responses to the repeated reading activity. These categories resonate with the two phases of the course, reading as a social process and SFG analysis of the texts. As these two phases were complementary with each other, so are these categories in students’ answers.

I discuss these categories further in relation to the course and argue further that the course had an impact on the students’ adopting a more critical approach in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 6
DATA ANALYSIS: STUDENT MOTIVATION AND RESISTANCE

As reviewed in Chapter 1, CLA courses aim at focusing on the students' own realities. This aim has been revealed to have a diverse impact in the previous studies in CLA. In some contexts, this results in frustration on the students, yet in some others, it results in an increase in the motivation of the students, Section 1.3.1. Based on these studies, I inquired about the impact of the critical reading course on students' motivation with particular regard to reading lessons.

Before moving on to the findings on the impact of the course on students' motivation, I would like to discuss students' overall motivation to study English, as background for the motivation of the students for reading lessons.

6.1 Students’ Motivation to Study English

In order to find out the students' motivational background, in Questionnaire I asked their reasons for learning English and why they chose to study in an English focused branch (See Appendix 6, Charts 6.1.a, b and c).

To find out about the students’ reasons to study English academically, I asked an open-ended question, “Please explain why you chose to study in an English focused branch”.

As can be seen from the answers in Appendix 6 (charts 6.1.a, b and c), the students are highly motivated to study English, as was anticipated before the course, and they express an interest in the language as well as clear and strong goals and high levels of self-efficacy.

The most common answer in both groups for the question “Why did you choose to study in a foreign language branch?” is the interest the students have for English/ for a foreign language. Eighteen students state that they like English or studying English and seven students state that they are interested in learning a foreign language, Appendices 6.1.a and 6.1.b. Although these two sets of answers are different from each other as the latter signals an interest in learning a language other
than one’s own, rather than an interest in English language specifically, they can be
treated together for the purposes of this study as they both signal an interest in the
foreign language itself, since my aim in asking this question is to find out, a) the level
of students’ motivation for studying English, and b) the sources of this motivation.
Hence, in total, twenty four students state that they like / are interested in studying the
language, one of whom writes she is interested in studying both foreign languages and
English in her answer, hence, her answer is in both categories.

The second most common pattern in both group’s answers is that English
provides job opportunities. Fifteen students’ answers point out the role of the job
opportunities English is likely to provide in the future in their decision to study
English in high school, which is a typical extrinsic reward.

However, prospective jobs for English language speakers are not the only
reason in these students’ answers except for one student. Güray’s answer to this
question is “To find a good job in the future”, whereas all the other students’ answers
follow a pattern where job opportunities are mentioned not as the only reason but
together with an interest for the language. It is possible to see some other reasons in
these answers as well such as self-worth or pride, which I shall be discussing below,
but what is common in all these answers is that they state at least an interest in
English besides English related occupation prospects.

For example, Feyza writes, “I like studying a foreign language. My aim is to
be a good English teacher and I know English teachers will not be unemployed”. 
Similarly, Merve says, “As I started noticing bad translations, I became more
interested in this subject. Besides, foreign language students can easily find jobs even
while they are still attending the university”. Seyda says, “I like English and I believe
that I am successful in this subject. Another reason is that I think (speaking) a foreign
language creates job opportunities in any country at any time. ....”. As well, Koray
says, “I like learning a foreign language. ....and my ambition is to be a translator”; and
Volkan, “I like English and I would like to be an English teacher”.

As can be seen from the examples above, within this pattern it is possible to
find two different groups of answers. The first group of answers, like that of Feyza’s
or Merve’s, indicate that they consider these occupational possibilities due to the
reasons related to the occupations themselves, e.g. certainty of finding a job. On the
other hand, the other group of answers, like that of Koray’s and Volkan’s, do not
provide further clues on whether occupation is important for them due to the reasons
related to the occupations themselves or to the fact that they simply enjoy English, and hence, they would like to be in a profession that involves what they enjoy doing.

Another important point is the sequence of the reasons stated. Eleven students out of fourteen who gave this answer state that they like / are interested in (studying) English before moving on to the profession aspect. For example, Ayşegül writes, “Foreign language has been my favorite subject in which I have been successful since I started learning it. In terms of jobs, the first ones that come to my mind are the foreign language ones”. On the other hand, Gamze writes, “(I chose to study in this branch) because there is hardly anyone unemployed with a foreign language, because I like English, because it offers a wide range of job opportunities”.

It is possible to argue that this sequence is signaling the most obvious reason for the students, i.e. the first reason they choose to state. This serves also almost as a given, where they assume that the reader will be sharing this reason(ing). Later on they move to other reasons.

However, this does not have utmost importance for the purposes of this study, nor does the question whether or not studying English is the result or cause of the role of occupational prospects. In fact, what matters most for this study is that this distinction is blurred at this stage of their language education. In fact, the way these reasons are presented clearly shows that the students treat these reasons as equally important separate reasons rather than in a causal relationship. These two reasons are presented through use of ‘and’s or in some cases in different clauses, without an indication of a causal relationship.

Likewise, the most frequent three answers for studying English in the first place (Chart 6.1.c) are:

- I want to be able to communicate with people from other countries (twenty six students);
- I enjoy learning a foreign language (twenty five students); and
- I want to be able to find a good job in the future (twenty two students).

These responses were selected from a list developed from the motivation literature and students were asked to tick the appropriate boxes for learning English:
I am learning English because...
- I want to find a good job in the future;
- I want to attend the university;
- I like learning a foreign language;
- I want to study abroad;
- I am interested in British and/or American culture;
- I am interested in English literature;
- I want to travel abroad;
- I want to pursue my career in the future;
- I want to be able to communicate with people from other countries;
- I am interested in the English speaking countries’ culture and people;
- I want to live abroad;
- I want to use internet more efficiently;
- I want to follow the technological developments;
- Other

Interestingly, the responses for communication in this question are much higher than the responses for communication in the previous question. This is due to the students’ priorities in learning / studying the language. Not all the students who ticked the box for communication chose to write that reason for studying English for academic purposes. However, as stated above, the common pattern for both questions in both groups is the feeling of pleasure taken from studying English and the role of job prospects.

In Charts 6.1.a and 6.1.b to be able to communicate with people from other countries is the third most common answer in Class A. Four students from Class A, and one student from Class B, state that through learning English, they can communicate with people from other countries to the question “Why did you choose to study in an English focused branch”. Onur remarks, “Our language is not enough as the world gets smaller; I am learning a foreign language to communicate with people from other countries”. Thus, communication serves as an immediate real life purpose, not related to academic achievements or a far extrinsic reward like finding a good job or pursuing a future career. Two other students from Class A emphasise the role of being able to speak with / understand people from other countries and one student
from Class A and one student from Class B mention that they are interested not only in immediate communication but in other cultures, countries and people. Koray says, "... I chose this branch to communicate with people from other countries and because I want to learn about foreign people and foreign countries"; similarly, Ahu says, "... Besides, I am planning to visit and live in other countries, especially USA".

These answers on communication point out the role of English as an international language for these students since the correspondence between the answers “communication” and “interest in British/American culture” is very low.

As anticipated, high self-efficacy is another common reason for studying English for these students (Charts 6.1.a and 6.1.b). This aspect, i.e. the students’ self-beliefs as language learners/users, can be traced in answers reflecting students’ beliefs that they are academically successful in studying English, comparisons they make with other subjects and the degree of challenge they are exposed to.

Eight students say that they (believe they) are successful/talented in English. This shows that these students have high self-efficacy, i.e. their performance outcomes are perceived as internal and stable as a result of high ability. As Ushioda suggests, ability, being stable, promises maintaining success, hence is more likely to result in persistence in effort (1996: 15). And, in the case of this study, these students’ high self-efficacy had already resulted in persistence of effort, as they had chosen to study in this branch. This is also visible in Chart 6.1.c. The university exam (YDS) is very competitive in the context of this research and the students’ answers related to university show that they believe that they will have the advantage if they take the university exam for English, pointing out their high self-efficacy in English in a very competitive context.

As reviewed in Section 1.3.2.1.3, attribution theory focuses on one’s perceptions as a result of past experiences, whereas Rotter, Skinner, and others emphasise the role of perception in one’s future actions (Stipek 2002: 63). However, these students’ answers point to another direction, which Ushioda suggests as well, i.e. one’s perceptions on their performance outcomes usually are "recursive" (1996: 9). These students have been successful, they have been seen as successful and had a good education that resulted in their being successful, which in return results in shaping their “expectations related to future events” (Stipek 2002: 63), leaving motivation to be both the “cause” and “product of learning process” (Ushioda, 1996: 9). For example, Soner says, “I always had an interest and talent for foreign languages
since I was a child. And I chose this branch because I can be successful in it and it is enjoyable for me”. Similarly, Özlem says, “I always wanted to choose an occupation related to English because both I knew and people who know me have been telling me that I have the talent and interest for this. I am in a language branch at the moment; I don’t regret it and I don’t think I will.”

If we take self-efficacy to be linear, the answers above are at the positive end, as they indicate not only high self-efficacy but also an awareness of this by the students. The next point on our linear self-efficacy model would be the answers “I find English easier”, one student from each group. This answer still indicates high performance outcomes but compared to other subjects. Hence it is possible to find an element of avoiding failure, as Achievement Theory suggests (Section 1.3.2.1.3). However, their being successful in English is still perceived as internal, stable and controllable.

The answers “It is the only branch I can do” and “It is suitable for me” can be taken to be in the middle of our self-efficacy model. These answers signal that the students see their performance outcomes as internal and stable and probably controllable, and English definitely within their abilities. However, it is not clear whether or not they believe so in comparison to other subjects. The answer “it is the only branch I can do” might mean compatibility of one’s values/ beliefs with the subject they are studying as well as avoiding failure. Similarly “suitable” can mean the same thing.

Towards the negative end of our linear model of self-efficacy, we can find answers like “My grades in the subjects in this branch are high” and “I had a good education in English in my previous school”. Different from the answers above, these two answers indicate performance outcomes’ being external rather than internal. One student attributes her success to the good education she had received. The other student treats her marks as a separate entity using an attributive process. The attribute, high, is credited to her marks, making herself, or her effort invisible.

At the negative end of the linear model, there are four answers from Class B that state that the students are not good at science or maths or that they do not like these subjects. This still indicates that they are good at English comparably but the element of avoiding failure is higher in these answers. Compared to those who are more confident of their success and ability in this area, these students have lower
perception of their abilities. Similarly, one student from Class A writes, “My grades in the subjects in this branch are high.”

It is also possible to interpret these answers in terms of the students’ need to maintain their “sense of self-worth” (Section 1.3.2.1.3). In other words, rather than choosing a branch that they believe they are successful in, they have chosen to avoid a branch in which they will not be successful.

Another aspect in students’ motivation is the pride the students take in studying English. Merve says, “As I started noticing bad translations, I became more interested in this subject”. Her answer indicates the pride she takes in being able to point out the mistakes of ‘expert’, translators. Similarly, Ceren says, “I believe it is an unusual branch that requires courage”. It is pointed out by Ushioda that intrinsic motivation is “of course founded in people’s need to be competent, effective and self-determining” (1996: 49). Hence, Merve’s and Ceren’s answers denote the intrinsic satisfaction they get by speaking English, or being more accurate in English than the so-called experts. This point also shows their self-impression as language users.

The answer “It is important to learn English” can be signalling the role of English as an international language as well as the role of prospective jobs English can offer.

And finally the answers “… the programmes offered by the universities for foreign languages are more enjoyable”, one student, and “I find English enjoyable”, two students from each group, signal intrinsic motivation as intrinsic motivation is related to feelings of pleasure and enjoyment. Hence, students’ answers “I like / am interested in English” are also related to their being intrinsically motivated.

To conclude, it is possible to argue that the students’ motivation level, and their goals, and approach to English reflects the educational setting of their context and their own beliefs about this setting, and themselves as individuals and as learners. As argued above, the students are highly intrinsically motivated as they manifest feelings of interest and enjoyment in studying English. Besides, they have high self-efficacy, showing an appreciation of persistence in learning and paying effort.

However, at the same time, a strong extrinsic reward is visible in their answers, i.e. finding a job and securing their lives in the future through attending a university. The intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their motivation cannot be separated as they have been moulded together in the students’ value and belief systems. Yet, this coexistence does not secure the existence of intrinsic motivation for each task the
students are involved in the school setting, as I discuss below. The extrinsic reward’s being a very strong reinforcer plays a role in persistence in these tasks but does not mean that the students are intrinsically motivated for these tasks as well.

Below, I shall discuss students’ answers related to their lack of motivation to the tasks in their educational settings and the factors causing alienation on the part of the students, who, as we have seen, are in fact highly intrinsically motivated to study English.

6.2 Students’ Motivation for Reading Courses: “At the End of the Day It’s a Lesson”

The students who participated in this study were highly motivated students who chose to study in a foreign language branch in high school, as discussed above. However, their approaches to reading lessons in particular were not in correspondence with their high motivation to study English.

The first interview conducted with Class B, which was in the form of a group interview at the beginning of the term, reflects students’ approaches towards their reading lessons. This group, except for Soner, expressed a negative approach towards their reading lessons:

T: What do you think of the reading lessons you have? Do you find them beneficial? Enjoyable?
...
T: OK, do you enjoy reading lessons?
Ss: No.
Ezgi: They are very boring ma’am (shouting)
Ss: Hush! (Teachers’ room is next to the classroom)
T: Why not?
Ss: It is monotonous ma’am...
   Four hours every week...
   Same things all the time...
T: In what way is it monotonous?
Ss: It is monotonous.
   We do the same things all the time...
Cristina: I don't think we have real (proper) reading lessons actually. It is always the teacher talking. She asks the questions and then answers them. We don't do anything!

Gamze: At the end of the day it's a lesson
T: What do you mean?
Gamze: Ma'am, I mean, we don't need to like it but we still must do it. That's why we are here.
T: Because it is a school subject?
Gamze: Yes.
Ayşegül: And for YDS.
T: YDS is important?
Ss: Of course!

Yes!

Gamze: You can't get married without a university degree! (A saying in Turkish. Laughter)
Soner: I like reading lessons because I like reading anyway. I enjoy it.
Ezgi: I guess it is better when we all get to read a paragraph (of the text). But when the teacher reads it and we follow, it is boring.
T: Can you describe your reading lessons? Do you have a book you follow, or texts from other sources?
Ss: At school or language course?
T: At school.
Umut: Both.
Soner: (We read) texts from our course book, Mission.
T: OK.
Soner: Or we answer paragraph questions (multiple-choice questions)
T: OK. When you read a text from your textbook, how do you read it? What kinds of activities do you do?
Soner: Sometimes our teacher reads it sometimes we read it... We read paragraphs in turns.
T: OK, what do you do after reading the text?
Ss: Find the vocabulary...
Answer questions about the text...
Translate the sentences...
T: OK. Anything else?

Mirac: Sometimes we answer paragraph questions (multiple-choice questions)
T: For YDS?
Ss: Yes.

Ceren: Probably the teacher is bored of teaching the same things for years too...
Can: Last year we read a book.

... 

T: A novel?
Can: Yes.

Gamze: I still don’t know what it (the book) was about. The teacher read and we followed it. I slept in half of the lessons, I swear.
T: OK. What would you like the reading lessons to be like?
Cristina: Ma’am, first of all we should be able to talk. I mean, to contribute... Nobody asks our opinion. There are questions, OK, but we don’t contribute. The teacher does not care about our ideas. For example we were never asked before if we enjoy these lessons. I want to be able to talk!
T: OK so you want to be more active?
Cristina: Yes.
Ezgi: It gets boring otherwise.

T: OK. Any other suggestions?
Ss: ...

T: In terms of texts? Activities? What you would like to study...
Mirac: Texts could be more fun.
T: What kinds of texts would you like to read?
Ss: Humorous texts...

Adventure...

Horror or adventure...

Famous people’s lives (biographies)...

...

The main criticism this group, except for Soner, had of the reading lessons was that they found the reading lessons to be monotonous. The monotony was a result of repetitive reading activities they had in the classroom. When asked why they found the lessons monotonous their response was “same things all the time”.
Although they express that they do not enjoy reading lessons, they do not provide further information on why. This is partly due to their acceptance of these practices as the norm. Gamze says, “At the end of the day it is a lesson. … I mean, we don’t need to like it but we still must do it. That’s why we are here”. Similarly, Koray, from Class A, said, “Other reading lessons were very boring and monotonous and they were like lectures. We had them because they were lessons we had to take”, when asked to compare traditional reading courses with the critical reading course.

However, a closer look at the classroom practices provides clues regarding these perceptions of expressed monotony

6.2.1 Optimal Arousal / Challenge

Based on the assumption that human beings have an inborn tendency to develop competencies in their interaction with their environment, intrinsic motivation requires “optimal challenge” / “optimal arousal”. Perhaps the most obvious reason for the perceived monotony is the lack of novelty in their traditional reading courses. As reviewed in Chapter 1, intrinsic motivation scholars claim that human beings need a degree of surprise, strangeness in a task to be able to derive pleasure from it (Stipek 2002, Williams and Burden 1997). As remarked above, the English proficiency level of these students is intermediate to upper intermediate and the level of optimal challenge provided by the language itself through reading tasks fails to meet the required degree of challenge. Koray, from Class A says, “In the (traditional) reading lessons there is a text and it has three answers… there are vocabulary (items)…”

Similar to the criticism in Class B, Semih from Class A says in the end-of-term interview, “For example, … we always (had) multiple choice, and err… according to the textbook… for example finding the vocabulary… reading lessons were always… usual things… weather forecast… and like, introducing someone, someone from the past.”

In fact, Gamze explicitly states this aspect in her second interview, which was given at the end of the year, “Yes, I believe it (the course) has contributed because, well, it is different, your lessons were not monotonous at least. They were more enjoyable, and we did different things, for example, we did projects. The last project we did was in the prep class. When you do different things, the students find it more interesting”.
6.2.2 Optimal Arousal and Developing Competency

It is possible to see a lack of optimal arousal provided by the tasks students are exposed to in normal reading lessons. The reading practices, and reading activities in particular, as reported by the students, do not create an environment for the students to relate to. The traditional reading practices were referred to as “dull comprehension questions”, by Koray, “multiple-choice nuisance”, by Merve, and reading practices being superficial by Gamze, Umut, Özlem, Onur, Gaye, and Mirac. For example Özlem responds to the question “What do you think the aim of the reading lessons should be?” as, “…I mean… not just to answer the monotonous three questions below the text but how to approach the text…”

As Ushioda (1996) remarks, school education bears the danger of alienating students if it fails to provide a bridge between school practices and students’ interests, and immediate lives. Especially language learning, she suggests, bears this risk, as it is likely to break a skill into its components. She argues that this brings a need to use activities that can make it possible for the language learners to relate language learning to “areas of life that are personally meaningful”. In this respect it is important to help the learners see that language is not just

... an abstract object of study or a system of rules, but a further means of expanding their own behavioural repertoire in terms of how they interact with the world, indulge their own passions and interests, access new sources of information and materials, appropriate new ideas and experiences, develop worthwhile skills and knowledge bases, etc.

(Ushioda 1996: 43-44)

For example Merve says, “In fact I cannot say that I find reading lessons very enjoyable. Because, well, it was like, (first) find the vocabulary items from the dictionary... And we were focusing only on grammar. It was mostly based on grammar, not reading”.

Students’ need to relate to the classroom practices is explicitly voiced by Cristina, “First of all we should be able to talk. I mean to contribute. Nobody asks our opinion. There are questions OK but we don’t contribute. The teacher does not care about our ideas”.

Her response shows the students’ position as distanced from educational practices in relation to reading. “I don’t think we have real (proper) reading lessons
actually. It is always the teacher talking. She asks the questions and then answers them. We don’t do anything!” She also points out that she finds the tasks meaningless, as she cannot relate to them as a student or as an individual.

Umut voices the same alienation from reading practices at school in the end-of-term interview, “Before, they would make us buy a book, the teacher would read and we would listen to it, and s/he would say “answer the questions below” and s/he would write answers as well. S/he would say, “do these (for the next lesson)”. And it was very boring, to read a book all the time, to answer the questions”.

6.2 .3 External Control and Communication in the Learning Process

The issue of control has an important role in these criticisms as well. It is the teacher deciding not only on the texts and questions to be asked, but also the answers to be given. And, most importantly, on the classroom routines: “For example we were never asked before if we enjoy these lessons. I want to be able to talk!” says Cristina.

As Deci and Ryan (1985) argue, the role of control in motivation is high. A higher level of external control over the learning process results in lower intrinsic motivation (Stipek 2002, Ushioda 1996). Umut’s, Cristina’s, Merve’s, and Koray’s answers reflect this as well.

The issue of control is also visible in answers related to the educational system’s demand for memorisation. Ayşegül states, as a reason for finding critical reading course more enjoyable than traditional reading courses, “I have the stress of (having to prepare for) YDS. It requires memorising knowledge. This one (critical reading course) is not like that. One feels more relaxed”. Similarly, Cristina refers to “memorising knowledge”. When asked about whether she would prefer a YDS oriented reading course or a critical reading course, she answers, “No (I would not prefer an YDS oriented reading course). Anything YDS oriented is memorisation, I do not like memorisation”.

Another important aspect probably, as voiced by Cristina and Koray, is the absence of an opportunity for the students to practice their communication skills. Koray says, “The lessons (critical reading) were always fun. I like speaking. I like speaking in English even more. Just to be able to practice speaking, I work during summer holidays. That is why we had the lessons just the way I would like to”; “...I saw this course not as a lecture but as an activity. That’s why it was different, the
questions were different… In the other reading lessons there is a text and it has three answers, there are vocabulary but this was different. This was a mixture of both reading and speaking”.

Cristina repeatedly mentioned this aspect in the interviews and questionnaires. In the end-of-term interview she said, “Well, in the previous reading lessons the thing I was most annoyed with was that we couldn’t talk. The teacher was giving something, the teacher was giving the same answers anyway, and you couldn’t say anything. … [I liked] most of all speaking [in the critical reading course]”. Mirac gives a similar answer to the question why she found the critical reading course enjoyable, after having stated that she found it enjoyable in Questionnaire 3, in the end-of-term interview, “… And to discuss, for example we cannot speak English very often as we often study for YDS, but when we discussed reading questions [in critical reading course], we discussed all the time and it is very enjoyable.”

What is important and interesting is that the students involved in this study were highly motivated to learn English and to further their studies academically. However, this high motivation was not apparent in relation to their reading lessons. In fact, on the contrary, they were highly alienated from them. The students involved in this study, except for Soner, stated dissatisfaction with their traditional reading lessons. In sum, reasons for this dissatisfaction stated by them in their answers to the questionnaires and interviews are:

- Lack of novelty and optimal arousal raised by the classroom practices;
- Lack of a relationship between classroom practices and students’ immediate lives;
- High degree of external control on learning practice; and
- Lack of opportunity to practice oral communication skills.

Such alienation on part of the students and its reasons were anticipated, and since the Critical Reading Course, by its very nature, provides changes in the areas above, i.e. control, communication, novelty, optimal arousal and the link between classroom practices and students’ immediate lives, one of the research questions of this study is ‘What is the impact of the critical reading course on student motivation?’ In the following section I will begin looking at whether the course has changed students’ motivation towards reading.
6.3 Exploring Students’ Motivation for Critical Reading Course

6.3.1 Comparison of Traditional Reading Courses with the Critical Reading Course

Chart 6.3.1.a (in Appendix 6) shows a frequency chart with 21 students indicating positive change from their traditional reading courses to the critical reading course. Explanations of these responses are given in Table 6.3.1.a further below:

As can be seen in Table 6.3.1.a, students’ reasons for finding the course different in a positive way from their previous courses, can be grouped under four categories: 1) Enjoyment, 2) Developing Competence, 3) Participation and Persistence, and 4) Materials Used in the Course. These categories are adapted from the literature review in Section 1.3.1.1. It should be noted that these categories are overlapping at times and the answers usually include more than one reason, hence a single student’s answer may fall into more than one category.

Six students state that they find the course more enjoyable compared to their previous reading courses. Four of these students give reasons for their answers: One student states activities and materials, one student states activities, and two students state participation from the students as their reasons for finding the course more enjoyable.
Table 6.3.1.a

Is there any difference between our lessons and your previous reading lessons? If there is, please state if you find the change to be positive or negative and explain the nature of the change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS A</th>
<th>CLASS B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES Positive: 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES Positive: 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It is enjoyable: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>This is more enjoyable: 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We focus on the way the subject is presented, it is different: 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Our aim is to understand and to interpret the text: 2&lt;br&gt;It doesn't limit us by giving multiple choice questions: 1&lt;br&gt;We look deeper in the text: 2&lt;br&gt;We read according to the relationship between the reader and the writer: 1&lt;br&gt;More systematic: 1&lt;br&gt;We look at different structures: 1**</td>
<td><strong>This is more detailed: 2&lt;br&gt;This is more educational: 1&lt;br&gt;We discuss the texts instead of just reading them: 1&lt;br&gt;We criticise texts and look from different perspectives: 1&lt;br&gt;We learn SFG and it is beneficial: 1&lt;br&gt;This is more beneficial: 2&lt;br&gt;We question / comment on the text: 1&lt;br&gt;We look at the (grammatical) structures: 1&lt;br&gt;Beneficial: 1&lt;br&gt;I analyse more: 1&lt;br&gt;I comment on the text instead of taking it as it is: 1&lt;br&gt;I want to study English Literature at the university</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher participation: 1&lt;br&gt;We discuss the text: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I think more on reading: 1&lt;br&gt;We are more active / we participate more: 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We read up-to-date texts: 2&lt;br&gt;We read the way we normally read newspapers and magazines. No dull comprehension question at the end: 1&lt;br&gt;It is more interesting: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>We have up-to-date texts: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **YES Negative: 2**<br>We used to prepare for YDS before but we read up-to-date texts with you. I think YDS is more important for us: 1<br>Up-to-date texts that should be thought about but I started to get bored after the grammar, I prefer our lesson on magazines: 1 | ****
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES there is a change but it is still boring: 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't know: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn't really have reading lessons before: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: 1</td>
<td>There is no difference: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer: 2</td>
<td>No Answer: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, Koray writes, "... There are no dull comprehension questions. It's enjoyable. We are reading (the texts) the way we read newspapers or magazines, we know that there are no dull comprehension questions below the newspaper articles", making reference to the materials, activities, and feeling of enjoyment. Likewise, Gamze writes, "In the previous reading lessons, they would ask us to buy a book and the teacher would read it and we would follow until the end of the term. Now it's different. We all participate, discuss the texts... It used to be monotonous, now it is more enjoyable", referring to participation.

The students' answers related to developing competence can be divided into two further categories: 1) those related to the students' approach to the text, and 2) those related to the students' perceptions of the course.

The first sub-category includes answers referring to the presentation of the subject, understanding / discussing / analysing / commenting on the text, looking deeper in the text, the relationship the text builds with the reader, and different perspectives to the text. In other words these students express that they find the course to be different in a positive sense due to the new skill they are developing, i.e. the new approach they are claiming to adopt towards text. Fulya writes, "There is a positive change. Instead of taking the text as it is, I comment on it". Similarly Mirac says, "Now we don’t read it superficially, but we question, comment on the text. We even look at the personal pronouns. Before we used to read and answer the comprehension questions. But this is beneficial". Yağmur says, "In this lesson we concentrate on the way the subject is presented and its methods. In other reading lessons we translate
vocabulary and sentences". Onur, "We used to read the texts and interpret superficially. Now we are looking deeper". Gaye, "Now, in these lessons, understanding and interpreting is important. We discuss the text but before, we just used to read and move on, just the pronunciation was important". It is possible to see from these answers not only that these students find the course helps them to develop skills but also that they value these skills compared to the skills they used for their traditional reading lessons.

Of course the role of novelty of this approach for the students should not be disregarded. The role of novelty is most visible in these two answers: "We focus on the way the subject is presented, it is different"; and "We look at different structures". As reviewed above, novelty (Stipek 2002) and the degree of challenge, "optimal arousal" (Williams and Burden 1997) offered by the task is important in building and maintaining motivation. Hence, it can be argued that the course provided an "optimal arousal" for these students as it provided a novel approach to the text.

The second sub-category includes answers such as "This (the course) is more detailed", "more educational", and "beneficial". These answers indicate that these students find the course a) more detailed, hence, requiring higher skills; b) more educational, beneficial, hence, helping them to gain skills, signaling that the students value the course as a means to develop competence.

And finally one student answers, "I want to study English Literature at the University. Therefore, it is positive", signaling that she sees the skills she develops in the course as skills she will be using in her higher education. Mirac gives a similar answer to the question if she would prefer to have a YDS oriented or critical reading course, "...we will study these in the university... It will be a foundation for that". It can be argued that this student also sees the skills promoted by the course to be helpful for developing competence, for her higher education in this case.

The third group of answers are related to increased participation in the class as well as one answer claiming increased persistence in reading. As reviewed earlier, intrinsic motivation results in increased participation and persistence in tasks (Ushioda 1996). As well as being a result, participation, or "communicative success" is among the causes of intrinsic motivation (Ushioda 1996:20, Stipek 2002).

In educational practices where the control is mostly in the hands of the teacher even in terms of communication flow in the classroom, the students may feel more alienated from the educational setting, as is the case in the context of this study. As
mentioned above, one of the criticisms the students had about their previous reading courses was that they were passive recipients of the classroom practices. They were required to follow a book, translate a text, answer comprehension questions, answers of which were to be given by the teacher at the end, find the right answer, or be "limited by the multiple-choice" questions.

The activities that followed reading the text in this course, i.e. group or class discussions on the texts, provided the opportunity to contribute with their arguments rather than giving the "right answers" as Merve puts it.

Although the control was still mostly held by the teacher/researcher, as I was the one who had decided before the course started the aims of the course, the materials to be used (to a large extent), the questions to be discussed, the framework to analyse the texts etc.; I would like to claim that the students had more control over the lesson compared to their traditional reading lessons, as my role was limited to introducing the texts and critical reading frameworks and to facilitating the group and class discussions. The students had freedom for their answers related to the reading activities, provided that they backed their arguments with the analysis for post-reading activities. Hence these students, who were critical about not being able to contribute to classroom practices, stated that increased participation was a positive change.

The last group of answers are related to the materials used in the classroom, i.e. the texts. Two students from Class A and one student from Class B state that they find reading up-to-date texts to be a positive change.

These answers are important in two aspects. The first one is that, as Ushioda argues, the use of authentic materials in the classroom, perhaps especially for students with a high level of English proficiency as in the context of this study, instead of materials specifically manufactured for language education, will help the learners to connect/relate to the classroom practices more (Ushioda 1996). For example, Koray answers, as already cited above, "... There are no dull comprehension questions. ... It's enjoyable. We are reading (the texts) the way we read newspapers or magazines, we know that there are no dull comprehension questions below the newspaper articles".

The second aspect is that, the materials' being authentic, the students' self-efficacy will increase, a point related to "communicative success" in the classroom (Ushioda 1996). In fact, increase in self-efficacy is expressed by Ayşegül and Şeyda. Şeyda says, "I approach reading texts with more confidence, I am less intimidated";
and Ayşegül says, "... I was stressed out because of YDS. This course has increased my self-esteem. I realised that I can understand what I read".

Fulya, concentrating on the approach of asking questions about the text, says, "(There is a positive change in my approach to reading lessons). I realised that all texts can be read. Asking questions to a text makes it easier to read it". Koray stresses the role of analysing / asking questions to a text in approaching the text with more confidence, "Before, when I looked at a text, if it was too long, I wouldn’t feel like reading it, or I would get bored when I did read. But now because I know how to approach it, I enjoy (reading) it more. I try to get what it says. I try to apply the analysis we did. I try them on the text and it becomes easier to read like that”.

The response “But occasionally its being too systematic can be weary” signals a point related to grammar which I discuss in Section 6.5.

Two students from Class A stated that there was a difference between this course and their previous courses but also stated that the difference was negative. Semih gave the reason that this course was not YDS oriented and Betül compared the lessons within the course with an earlier lesson. The former answer has high significance as this student explicitly stated that he would prefer a course for YDS.

Having received this response, right after Questionnaire 2, I asked the students in both groups whether or not they would prefer a course on YDS too. The majority of the students from each class, except for Merve, and Koray from Class A, and Cristina, Mirac, and Soner from Class B, expressed that they would prefer an YDS oriented course. They said that although they found this course more enjoyable and beneficial, they were concerned that they had to use all the opportunities to prepare for the exam: "... everyone is preparing for the YDS at the moment, I mean, no one cares for the current issues, events. None of the final year students are reading newspapers at the moment. They are practicing for the exam all the time... or instead of reading an English newspaper, they prefer to answer multiple-choice questions (in daily life, outside school)”, was Semih’s response in the end-of-course interview.

I discuss this issue in the section on resistance below but let me note here that there was a change in some students’ approaches in this area by the end of the course.

One student stated that there is a change, that the texts are more interesting but that she still found reading courses to be boring.

To sum up, twenty four students stated that there was a positive change between their traditional reading courses and critical reading course, two students
stated that there was a change but that it was negative, one student said there was a change but reading classes were still boring, one student said that he did not know, and one student said that there was no difference between two courses, out of seventeen students.

The reasons for those responses that state a positive difference between two courses can be grouped into the following categories:

1) Enjoyment, 2) Developing Competence, 3) Participation and Persistence, and 4) Materials Used in the Course.

Below I will be looking at students’ comparison of their own approaches to traditional reading courses and critical reading course.

6.3.2 Students’ Assessment of Their Own Approach to Traditional Reading Courses and Critical Reading Course

As discussed above, students who reported a positive difference between their traditional reading courses and the critical reading course stated that the differences were based on feelings of pleasure, developing competence, increase in participation and/or persistence, and materials used in the critical reading course.

Both groups were asked in Questionnaires 2 and 3 whether or not there were any changes in their approach to reading lessons. As shown in Charts 6.3.2.a and b (in Appendix 6) and the tables below, seventeen students said that there is a positive change in their approach to reading lessons in Questionnaire 2, and eighteen students said their approach changed in a positive way in Questionnaire 3.

Students’ comparisons of the critical reading course with their traditional reading courses reveal that those students who report a more positive approach to critical reading course do so due to 1) Feeling of enjoyment; 2) The course’s providing competence in reading; and 3) Higher participation and persistence.

This is shown in Table 6.3.2.a, which lists reasons for change in students’ approaches. Table 6.3.2.a below shows the students’ responses from both groups in Questionnaire 2:
Table 6.3.2.a Changes in Students' Approaches to Reading Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Participation and Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES Positive: 8</td>
<td>YES Positive: 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it more enjoyable: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more interesting: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More enjoyable: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like this more: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My perspective to written texts has improved: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interpretation skills have improved: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My English has improved: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read in a more systematic and conscious way: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more confident: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I analyse texts from different perspectives: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is more educational: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t find it unnecessary now: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to understand and interpret the text: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think on the text now: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend more time on it now: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES Neutral: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I analyse the text as if I am analysing a literary text: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The texts are boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is boring if I don’t read the text (aloud): 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always liked reading lessons: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I liked it at the beginning but I get bored with grammar: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine students write that they find the critical reading course more enjoyable than traditional reading courses. Feyza, Mirac and Koray say that they used to find...
reading lessons boring and that they enjoy them in this course. Gamze says that she used to find reading lessons monotonous but that she finds them more enjoyable with this course. Likewise, Merve, from class A says, “Yes, before, even though I enjoyed it, I used to see it as a multiple-choice nuisance but now it is more enjoyable”. Ayşegül, Merve, from Class B, and Cristina are the other students who state that they enjoy reading lessons more.

As reviewed in Chapter 1, intrinsic motivation is referred to in relation to feelings of pleasure and increased participation (Ushioda 1996).

*Miserandino (1996) found that students who engaged in schoolwork for intrinsic reasons reported more involvement, persistence, participation, and curiosity along with less boredom in school activities than students who reported being extrinsically motivated.*

(Stipek 2002: 129)

Students’ responses, besides being in synchronization with their comparisons of their traditional reading class and critical reading class (Table 6.3.1.a), bear importance in this respect. As discussed in Section 6.1, the role of YDS, as a strong extrinsic reward, is high in these students’ motivation for studying English academically. Although they are highly motivated to learn English, their motivation for reading tasks at school was quite low, and was expressed in terms of ‘boredom’ and ‘monotony’ in both groups.

Hence, these responses signal increase in intrinsic motivation of these students as they report enjoyment and absence of boredom and monotony.

For example, Gamze says, “Yes, it was monotonous before. Now I can look at what I read from a different perspective”, referring to the role of developing competence in her new judgement. As stated above she also stated in her interview that the novelty of the activities was another reason for her judgement, “... We did different things, for example we did projects. When you do different things, the students find it more interesting”.

Cristina, on the other hand, reports increased communication, hence participation, and altered control arrangements in the classroom as her reason for her new judgement, “... most of all speaking I mean, writing, the projects we did... group work... I believe they united us all in the lessons”, “We are the ones who are active now”. Mirac’s answer shows that she values the course from a developing competence perspective, “I don’t find it unnecessary now”, and this results in
persistence and higher participation, "Now, I see that I can take a lot if I pay attention", "I try to participate in the discussions now". Similarly, Gaye reports that her increased interest in the reading tasks results in persistence, "I find it more interesting, instead of leaving a text that I don’t understand aside, I try to understand the vocabulary and try to understand and interpret the text".

Merve’s stance is similar to Mirac’s in terms of the role of competence since she reports that she finds it more enjoyable for being able to “approach from different perspectives”.

It is possible to see all the aspects of intrinsic motivation at interplay in student responses. And as argued above, they tend to be recursive, one being both the cause and result of another.

The second set of similar answers from both groups is in relation to developing competence in reading. Three students refer to developing competence in reading while one refers to her language skills in Class A. And in Class B, five students refer to developing competence in reading.

The responses include reading from different perspectives, interpretation skills, the course’s being more beneficial, and educational, and the students’ self-efficacy as language learners. What is interesting in these answers is developing competency as language learners emerges among these responses. Developing competency already existed in students’ responses in Section 6.2.2; however, they were based on developing competency in relation to reading. Therefore it is interesting that the critical reading course also was perceived by students as improving themselves as language learners more compared to the traditional reading courses.

Şeyda says, “I used to find it difficult but now when I see different texts, I feel more confident, and I like it more”. As already discussed in the section above, her answer indicates that the optimal challenge, and the degree of novelty provided by the authentic materials as well as the approach to the texts in the course, has resulted in not only in feelings of enjoyment but also confidence as a language learner. As argued above, the literature suggests that feeling of competence is a necessary, although not sufficient, condition to enjoy a task. Also studies suggest that a low degree of competences result in changes in self-efficacy, just as in Şeyda’s case high competence results in changes in self-efficacy in a positive way. It is also possible to
argue that there is correspondence between persistence and high self-efficacy in relation to reading tasks.

As reviewed in Chapter 1, intrinsic motivation presupposes that human beings are naturally inclined to improve themselves and suggests that individuals will have a tendency to improve their skills if it is meaningful for them in their relationship with their environment. Going back to students’ perception of traditional reading courses, it is possible to see that one of the criticisms was that the traditional reading activities provided neither novelty nor optimal arousal, hence, failed to provoke curiosity or an understanding that those skills that the activities offer will be meaningful for the students in their interactions with their environment. Based on the responses above, it is possible to argue that the critical reading course provided novelty and/or optimal arousal not only in terms of reading as an intellectual activity but also reading as part of the language learning process, i.e. the students reported both increased competence in reading and increased proficiency in English.

Another result of competence on a task, as well as feelings of enjoyment and changes in self-efficacy, is the degree of participation and persistence as discussed above, which is visible in some of the student responses.

Three students from Class A and one student from Class B answer that they are more involved in the activity of reading in this course. As competence and persistence / participation are complementary, as argued above, these answers denote both aspects. One student says that she reads in a more systematic and conscious way, and another writes she tries to understand and interpret the text.

The other two answers in this category indicate persistence in a more definite way, “I think on the text now” and “I spend more time on it now”.

By contrast one student’s answer reveals that she does think that the course is different but that she finds the difference quite neutral compared to other students’ answers. She writes “It is different as we used to study for YDS (the university exam). Not much has changed”. Her answer shows that to this particular student the changes are limited to the stages and materials of the lesson. Similarly one student from Class B writes, “we used to have reading lessons like this with the Hotline textbook but I analyse more now. I analyse the text as if I am analysing a literary text”.

Finally seven students answer that their approach to the reading lessons have not changed in a positive way. One student answers that the lessons are boring and another student answers that the texts are boring. And finally one student answers that
she finds the lesson boring if she does not read the text aloud for the class to follow. This is a practice the students experienced in some of their previous reading courses but we did not use this practice in the classroom. Therefore, this answer was quite surprising to me. However, I must state that this student was resistant to the course, and particularly to the group activities. I discuss her resistance to group activities below in relation to Table 6.3.2.1.

The answers to the same question in Questionnaire 3 regarding reasons for change in approaches to reading lessons were as follows:

Table 6.3.2.b Changes in Students’ Approaches to Reading Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS A</th>
<th>CLASS B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES Positive: 7</td>
<td>YES positive: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyment</strong></td>
<td><strong>I find it more enjoyable: 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I learned to analyse: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>The lessons are enjoyable: 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My perspective to written texts has improved: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I don’t find it boring anymore: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I question more: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>The activities are more enjoyable: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing Competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>I learned new things: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am exploring the texts in a detailed way: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I approach from different perspectives to a text: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I think on the text now: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I feel more confident now: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persistence and Participation</strong></td>
<td><strong>I don’t find it hard anymore: 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I pay attention to the text: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I try to participate in the discussions: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am exploring the texts in a detailed way: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I think on the text now: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I think on the text now: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I pay attention to the text: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am exploring the texts in a detailed way: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I think on the text now: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I pay attention to the text: 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>I think on the text now: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO: 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always liked reading lessons: 1</td>
<td><strong>Neutral: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is more detailed and harder for me: 1</td>
<td><strong>This is more detailed and harder for me: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA: 4</td>
<td><strong>NA: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer: 2</td>
<td><strong>No Answer: 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same patterns in the answers to this question in Questionnaire 3 or in Questionnaire 2 can be seen. Eighteen students state that their approach to reading lessons has changed in a positive way.

Similar to the answers in Questionnaire 2, those students’ answers who said ‘yes’ can be grouped into categories of feelings of enjoyment, developing competence, and persistence and participation in relation to competence. One student in Class B cites increased participation in the activities in the classroom setting in relation to the lesson itself, whereas, another three students cite participation in relation to the text.

To sum up, it is possible to argue that compared with the traditional reading courses, the critical reading course provided the students with novelty and optimal arousal, as well as more control over the lesson, which resulted in:

- Increase in feeling of pleasure for the reading tasks;
- Developing competence in reading and English;
- Higher persistence and/or participation.

Based on these responses, it is safe to claim that there was an increase in students’ intrinsic motivation for reading texts during this course.

Below I shall be looking at the roles of the components of the course, i.e. critical reading, activities, and texts, in students’ assessment of the course.

6.3.2.1 The Role of Reading Activities in Students’ Motivation

I inquired about the role of reading activities in students’ motivation in Questionnaires 2 and 3. The frequency of students’ responses are portrayed in charts 6.3.2.1.a and 6.3.2.1.b in Appendix 6, and reasons for these responses are listed below, in Table 6.3.2.1.a:
Students’ responses to the question “I find/ do not find the activities we do enjoyable because...” show that those students who found the activities enjoyable assessed the activities in three main areas: communication and control, competence, and texts.

In Questionnaire 2, twelve students made reference to communication and control. These responses include group work, speaking, projects which they prepared in groups, and not being forced, meaning individual students’ not being asked...
individual questions, but discussing and answering in groups. In Questionnaire 3, seven students respond in relation to communication and control.

In Questionnaire 2, other responses are in relation to developing competence ("We learn new things", "Interpreting the texts"). In Questionnaire 3, three students make reference to competence, (learning new things, the activities’ being beneficial, and grammatical analysis).

Texts are mentioned by one student in each of Questionnaire 2 and 3. One answer is that we had a variety of texts, whereas the other indicates that the student enjoyed the texts, and, through the texts, the activities.

Texts’ being a criterion for the assessment of the activities is visible in two more answers where it is stated that the students’ enjoyment of the activities depends on their enjoyment of the texts. The role of the texts in determining the students’ approaches for the lesson and activities is more visible in responses to another question, which I shall be discussing below.

Gökhan says “No” to this question in his Questionnaire, but does not provide reasons for his answer.

Two negative answers to this question, which I would like to discuss in detail, come from Betül and Umut, who were particularly unhappy about the group work. Betül, in Class A, first writes in Questionnaire 2 that she does not like group work and in Questionnaire 3 she notes “We did not do much activities, we only did group work”. When asked in her interview what she liked / did not like about the course, she responded that she would prefer the teacher to ask questions directly to her rather than answering as a group: “if you [pointed to someone and] said ‘you answer this question’ to them, I would try to answer [participate] more”. I would like to note that I asked her classmates’ opinion about whether or not they would prefer this practice, and the responses were negative. Besides, the students responded and stated on numerous occasions that group work facilitated participation. Nonetheless, Betül, was unhappy about the group work throughout the course.

I should also note that I did not witness any tension between Betül and her classmates or intimidation on her part in group discussions. She participated in the group discussions. However, she was anxious about not giving the "right" answers, although I repeatedly stated that there were no "right" or "expected" answers, as long as they supported their answers with their analysis. When asked to state two things she did not like about the course in Questionnaire 3 she writes, “We could not always
give the right answers”. Similarly, in her second Questionnaire, she notes, “I don’t feel good in group activities because I don’t feel that I am giving the correct answers”. I must also note that Betül was the only student who expressed anxiety about giving the ‘correct’ or ‘right’ answers. As discussed above, for other students participating in this study, not having ‘correct’ answers meant less external control and they reported higher participation and motivation.

Umut, in Class B, was also resistant to group work. Although he answers that he finds the activities enjoyable in his second questionnaire, he gives a negative response in his third questionnaire and states that he did not like group work. Umut, unlike Betül, had tensions with his classmates. When asked in his interview if he found the group work to be problematic in this course or if he does not like group work in general he responded, “I don’t like group activities anyway, I mean, I never like being in a crowd / group”. It should be noted that he was placed in the group of his choice, except for the project work, for which the students formed bigger groups than their usual groups. However, it is one of the shortcomings of such research that the teacher / researcher is not in a situation where they know the class dynamics from previous time spent with the students, or where they can spend enough time to try to resolve tensions within the class community. Hence, although the students were free to choose their own groups, and I monitored the group discussions to facilitate participation, group work remained a problem for Umut.

Guray, who was mostly in the same group as Umut, also responds that his opinion about the activities depends on the lesson in his second questionnaire and says that he did not find the activities enjoyable in his third questionnaire, but does not provide explanation.

Another point arising from the responses is the student reaction towards grammar involved in the course, which I will discuss in Section 6.5 below.

To conclude, twenty-three students from both groups stated that they enjoyed the reading activities and two stated that they did not in Questionnaire 2, out of twenty-nine that responded to that question; and twenty-one students stated that they enjoyed the activities, and five stated that they did not, in Questionnaire 3, out of twenty-seven.

Students’ answers can be analysed in four categories: communication and control, competence, texts, and group work.
6.3.2.2 The Role of Reading Texts in Students' Motivation

Reasons for students' overall enjoyment/lack of enjoyment of the critical reading lessons are listed in tables 6.3.2.2.a and b below:

Table 6.3.2.2.a Class A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mustafa YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Semih ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Feyza YES. I like reading and learning through reading. We learn vocabulary and our pronunciation gets better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yağmur YES. The texts are interesting but sometimes they are heavy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Merve YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Onur YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gaye YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Özlem YES because we learn vocabulary, NO because it (the text) is not interesting for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Makbule YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Betül NO when there are vocabulary items I don't know in the text, it gets boring and when only one person reads the text, it gets boring too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gökhan YES. The texts are up-to-date and interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Koray YES. The texts are good, the structure of the lesson is simple and the vocabulary (we learn) is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gülsün YES. Some texts are really interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Volkan YES. We study different things and a variety of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Egemen YES. The texts are interesting and help improve my vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: YES: 12
The texts are interesting / good / up-to-date / on a variety of subjects: 6
Vocabulary: 4
I like reading: 1
I like learning through reading: 1
Pronunciation: 1
Lesson is simple: 1

NO: 1
Novel vocabulary: 1
It gets boring when I don't read the text: 1

YES and NO: 1
Yes: Vocabulary
No: It's not interesting for me

No Answer: 1
Table 6.3.2.2.b Class B

Overall, I enjoy/don’t enjoy reading lessons. What I like/don’t like is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Merve</td>
<td>YES, it is enjoyable to read good texts and to discuss on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Şeyda</td>
<td>YES, as I said, I enjoy them overall but there are texts I don’t like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Can</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Güray</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Umut</td>
<td>No, reading lessons are boring generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ezgi</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Önder</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ayşe</td>
<td>YES, I don’t get bored, I like reading anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ahu</td>
<td>YES, but sometimes the texts are boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fulya</td>
<td>YES, the texts are interesting, I comprehend what I read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Gamze</td>
<td>Texts are good overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Engin</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cristina</td>
<td>YES, I like reading lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Soner</td>
<td>YES, the texts are good, teaching technique is good overall, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Aysegül</td>
<td>YES but sometimes, I get lost if I don’t like the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ceren</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mirac</td>
<td>YES, I don’t get bored as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES: 14</strong>&lt;br&gt;The texts are good / interesting: 4&lt;br&gt;Discussing on texts: 1&lt;br&gt;I comprehend what I read: 1&lt;br&gt;Teaching technique: 1&lt;br&gt;YES BUT&lt;br&gt;Some texts are boring: 2&lt;br&gt;Sometimes depending on the text I got bored: 2&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO: 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reading lessons are boring: 1&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>NA: 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the answers, the most important factor in students’ assessment of the critical reading course is the texts. Ten students state that they find the texts interesting / good / up-to-date/on a variety of subjects. Texts are followed by competence in English in Class A and competence in reading in Class B. Four students from Class B also state that they do find the course enjoyable but that some texts were boring, still drawing attention to the texts.

The students were also asked specifically if they find the texts enjoyable and the answers to this question indicate that the students’ assessment regarding the texts is based on: a) the texts’ capability to evoke optimal arousal, e.g. being interesting, up-to-date, boring, not boring, different; and b) the texts capability to facilitate competence development, e.g., analysis of the texts, informative, beneficial,
understanding the text, as can be seen in Frequency charts in charts 6.3.2.2.a and b (Appendix 6) and Table 6.3.2.2.c below.

### Table 6.3.2.2.c I find/I don’t find the texts we read enjoyable because …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire 2</th>
<th>Questionnaire 3</th>
<th>Questionnaire 2</th>
<th>Questionnaire 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CLASS B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES: 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES: 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Because…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are up-to-date: 3</td>
<td>They were interesting: 2</td>
<td>Texts were up-to-date: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are interesting: 3</td>
<td>They were enjoyable: 1</td>
<td>They were beneficial: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are enjoyable: 2</td>
<td>They were different: 1</td>
<td>They were interesting and we analysed them from different perspectives: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are not boring: 1</td>
<td>NO: 3</td>
<td>They were enjoyable: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are informative: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some texts were boring: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are suitable for our level of English: 1</td>
<td>No answer: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand them: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I still don’t have fun reading them: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO: 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO: 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are boring</td>
<td></td>
<td>They were boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOTH: 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BOTH: 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the text</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on the text: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES: 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Because…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts were up-to-date: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texts were up-to-date: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were interesting: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>They were interesting: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were beneficial: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>They were interesting and we analysed them from different perspectives: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were enjoyable: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>They were enjoyable: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some texts were boring: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some texts were boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO: 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO: 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>They were boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the text: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on the text: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar analysis is boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar analysis is boring: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA: 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NA: 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the reported place of activities in motivation, in this study, since the course was heavily centered on texts, it is not surprising that the role of texts is more determining compared to activities since optimal arousal is not visible in the responses related to activities but in the responses related to texts.

It is also not surprising that optimal arousal, being the starting point of intrinsic motivation, exists in texts since texts were usually the first, and always the main component of this course. Hence, the texts served as the component which provoked, and sometimes failed to provoke a curiosity, representing the bigger factor in increasing intrinsic motivation.

However, it should be noted that this does not mean that provoking optimal arousal is enough on its own. On the contrary, as the students’ responses to the
questions in Questionnaires and Interviews show, as discussed in this chapter, optimal arousal works together with issues of control, communication, competence, and persistence and participation. In fact these do not only interact but are usually fused together and in a recursive pattern. The texts’ role is in providing the right lights for the students to take off.

Although a critical reading course can inherently bring the means to increase intrinsic motivation in the reading classroom, as discussed above, and although this was the case in this study, the critical reading course in this study also encountered resistance. Paradoxical though it seems, the resistance does not stem simply from the students but from the educational system. Below, I discuss student resistance to the critical reading course in relation to the educational system, and in particular to the university entrance exam (YDS).

6.4 Resistance From the Educational System Through the University Entrance Exam, YDS

6.4.1 Student Resistance to the Course: YDS is everything!

After I gave the students their second questionnaire, Semih’s answers drew my attention to resistance stemming from his wish to have reading lessons only to prepare for the YDS. His answers to some of the questions in the questionnaire were almost independent of the questions, drawing attention to the fact that he wanted to have reading lessons to practice for YDS, which means that he wanted to practice answering multiple-choice questions based on short paragraphs. The questions can be comprehension questions as well as translation or vocabulary questions.
Table 6.4.1.a Semih’s answers regarding the critical reading course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 2</th>
<th>SEMIH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the aim of the reading lessons should be? How do you find them beneficial?</td>
<td>We are preparing for YDS (the university foreign language exam) and our reading lessons should be for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think of the texts we read in the classroom? For example do you find them enjoyable and beneficial? Why/why not?</td>
<td>I don’t find what we read in this lesson enjoyable and beneficial. It would be better if we read paragraphs for YDS (university exam).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please remember a reading lesson you had recently that you thought was enjoyable. Why did you think it was enjoyable?</td>
<td>The texts/subjects/lessons are boring, it should be YDS oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of texts would you like us to read in the lessons?</td>
<td>YDS oriented/ focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any difference between our lessons and your previous reading lessons? If there is, please write the nature of the change.</td>
<td>Yes, there is. We used to study for YDS before, but we read up-to-date texts with you. I think YDS is more important for us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let me point out again that the students are not to take the exam until the end of the 11th grade and the students who participated in this study are 10th grade students. Nevertheless, the importance attached to this exam causes such high degrees of anxiety.

Apart from Semih, Makbule was the only one who mentioned YDS in her answers, however, her answers do not show a resistance on her part but rather state the differences she finds between this course and her traditional reading courses:

Table 6.4.1.b Makbule’s answers regarding the critical reading course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 2</th>
<th>MAKBULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What kind of texts would you like to read?</td>
<td>Up-to-date (texts), stories, children’s stories, (texts) to prepare for YDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any difference(s) in the way you approach reading lessons? If there is please explain in what way.</td>
<td>It is different because it was not in form of multiple-choice questions for YDS, not much has changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although she expresses in her answer that she would like to practice for YDS, she is also happy to read “up-to-date texts, stories, children’s stories”. Similarly, in her second answer with YDS in it, she expresses that her approach to reading lessons has not changed and that the only difference she finds is that she does not practice for YDS through answering multiple-choice questions in the lessons, but, adds “not much has changed” in her approach.

Because Semih had not expressed his reservations about the course before the 2nd Questionnaire, I was not sure how many of the students felt that way although they had not expressed it in their answers to the questionnaire. Hence, having received Semih’s answers I decided to ask the students in both groups whether or not they would prefer a YDS preparing reading course rather than the critical reading course. Except for Merve, and Koray from Class A, and Cristina, Mirac, and Soner, from Class B, the students expressed that they would prefer an YDS oriented course.

Although I left room for student resistance towards the course, having read the literature on resistance, (Kramer-Dahl 2001, Granville 2003, Janks 1999, Males 2000) and asked questions in the second questionnaire to explore students’ feelings and opinions about the course, activities and texts, I was still surprised to see Semih’s answers and the large number of students who stated that they would prefer a traditional reading course to prepare for the university exam.

This kind of resistance among so many students was surprising to me as a teacher-researcher due to two reasons. Firstly, none of the students had expressed any concerns about this until I asked them openly, after seeing Semih’s answers.

Secondly, and most importantly, although we were not reading paragraphs to answer multiple-choice comprehension or vocabulary questions, the texts we read in the course were authentic texts from a number of genres; and by the nature of the critical reading course, comprehension was a prerequisite. Hence, the students were actually expected to be improving themselves as foreign language readers in this course. In fact, as already stated in Chapter 3, when I presented the materials and the course plan to the class teachers at the beginning of the term, to discuss their opinions about the course, reading teachers of both groups expressed openly that the students needed to improve themselves for the university exam and that they believed this course would be very helpful for the students for this purpose.

Similarly, and at the same time paradoxically, some of the students claim that this course helped them to improve their language proficiency levels. As stated above,
Gaye writes, in Questionnaire 2, “Now, in these lessons, understanding and interpreting is important. We discuss the text but before we just used to read and move on, just the pronunciation was important”.

As already discussed, the materials’ being authentic and comprehension being a prerequisite actually resulted in an increase in positive self-efficacy as foreign language learners, and foreign language readers: Şeyda says, “I approach reading texts with more confidence, I am less intimidated”; and Ayşegül says, “… I was stressed out because of YDS. This course has increased my self-esteem. I realised that I can understand what I read”; and Fulya says, “[There is a positive change in my approach to reading lessons.] I realised that all texts can be read. Asking questions to a text makes it easier to read it”. Denoting persistence, which is expressed more explicitly by Gaye and Koray, as well as increased self-efficacy. Koray notes, “Before, when I looked at a text, if it was too long, I wouldn’t feel like reading it, or I would get bored when I did read. But now because I know how to approach it, I enjoy (reading) it more. I try to get what it says. I try to apply the analysis we did. I try them on the text and it becomes easier to read like that”.

In other words, there is an increase in the students’ motivation for reading lessons in this course. Indeed their reservations about the traditional reading courses were mostly based on the activities they did to prepare for the exam, as discussed above. The most referred to reasons for their lower motivation to traditional reading courses were related to the ‘spuriousness’ of the activities involved. I would like to note students’ answers relating to traditional reading classes again: “… There are no dull comprehension questions. … It’s enjoyable. We are reading (the texts) the way we read newspapers or magazines, we know that there are no dull comprehension questions below the newspaper articles”, Koray; “We used to read the texts and interpret superficially. Now we are looking deeper”, Onur; Gaye, “Now, in these lessons, understanding and interpreting is important. We discuss the text but before, we just used to read and move on, just the pronunciation was important”, to give a few examples.

To sum up, the students at this point expressed a higher motivation for the critical reading course and a lower reported motivation and yet a preference for the traditional reading courses.

Contradictory as it seems, their answers to the question “Would you prefer to have university exam oriented lessons”, asked in Questionnaire 3 as a result of this
expressed resistance, not only clarifies their standing point but also affirms their statements about their perspective to school education: “At the end of the day, it is a lesson”, as Gamze puts it (see section 6.2). I will be looking at these answers in the section below.

6.4.2. Student Resistance to the Course: “This is what the (educational) system is like”

In the third questionnaire I asked the students the same question. However, this time there was a change in the numbers of those who said that they would prefer a YDS oriented reading course:

The answers in the chart above show an increase in the number of the students who expressed that, were they involved in the process of curriculum development, they would choose to study this course rather than a more obviously exam-oriented reading course: nine as compared to the five students who expressed that they would prefer a critical reading course in my initial inquiry. These nine students’ answers are listed in Table 6.4.2.a below:
Table 6.4.2.a Would you prefer to have university exam oriented reading lessons?

**Questionnaire 3: No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merve</td>
<td>No, one needs culture as well, not everything is YDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Onur</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Koray</td>
<td>No, not everything is university. We need to learn other things as well (for the) university because we must be unique in some respects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seyda</td>
<td>No, there are enough courses for the exam. I feel that I relax in this course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ayse</td>
<td>No, I think we have enough studies for the university exam as it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ahu</td>
<td>No, as far as I know, our biggest problem as a class is the questions on reading texts. We can neither comprehend nor comment on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Engin</td>
<td>No, this has benefits too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>No, everything oriented towards YDS is based on memorisation. I don’t like memorisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mirac</td>
<td>No, although it is not obvious, this course is preparing the basics to be able to answer paragraph questions. Besides it is preparing us for the university (environment) and lightens the burden other courses place on us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above nine students state that they would actually choose to have a critical reading course. Out of those who say that they would prefer a critical reading course, Ahu and Mirac explicitly write that they find the course directly beneficial for YDS. However, I should note that this does not mean that the other students do not find the course beneficial for YDS as they express this in their answers to other questions, as discussed in the previous sections.

Koray, Engin, Cristina, and Mirac state that they find the course beneficial in some other aspects. In Table 6.4.2.a Koray’s and Mirac’s answers show that they believe the course improves them as individuals as it prepares them not (only) for the YDS but (also) for the higher education environment. Cristina finds it beneficial as a result of the intellectual challenge (optimal arousal, see the section on motivation) it provides; and Engin does not provide an explanation on why she finds it beneficial.

Mirac maintains her position in the end-of-term interview as well:
Teacher: Would you prefer a reading course like the one we had or an YDS oriented one?

Mirac: I would prefer like this one. I mean, we are studying for YDS ten lessons [a week] but this is necessary for YDS too, there are paragraph questions and we will study these in the university as well. It will be a foundation for it too...

Table 6.4.2.b Would you prefer to have university exam oriented reading lessons?

**Questionnaire 3: Yes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mustafa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Semih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gökhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Özlem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Betül</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Merve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ezgi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gamze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ceren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Önder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Egemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Güray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ayşegül</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Feyza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The emphasis written in bold in this table are mine.

Answers explaining why they would prefer a traditional reading course provide valuable data on other students’ reasons for their choice (Table 6.4.2.6 above). Out of fourteen students who answered to this question that they would prefer an exam-oriented reading course, three students do not provide further explanation.

Although all the remaining eleven answers provide data on the extent to which YDS is important for these students, it is possible to group these answers into two:

1. Those for whom YDS is a priority, and
2. Those for whom YDS is an imposing agent.

The first group of answers show the degree of importance YDS has for these students. I should re-emphasize that these students do state that they find the critical reading course beneficial, as already discussed in relation to motivation for the critical reading course. For example, as stated above, Ayşegül remarks that her comprehension improved through increased self-efficacy, “This course has increased my self-esteem. I realised that I can understand what I read”. Similarly, she acknowledges such improvement in her end-of-term interview too:

*Ayşegül:* At the moment I prefer an YDS oriented course... I mean... (although) this will help YDS too (because) there will be questions on reading paragraphs... etc...

*Teacher:* But you prefer an YDS oriented course? 

*Ayşegül:* Yes.
Ayşegül’s interview demonstrates that although the critical reading course helps her to improve her comprehension skills, which will be necessary for the exam, the course does not aim at preparing her for the exam through practicing test questions, i.e. developing/improving exam skills, which is the students’ priority at this point.

Önder’s answer is the most drastic one in this group, “Our lives are [based on] the university exam”. Egemen states that he devotes most of his time in preparing for the exam, and his answer denotes that a reading course for YDS would be complementary to their other activities. Another point that I would like to add about this group is that although Umut’s answer shows that he wants to do activities directly related to YDS, this answer is fused with his resistance to the activities, which I shall be looking at in the next section, as he writes “… instead of reading texts and preparing projects” (emphasis mine). Besides, in his interview he says, “I think there should be both. One week we can prepare for YDS and the following week we can read a paragraph that is fun… to relax”.

Feyza did not take Questionnaire 3 but answered this question in the end-of-term interview.

The second groups of answers, where YDS is seen as an imposing agent, show that these students are almost not free to choose what to study but that this choice is imposed on them. Özlem states that she finds the course very beneficial but that YDS is a “must”. Similarly, Betül emphasises the role of YDS for them and writes, “… the educational system makes us think like this”. Gamze’s answer is even more explicit on the role of the educational system in her choice. The most important data these students provide is the acknowledgement of their awareness of the place of the current educational system in their choices.

It should be noted here that even Cristina, who answered that she would not prefer an YDS oriented course, uses similar structures in her interview, “I would prefer this course… Well we have to study for YDS… but I would prefer this course because… this is more enjoyable, more educational, I think” (emphasis mine).

Because Semih was the one who brought this point forward in the first place and did not provide any further data in Questionnaire 3, I repeated the question in his end-of-term interview:

Teacher: Would you prefer a reading course like the one we had or a YDS oriented one?
Semih: I would prefer YDS oriented, I mean, because they conditioned us for that. That is what the system is like.

... 

Teacher: Do you have suggestions to improve the course?

Semih: First of all the system needs to change for this course to come to schools.

Teacher: OK?

Semih: The system needs to change completely because everyone is preparing for YDS at the moment; I mean no one cares for the current issues, events. None of the 11th grade students is reading newspapers at the moment (the students take the university exam at the end of the 11th grade). They are practicing for the exam all the time... or... instead of reading a newspaper in English, they prefer to answer multiple-choice questions. I mean, it would be good if they put this among our courses but the system needs to change.

And finally, four students state that they are not sure which course to choose:

Table 6.4.2.c
Would you prefer to have university exam oriented reading lessons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yağmur</td>
<td>In fact I don't know, YDS is important to us but we need this kind of lessons to get rid of the YDS stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkan</td>
<td>I am not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulya</td>
<td>Yes (?), YDS is very important and we are preparing for that but sometimes we should have courses on general subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soner</td>
<td>I am not sure, both would be beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yağmur repeats her answer in the end-of-term interview:

Teacher: Would you prefer a reading course like the one we had or a YDS oriented one?

Yağmur: I don't think we would lose anything if we had this course. In fact, we have very unnecessary courses. This one would be much too beneficial for us (if it replaced them). I mean... um... I wrote this too (in Questionnaire 3). I cannot decide which one to have... I mean... Both seem necessary.

On the other hand, Volkan revises his position:
Volkan: This one or YDS oriented one... uh... Actually we are studying for YDS in other courses. I think a course like this is better because we are going to have reading texts in YDS anyway. I mean, it would be beneficial for both YDS and for improving our understanding skills. I would choose this one.

To sum up, the critical reading course in this study encountered resistance from the educational system, through the students. Unlike what was anticipated as a result of the literature review in this area (see Chapter 3) the resistance did not come from the individual level, nor was it disruptive of classroom practices. In fact the only indication of it was Semih’s answers to Questionnaire 2. Following his answers, I found out that a large majority of the students were in agreement with Semih in the middle of the term.

However, by the end of the term the majority of the students had revised their positions on their preferences between a critical reading course and a YDS oriented course, expressing that they believed critical reading course to be equally beneficial or to help preparing for the exam, however subtly.

Another interesting point that emerged from the students’ self-reports regarding their preferences on reading courses was the awareness of the role of the YDS in their choice and the awareness of the results of this choice in terms of their school education.

6.5. Systemic Functional Grammar and Student Motivation

I would like to briefly discuss the role of SFG in students’ motivation. It is possible to see in Section 6.3 that some students stated that they did not like the grammar in the course or that they found the grammar excessive in the course, see for example Tables 6.3.2.1.a and 6.3.2.2.c above, while others found grammatical analysis valuable for developing competency (see for example Tables 6.3.1.a, 6.3.2.a, 6.3.2.b). Therefore, in the second interview, I inquired whether or not these students found SFG beneficial.

Simla: What did you think of SFG? Did you find it beneficial?
Yağmur: It was beneficial. Because... for example... appraisals, you get the text... ... more systematic (She means that SFG makes critical reading more systematic).
Feyza: Maybe we could manage without it but it helped to draw my attention to it (the analysis) because it was more systematic.

Mirac: Yes, yes. After studying Systemic Functional Grammar, we started to look at it differently anyway. I mean we studied “Asylum Seekers” before but afterwards we did it with SFG and they were both very helpful/useful.

Özlem: I found it beneficial. It helps to see the perspective... And, how, and to whom... positive, negative... if it is closer to negative pole or positive pole. Um... I mean, it made it (analysis) more systematic.

Aysegül: I think it helped us to see more clearly. It made it easier to read critically.

When I inquired about their responses to the questionnaires, the students responded that they found SFG beneficial but confusing at times due to:

1. The novelty of the grammar;
2. The limitations of time to master a new grammar; and
3. Explanations/informations and activities being inadequate in compensating for the above constraints:

Gamze’s interview responses are revealing in this area

Simla: Did you find SFG beneficial?
Gamze: I mean, it is beneficial to learn it but sometimes when it is excessive SFG, it is boring. I think it would be better if we were taught only the important parts.

Simla: Do you think it was because of the way it (SFG) was explained? Do you think it was too detailed?
Gamze: I mean, it was both that and because SFG was new to us, it was hard. We did not have enough time. It was too much for a term. When we learned a new structure it was confusing and when we moved to the analysis it became clearer (through practice) but then we moved to another structure. So it was confusing.

Simla: Can you think of any suggestions for improving this?
Gamze: I mean, if we had more time and if we had more examples...

Volkan expresses similar concerns:

Simla: You wrote in your questionnaire that you found the lessons confusing sometimes. What did you find confusing? Can you explain?

Volkan: First... SFG was confusing at the beginning... but later.... as time passed...

Simla: Was it because it was new or because of the way it was explained, or...?

Volkan: Both, I mean... because it was new, because we didn’t study it before, it was confusing.

Simla: How can this be improved do you think?

Volkan: Umm... It cannot be.

Let me point out again that not all the students found grammar to be excessive nor did they all state a preference for less SFG in the course. The value attached to SFG by the students is discussed in Chapter 5 and Section 6.3. Similarly, those students who find SFG to be excessive or boring also state that they found SFG beneficial. Thus, based on the points above the role of SFG in students’ approach to grammar calls for further action research. Further research is required to find out the impact of SFG in students’ approaches to grammar with adapted duration and activities as a feature of a critical reading course, based on the results of this research.

6.6 Conclusion

The students who participated in this study were highly motivated to study English yet their motivation for the classroom based reading activities was much lower, due to alienation from the classroom practices they were familiar with. This alienation was caused initially partly by the students’ high English proficiency level, since for them learning the language on its own fails to provide novelty and optimal arousal, and partly by the low degree of student interaction, highly defined controlled settings, and reading tasks’ failure to provoke an interest for developing competence in relation to students’ immediate lives. The critical reading course challenges the conditions offered by the traditional reading courses by meeting these needs.

Hence, students who participated in this study report higher participation and persistence for the critical reading course compared to traditional reading courses. The
role of critical reading course in promoting intrinsic motivation is discussed in Chapter 7, based on these findings.

In spite of the increase in students’ intrinsic motivation for the reading course practices, students showed resistance due to the current educational and exam system in the context of this research. By the end of the term, resistance was found to be lower, with more students expressing preference for the critical reading course compared to an exam-oriented course. I discuss student resistance further in Chapter 7.

And finally, student feedback showed that SFG explanations and exercises, which were done in the form of analysing texts, required more time. Now, I would like to move to Discussions and Implications, where I continue to discuss motivation, resistance, and the role of SFG in motivation together with the impact of the course on students’ reading.
7.1 Discussion of the Findings

As discussed in the Introduction, and Chapters 1 and 4, there is a need for a critical approach to reading in the context of this study. Similarly, there is a need for research in CL and specifically in CLA in diverse contexts to build a body of knowledge on possible adaptations of the suggested CL and CLA principles and practices in various contexts. Issues requiring further investigation include, in particular, appropriacy of CLA courses in different, i.e. “Non-Western” contexts and the relationship between motivation/resistance and CLA courses.

The critical reading course given in this study, which was built on the assumption of a shared social reality, adopts and adapts principles and practices suggested by CLA researchers to inquire about the impact of a critical reading course on students’ reading and motivation for reading lessons in a Turkish Anatolian High School Context.

In this respect the findings of this study can be further discussed in three main areas in relation to the research aims and questions:

- ‘Exporting Methodology’ (7.1.1.),
- ‘The Critical Reading Course’s Impact on Reading’ (7.1.2), and
- ‘The Critical Reading Course’s Impact on Motivation for Reading Lessons’ (7.1.3).

7.1.1 Exporting Methodology

Previous studies on CL and CLA suggest principles for a critical reading course. As discussed in chapters 1, 2 and 4, Wallace, in particular, provides valuable data, and suggests a much-needed methodology for a critical reading course. Yet, the research on critical reading practices in classrooms, especially in ESL and EFL contexts, is fairly limited. In this respect, this study aims to add to the studies on CLA principles and practices in an EFL high school context.
As already discussed in Chapters 1, 2 and 4, the critical reading course in this study was greatly influenced by Wallace's previous work. However, due to the context of this study, there were some differences from the studies of Wallace and necessary changes had to be made in accordance. Below, I discuss these changes drawing conclusions in relation to the issues of adaptation and appropriacy.

7.1.1.1 ESL vs. EFL Contexts

This study was conducted in an EFL context. This has implications mainly in terms of the texts read and analysed in the classroom and the texts the students have access to outside the classroom, but also for how students have learned English.

Having limited access to texts in English has two main impacts: 1) in terms of classroom activities, and 2) in terms of students’ developing critical reading habits.

As Wallace points out it is important that the students have access to a variety of texts for analysis in the classroom (1999). These texts can be offered by the teacher and/or the students themselves in an ESL or EAP context (Wallace 1992a). However, in an EFL context, bearing in mind that the texts should be authentic texts, it is very likely that the texts used for classroom practice will be limited to what the teacher brings to the classroom, as was the case in this study. I took along a variety of texts with me from the UK, as it was anticipated that it would be difficult to have access to authentic texts in English in Turkey.

Although the students were encouraged to bring texts they found interesting throughout the term, only one student in one class brought texts to be analysed in the classroom at the end of the term, as the other students did not have easy access to authentic texts. Their options were limited to novels and some year-old issues of magazines in the school library in one of the schools, which the other school did not have, nor did the students have easy and immediate access to the internet, within schools, for example.

Therefore, the classroom practices were limited to the texts the teacher brought top-down. This can be a drawback in terms of motivation as well as students’ developing an understanding that any text can be subject to analysis and to critical reading. Students are more likely to feel less involved, and it also bears the danger that the students see the classroom practices limited to the texts brought by the
teacher, which are produced by a foreign culture to be consumed by that same culture in a far away land.

Similarly, students' not having access to English texts outside the classroom bears the risk of the students' seeing critical reading as a strictly curriculum related activity and not transferring critical reading to their reading habits outside the classroom, as well as being isolated from the discourses due to their disadvantage related to intertextuality.

However, these obstacles can be overcome. In this study authentic texts served to increase students' motivation and the use of authentic texts from a variety of genres helped to develop an understanding that any text is indeed subject to analysis.

Likewise, drawing continuous attention to the students' reading habits in L1, and to students' identities in their own culture, selecting texts that are related to the students' own lives and/or culture, and asking regularly for examples the students might have come across with in L2 or L1 helped to build the missing link between students' reading habits and classroom practices in this study. It should be noted here that the students' sharing the same L1 provided a certain degree of ease in discussing examples, the role of culture, etc., which is often missing in ESL contexts.

Nevertheless, it should be remarked that these adaptations are context bound. The role of the current educational practices shaped by YDS to a great extent caused alienation on the students participating in this study from school practices. Hence, their positive approach to the course is partly determined by the course's meeting the needs of the students, i.e., developing competencies in relation to their immediate lives, and developing them as individuals, as discussed in Chapter 6.

Another important point in relation to access to texts is the issue of intertextuality. EFL learners are left without the necessary means to this end with only limited access to texts. Although some texts were chosen to overcome this obstacle, e.g. Rapunzel, or activities were designed to draw the students' attention to the role of intertextuality, e.g. The Practical Princess followed Rapunzel, and two texts were read on the Kyoto protocol, intertextuality remains a problem in an EFL context.

Yet, at the same time EFL learners have the "outsider" position Wallace remarks on (1992a: 68). In other words, the students can make use of their position as outsiders to look at the texts, without being a part of the model reader, using their own immediate resources and context for interpretation.
Finally, the students participating in this study were foreign language students. They had both metalanguage and experience with analysing the language and texts grammatically. Therefore, they were familiar not only with usual grammar terms such as subject, verb, predicate, etc. but also with more specific terminology such as agency as opposed to subject. Hence, SFG was built upon the students’ existing metalanguage and the students’ familiarity with analysing the sentences grammatically proved helpful in both covering metafunctions and analysing the texts.

7.1.1.2 Availability of Different Cultures in the Classroom

Even within the somewhat multicultural Turkish context, this study took place in a relatively homogeneous cultural context. This has implications in terms of the student input. In a multicultural context, the students are more likely to provide a wider variety of input in terms of their experiences and perspectives and examples of these processes can be seen at work in Wallace’s studies (2003). In such a context, the students will learn from each other, experience different perspectives, and will possibly be involved in a context where different power inequalities are experienced by different members of the classroom community.

On the other hand, in a monocultural context, such as the context of this study, students will provide less variety of perspectives and experiences, and will not have as much chance to be involved in a context where different forms of power inequalities will be experienced by the class members, especially if they are members of a relatively privileged community, i.e. Anatolian High Schools.

However, this situation can be made use of to provide more detailed input on the students’ own wider culture. Students in this study were encouraged to focus on their own perspectives and experiences as members of the same wider culture whenever possible. This, for example, gave a better chance to focus on the possible different perspectives and power inequalities existing in the students’ shared wider culture, in terms of ethnicity, religion, gender, and age.

Merve, for example, commented on the role of Turkish past tenses in media discourse, showing that she started considering language as a formal system to reflect and reproduce different perspectives. While discussing possible effects of writer’s / producer’s choice of mood on the model readers, Merve remarked on the possible effect of the use of witnessed past in the written and visual media in Turkish. As
discussed in Chapter 1, Turkish has two past tense forms, i.e. witnessed and learned past tenses. Referring to a past event, the speakers must choose either of these forms and these forms can be used to distance oneself, a) from the point of time the speaker is in; and b) the source of information. Witnessed past tense is used when the information is first-hand and reliable, or has truth-value. For example, based on this distinction, children’s’ stories are told in learned past tense in Turkish.

The choice of past tense used in the media is witnessed past. Hence, the students having discussed the impact of the use of this language structure in the media, specifically in written media, came up with the conclusion that unless one is aware of the impact of this choice, it is more likely that they will take the truth-value of the information presented as high, merely due to the habitual behavior of recognizing witnessed past as reliable, an aspect raised by Whorf’s linguistic determinism, Section 2.1.1.

Similarly other students stated that they were considering the effect of writer’s choices while reading in L1 or L2 as an extracurricular activity. Besides, in the students’ responses to repeated reading activity, it is possible to see that the students started negotiating their own identities and perspectives in the second activity, showing a degree of internalisation.

Nevertheless, opportunities for providing input from different social groupings’ experiences are typically missing in a monocultural EFL context.

7.1.1.3 Higher Education vs. High School Education

Another difference in this study was that the course was given as part of high school education as oppose to university education. The main difference is that in a course in higher education, the students will have chosen to enrol in the course whereas, in high school education, the course becomes part of the curriculum, which the students are expected to study. Again, this might have implications in terms of student motivation, and student interest in the subject.

As discussed in Chapter 6, student motivation in this study was not an obstacle as the course provided activities to increase student motivation and the students in this study were foreign language students who were interested in studying language. Developing competencies through adopting a critical approach to written texts and classroom activities to involve the students in the control of the classroom procedures
served, not only in this case to develop critical reading skills but also to provide the students with the motives to study this course, which they had not chosen to study in the first place.

It should be noted here that in the same context, i.e. Turkish Anatolian High Schools, the same course for students in other academic branches would have to be adapted further as the degree of interest and choice in relation to issues of language and language practice is likely to be even more limited in the academic branches other than foreign language branch.

Another important aspect in relation to high school education in Turkey was the degree of external control on the course. The course had to be planned, the texts selected and the activities prepared beforehand to be presented with the proposal for the course to be given to the Ministry of Education. Similarly, the English teachers of the classes had to be informed of these issues before the term started and a copy was given to those who wished. Although both in the proposal and in the discussions with the class teachers it was pointed out that necessary changes would be made depending on the requests from the students, and the demands of the teaching practice, the course had less flexibility than in a higher education context, i.e. I did not have the chance to change the course radically depending on the students' needs had the necessity arisen, which fortunately it did not.

On the other hand, at university level, such a course could be more likely to be independent of the "term plan" prepared by the teacher before the course, and likely to be more dependent on the students' needs and demands, as well as context, which enables the teacher and the students to shape the course with relative autonomy.

In fact, partly due to the top-down curriculum of the Turkish educational system and partly due to the fact that the course was not a part of the curriculum but was part of a research project and was not planned by the Ministry of Education, there was more detailed and stricter examination of the course plan than usual, yet I was relatively autonomous since the course was a part of a research project. On the other hand, in the same context, any critical reading course, or any course indeed, has to be planned beforehand as part of the curriculum, and has to be implemented by following the curriculum faithfully.

Another important change was due to the prominent position of YDS in the educational setting. Although preparing the students for YDS was not a prominent aim of the course and although the students found the course beneficial for improving
their reading skills, as discussed in Chapter 6, the issue of YDS was very important and the course had to prove useful for improving the students' "exam skills". No changes were made in this direction. The students' expectations with regard to YDS were found out mid-way through the term and following this it was inquired whether or not the students found the course beneficial for the exam as well as for their reading skills. Although no changes were made, I discussed with the students whether or not they thought the course would be beneficial for their exam performance. The students later on reported that the authentic texts and reading activities proved useful for preparing them for the exam. Hence, YDS found room for itself in the course.

7.1.1.4 Socio-cultural Context

Within the Turkish socio-cultural context, both the students and I had to be careful regarding what power inequalities and identities we were dealing with. For example, homosexuality vs. heterosexuality was a taboo subject in the school setting that we could not touch on, and was brought up by neither the students, nor myself although the issue of gender was looked at. Similarly, adaptations were made with respect to power inequalities and identities in relation to the context of Turkey. For example, ethnicity and religion gained greater importance while issues of age and provinces of Turkey came up in addition to the usual issues. Some other issues found less room or no room at all, as in the case of homosexuality.

Although politics is typically another taboo subject in high school education, English provided the safe distance that Wallace mentions (1992a). It was easier to read texts on issues like the Iraq War, as it was a part of the immediate context at the time of the research, or the Kyoto Protocol, than it would have been had these texts been in Turkish, as the language of the texts provided the students with a safe distance from the context of production. The students assumed the role of "foreigners" in relation to these delicate subjects, and were comfortable in being a part of the context of interpretation, without having to assume the role of participants in the context of production initially.

To sum up, in this study, four main areas of concern arose in exporting critical reading methodologies to a Turkish Anatolian High School context: Changes from ESL to EFL context, which had implications related to access to authentic texts and intertextuality; changes from multi-cultural to mono-cultural context, which had
implications related to availability of different perspectives, experiences, and realities; changes from higher education to high school education, which had implications of external control on the course; and the role of the wider socio-cultural context of the study, which had implications of what aspects of power inequalities were covered.

Therefore, I would like to argue regarding the discussion on appropriacy of CLA in different contexts (Section 1.3.2) that adapting the methodologies suggested by the previous studies to the needs and circumstances of the context CLA courses is likely to generate results, and such courses can become appropriate. The changes and adaptations made in this study are discussed above. However, it should also be noted that adaptation of CLA courses is an ongoing process, as it needs to be shaped and reshaped based on the changing needs and contexts.

7.1.2 The Critical Reading Course’s Impact on Reading

The first research question this study seeks answers for is “What is the impact of the critical reading course on students reading?” Below I discuss the findings of this study in relation to this research question.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the students involved in this study report a modification in their reading on two levels:

1. Modification in their approach to reading;
2. Modification in their actual process of reading.

These two levels of modification are, obviously, complementary. Nevertheless, as the second level is where the actual practice takes place, and hence, can be assessed, this level is used to support the students’ self-reports on their approach to reading.

The data analysis in Chapter 5 shows that according to self-reports the students’ modified approach to reading relates to three main categories:

1. Acknowledgement of possible alternative perspectives to the text, as well as the readers’;
2. Acknowledgement of discourse as a social process, through recognition of the role of social context, and the role of sociocognitive processes; and

3. The use of SFG in the recognition of the two categories above.

I would like to argue here that the first two categories point to an increased understanding of reading as a social process. First I would like to recall Fairclough’s model of discourse as a social process, which helped shape the first phase of the course, dedicated to developing understanding of reading as a social process:

![Diagram of Fairclough's model of discourse as a social process](attachment://diagram.png)

(Fairclough 1989:25)

Students’ emphasis on the role of writer’s perspective and social context in their self-reports indicates an awareness of the context and process of production. By acknowledging the writer’s perspective, and the social context, therefore, students distance their processes of interpretation and context of interpretation from that of the production, as opposed to seeing reading as a linear process, as suggested by the traditional model. This, I would like to argue is an important aspect in a critical reading course, as the students not only acknowledge socially constructed realities, but create a safe-distance from the discourse of the text through recognising the writer’s perspective. Indeed, the role of the students’ “standing back” from the text, (New London Group 2000: 35) through distancing themselves from their “identities,
experiences and circumstances” (Wallace 1999: 104) is noticeable in students’ decreased affect in responses to the repeated reading activity (Chapter 5).

I should also note here that acknowledgement of context and processes of production through recognition of the writer’s perspective and the role of social context was reflected in the design of the course, i.e. with the first phase focusing on reading as a social process via pedagogical practices such as working with the “parallel discourses”, “unconventional stories” (Wallace 1992b), and class discussions on the impact of the wider social context on possible readings, as discussed in Chapter 4.

Similarly, acknowledging the possible perspectives of the participants in the text shows awareness of social contexts and sociocognitive processes. Perhaps this is most visible in Tables 5.1.3.1 and 5.1.3.1, where, by stating that the text could have been written “‘From the eyes of NATO” or “like a French or a Dutch”, the students acknowledge different processes and contexts of production and interpretation.

Acknowledgement of different processes and contexts of production and interpretation, arguably due to the recognition of these processes and contexts as socially constructed, also results in decreased affect in students’ responses to the repeated reading activity. For example, in Table 5.1.3.b, Aysegul’s answer to the first activity, “Turkey wants to defend itself and wants weapons; Belgium, France, and Germany disagree. Netherlands agrees with Turkey” becomes “Iraq crisis and France’s, Germany’s, Belgium’s and Netherlands’ opinions about the crisis and Turkey’s situation”. Turkey’s position in students’ responses to the repeated activity, i.e. whether or not it is placed in the centre of the crisis in NATO or in relation to war or other participants has already been discussed in section 5.1.3.

Therefore, students distance themselves not only from the writer’s perspective, but also from their initial positions as readers, which were shaped by their Turkish identities. By recognising possible perspectives on the text, the degree of affect, caused by the tension between their identities and the presentation of the crisis in the text, decreases. This decrease, arguably, is a result of the students’ adopting the view that “readers, writers, and texts (are) socially shaped and shaping” (Clark 1993: 118). Students distance themselves from the text through stepping out of their own “processes of interpretation” and “contexts of interpretation”, and recognise possible “processes of production” and “contexts of production”.
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The questions used as pre- and post-reading questions can be seen in students’ responses in relation to social context and SFG, as argued in section 5.1.2:

- Why is this topic being written about?
- How is the topic being written about?
- What other ways of writing about the topic are there?
- Who is writing to whom?
- What is the topic?

(Wallace 1992a: 71)

Gamze’s answer in Table 5.1.2.a, for example, “I think more on it. I ask myself, ‘when did the writer write this, what was he thinking when he wrote it?’” shows that she is using these questions in relation to the role of social context of production and to the sociocognitive process of production.

As argued in sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3, students integrate their awareness of reading as a social process with SFG analysis, as they are complementary by nature, and were complementary phases of the course. SFG analysis and the understanding of reading as a social process have complementary and recursive natures. Therefore, the understanding of reading as a social process is very often accompanied with recognition of SFG structures in the text.

To sum up, students’ self reports on their approach to reading show increased awareness of social context, possible perspectives on the text other than their own, and effect of lexicogrammatical structures in the text. Their answers to repeated reading activity, similarly, show decreased affect and increased perspective, as indicators of acknowledgement of possible perspectives to the text, increased awareness of social context, and use of SFG analysis. The role of the classroom methodology, e.g. the questions used as pre- and post-reading activities, adopted in this course in raising awareness is also visible in students’ answers as well as the emphasis of the course on reading as a social process and SFG analysis of the texts.

7.1.3 Critical Reading Course and Motivation

As my review of studies on CLA indicated, there is an unresolved issue regarding the relationship between student motivation / resistance and CLA courses (Section 1.3.2).
Thus, the second research question this study seeks answers for is “What is the impact of the critical reading course on student motivation?”.

The students who participated in this study were highly motivated English learners, already specialising in English language. They expressed an interest in the language, in EFL as a means for communication and as a means for strong external rewards, i.e. university education and employment, through a very strong reinforcer, YDS.

However, at the same time, ironically, they showed very low motivation for their traditional reading courses in the school setting. The students were ‘alienated’ from the school context in general, and from the traditional reading practices in particular due to:

1. The lack of optimal arousal these practices offered to these students with a very high level of English proficiency, as these practices were seen as repeating themselves over the years (Stipek 2002). There was a lack of a relationship between the classroom practices and students’ immediate lives;
2. The degree of external control involved in these practices, as the students needed to express themselves, or at least exist as individuals, in the process of such reading practices (Ushioda 1996);
3. The low degree of communicational practices offered to the students in the classroom settings due to high external control (Ushioda 1996).
4. Paradoxically, the strong reinforcer (YDS) that definitely contributes to the students’ high motivation to learn English also leads to classroom practices that adds up to students’ low motivation for reading courses.

In this respect, students’ alienation from educational practices is similar to the context of Leal’s study (1998); the context of this research is also similar to the context of Kramer-Dahl’s study regarding the competitiveness of the educational system (2001); and to the context of Zinkgraf (2003) regarding the methodologies being adopted, i.e. SFG analysis of texts, in an EFL context, as reviewed in Section 1.3.1. Although this study is different from the studies above as it is carried out in an EFL high school context, the findings are important as they will help build on the understanding of CLA in various contexts.
Similar to Zinkgraf’s study, some students stated that they found the grammatical analysis boring in the course. However, the proportion of students expressing this was lower than in the study of Zinkgraf (2003). Moreover, on the contrary to Zinkgraf’s study, those students who stated that they found SFG boring did not express demotivation from the course, but stated that they found SFG beneficial overall. The concern raised by these students was that SFG was a new grammar, and that there was not enough time to internalise it before moving on to and feeling confident about the analysis. Hence, in this respect, it is not an inherent aspect of the model adopted in this study, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 4, that SFG and SFG analysis are threats to student motivation; as the students suggested with a longer time available for instruction and practice of textual analysis and SFG, this aspect could have been overcome in this study.

Unlike Kramer-Dahl’s study, (2001), the students, except for Betul, did not have problems in adapting to the critical reading practices in this study. On the contrary, as a result of discrepancies between their realities and the educational practices, the students were alienated from school practices. The possibility of linking their personal experiences, their realities, to the critical reading classroom together with authentic texts and classroom practices with lesser degree of external control provided higher motivation for the critical reading lessons, with higher participation and persistence, and feeling of enjoyment, which is very similar to the findings of Leal (1998). As discussed in Chapter 1, authentic texts and classroom practices with lesser degree of control from the teacher are fundamental aspects of critical pedagogy, CLA in particular. I discussed the value of the critical reading course in relation to intrinsic motivation in Sections 7.2.2.1 and 7.2.2.2.

Besides, from the “Western”, “Non-Western” perspective, the findings show that ‘appropriacy’ of a critical reading course was not an issue in the context of this study, which is a non-western context. The students, who are members of a non-western context, did not report frustration or confusion, which were specifically inquired about during the course.

Rather the problem of resistance was born from the educational system. As discussed in Section 6.4 and below, the resistance they did display was due to the competitiveness of the exam system, which has its roots in the current economic situation, and not due to a ‘non-western way of thinking or being’.
The critical reading course provided the means to reduce alienation from school practices, but at the same time, encountered resistance due to the demands of a strong external reinforcer, YDS. As stated above the students expressed relatively higher motivation for the critical reading course and welcomed the opportunities it provided, as well as increased competence in reading in English as a foreign language. Nonetheless, because the course failed to provide practice for the exam specifically and directly, the students expressed resistance.

Interestingly, showing awareness of the inconsistency between their dissatisfaction regarding educational practices, for instance lack of student control over the classroom procedures or lack of practicing oral communication skills, and the demands from the current educational system, i.e. preparing for the YDS, the students expressed awareness of the role of the current educational system in their resistance.

7.2 Implications

7.2.1 Implications for Research

As I shall discuss in this section, this study contributes to the body of research on developing critical reading skills. It was carried out in a high school and in EFL context, whereas preceding research was conducted in ESL contexts and at university level.

From an EFL high school perspective, its implications for the body of research in developing critical reading skills can be discussed in terms of adopting and adapting the methodology offered by the studies conducted in ESL university education contexts.

This study also provides data for the literature on motivation, specifically for the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation and with regard to the role of extrinsic reinforcers in this distinction.

7.2.1.1 The Methodology of Developing Critical Reading Skills Offered by the Preceding Studies

The methodology adopted in this research was based on that offered by Wallace (Wallace 1992). As discussed in Chapters 3 and 5, the methodology of the course
given in this study was based on her studies in this area, which were conducted in ESL university contexts.

This research shows that the methodology offered by Wallace to develop critical reading skills can be adopted in a Turkish Anatolian High School context. As discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, the framework she provides for analysis, as well as the questions to be posed to assist the SFG analysis, together with other pedagogical applications such as 'parallel discourses, unconventional discourses, prove to be a valuable scaffold to develop a critical reading course for the teacher and, therefore, to develop a critical reading approach for the students.

Besides, the pre-, while-, post- reading activities suggested by Wallace (1992) provided the means not only to develop an understanding of language as a formal system in the students involved in this study but also to increase their intrinsic motivation, which was a very welcome outcome in the context of this study.

This study shows that based on the studies of Wallace the students involved in this study adopted a critical approach to reading using the methods and techniques offered to them by the course. Based on these methodologies and techniques, their critical approach manifested itself, in terms of acknowledgement of different perspectives through recognition of the social context and sociocognitive processes and SFG analysis, all of which are complementary and are necessary conditions of CLA. Thus, the data from the students’ self-reports and from the repeated reading activity show that these three main categories were blended into each other and were visible in different combinations, also resulting in a change in the degree of affect involved in reading, which is another indication of students’ distancing themselves from the status of ‘ideal reader’ (Wallace 1992, 1995, 1999).

Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 6, the students not only reported a change in their approach to reading but also questioned the role of Turkish grammatical structures in their readings in daily life, demonstrating an understanding of language as a formal system (Wallace 1992).

Hence, this study shows that the methodology offered by Wallace to develop critical reading skills resulted in developing a critical approach to reading among the EFL high school students involved in this study.
7.2.1.2 Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

This study also shows that the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can become blurry, due to the dynamic nature of human beings.

The students involved in this study were highly motivated students who reported both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Their reported reasons for studying English were based on an interest in the language and the extrinsic rewards they expected to gain, e.g. job, university. Nevertheless, both reasons were equally strong, since they were English language learners who chose English as their main subject of study.

Hence, the extrinsic reasons to study English can change into or give birth to intrinsic reasons to maintain self-worth, or intrinsic reasons at the beginning can give birth to extrinsic reasons to adjust to the social requirements, in a context like Turkey where studying in the university or finding a job is extremely competitive.

However, such intermingling of these two types of motivation should perhaps be expected to be reflected only in a very high degree of motivation, as it requires internalisation of extrinsic reasons by the students.

7.2.1.3 The Role of Extrinsic Reinforcer in Motivation

This study demonstrates that a strong extrinsic reinforcer can play an important role in relation to the fuzziness of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. YDS, being a very strong extrinsic reinforcer in the context of this study, manifested itself in students' reported reasons for studying English. However, its role as an extrinsic reinforcer was different than the literature offered in this area (Stipek 2002, Ushioda 1996). Contrary to the research previously done in this area, it provided persistence in studying outside the educational settings and promised further persistence even after the reward was to be gained, i.e. the university or the job, through the planned career that is related to the language itself. Moreover, for those students who expressed the importance of YDS or finding a job through passing YDS, in spite of YDS's being an extrinsic reinforcer, did express enjoyment of studying English in general, although not in school setting, though the studies done on this area show the contrary.

The unconventional nature of this extrinsic reinforcer lies, again, in the dynamic characteristics of human nature. Although an extrinsic reinforcer is an
undesirable condition to promote intrinsic motivation or the desirable outcomes of intrinsic motivation, YDS seems to provide some of these outcomes, i.e. persistence in learning and taking pleasure in learning.

However, it also causes a great obstacle in terms of school education. It creates its own demands and requirements from the school education through students’ expectations of school education. If a strong extrinsic reinforcer is introduced from outside the school context, e.g. society or the exam system, the reinforcer is likely to mould the school education to its own requirements, as happens in the context of this study. Under these circumstances, school education is expected to cater for the students’ needs, i.e. the requirements of the reinforcer, resulting in a sacrifice of educational goals (Erdoğan, 2005). Hence, in such cases it is essential that educational institutions negotiate with these requirements, defining and redefining their goals. Otherwise, a clash between the educational institutions, educational goals and the reinforcer is inevitable, and this is very likely to result in 1) sacrificing educational goals, and 2) alienation of the students from the school context.

This study shows that such alienation can have a vicious pattern and although the students are aware of this and state that it is an undesirable condition for their actual classroom practices, a challenge to the conditions creating the alienation can also be resisted by the students themselves if this challenge seems to be clashing with the extrinsic reinforcer.

This insight is also valuable as it shows that the students involved in this study did not show resistance on the individual level, as was anticipated before the course, but from an institutional level; and that the resistance did not come in the guise of personal resistance but directly from the system, through the students, who not only were well aware that the resistance was related to the exam system but also voiced this themselves.

Because neither the students’ needs can be ignored nor the educational goals should be sacrificed, under such conditions, the educational institution should negotiate its position and the students’ expectations from it, and find ways of both catering to the students’ needs and achieving its goals.
7.2.2 Implications for Teaching

7.2.2.1 Critical Reading Course and Intrinsic Motivation

This study shows that the critical reading course can help to increase or develop intrinsic motivation in an EFL context with high English proficiency levels through: 1) relating to the students' own realities, 2) the classroom practices, 3) the materials used.

By its very nature a critical reading course will provide a new approach to reading which is based on the principle of relating the classroom practices to the students' own realities as discussed in sections 1.1.2, 1.2.4, and 1.3. Students' realities finding their place in the classroom practices results in increased intrinsic motivation, as was the case in this study, through helping students to develop competency as readers in their immediate lives, as well as language learners in the classroom.

Indeed the students who participated in this study expressed that they found the critical reading course in this study enjoyable as it presented a new way of looking at reading, which not only is similar to the way the students “read newspapers or articles”, section 6.3.1, and enables the students to “contribute” with their ideas, section 6.2.1; but also helps them to adopt a different approach to the texts as discussed in sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2. The critical approach that the critical reading course offers also serves as an optimal arousal for the students with high English proficiency, for whom traditional reading classes fail to arouse curiosity or surprise.

Secondly, based on the principles discussed in 1.1.2, 1.2.4, and 1.3.1.2 the classroom practices that the critical reading course uses foster student involvement through group work, classroom discussions and enable the students to relate their immediate lives to the classroom setting, decreasing the degree of external control. As discussed in 6.3, increased student communication in the classroom and decreased external control can lead to higher participation from the students since it helps students to practice their language skills in the classroom as well as giving them more control over the classroom procedures, enabling them to bring their own realities to the classroom, which reportedly lead to increased persistence in this study.

And finally, the materials used in the critical reading course are typically authentic materials which provide optimal arousal and help developing competency as language learners besides relating to the students' own realities, as discussed in
sections 1.1.2, 1.2.4 and 4.2. Especially in an EFL context, where access to authentic materials, which relate to the students' immediate lives, is not easy, or is limited to the Internet to a great extent, the texts provide a challenge, an optimal arousal. The students who participated in this study took pride and performed with increased self-efficacy in studying authentic texts from a variety of genres, newspaper articles, poems, stories, advertisements, magazine horoscopes, etc.

Therefore, based on the principles and practices of CL, and CLA, the critical reading course provides optimal arousal, helps develop competencies both inside and outside the classroom, and decreases external control through relating students' realities to the classroom settings, developing critical reading skills and through the activities and materials used.

7.2.2.2 Use of These Materials and Activities in Traditional Reading Courses to Increase Intrinsic Motivation

The critical reading course provides the means to increase intrinsic motivation as discussed in section 7.2.2.1. However, based on the data on the role of texts and activities used in this course, it is possible to suggest that similar texts and activities can be used to increase intrinsic motivation in similar EFL contexts.

The role of the materials and activities in intrinsic motivation is reviewed in the section above. Although the element of optimal arousal and competency provided by a new approach to reading will not be available, this can be compensated for by providing it through other means, or exploiting the optimal arousal and competency raised by the texts and the activities. Similarly, in traditional reading courses, the constant link between the students' immediate lives and critical reading lessons will be missing. Hence, finding other ways of relating reading practices to the students' own realities will be needed.

However, use of authentic texts in a number of genres; use of activities that decrease the level of external control and increase student control and communication; and involving tasks that promote a degree of novelty can be used in traditional reading courses to promote intrinsic motivation, in contexts similar to the context of this research.
7.2.2.3 Critical Reading Course Benefits Reading in General

Students involved in this study reported that the critical reading course helped them to improve themselves as foreign language readers. Authentic materials prove to be an invaluable resource for the students to see the actual use of language structures, a point repeatedly reported by the students themselves. Besides, they result in increased self-efficiency as readers. As reviewed above, the use of authentic materials helped the students to achieve a perception of higher self-efficiency, achieving better performance from the students as readers.

Moreover, the students reported that asking questions to the text via the post-reading questions posed in the course was used as a strategy to help them not only to adopt a critical approach but also to better comprehend the text.

And finally, through promoting increased intrinsic motivation, a critical reading course increases participation and persistence in the reading tasks. The students involved reported increased effort and persistence while reading a text, both as a curricular and as an extracurricular activity.

7.2.3 Implications for the Context of This Study

7.2.3.1 Developing Critical Thinking Skills

This study aimed at providing research to develop critical thinking skills in Turkish high school context. In the curriculum provided by the Ministry of National Education of the Turkish Republic, “developing critical thinking skills” is among the aims of the reading lessons. However, due to the lack of research in this area, the teachers are not provided with any further explanation or means regarding how to achieve this goal, in spite of the fact that the curriculum provides detailed explanations, goals, objectives, expected behavior from the student and detailed lesson plans to achieve these for other skills. As a result of this, this aim goes unnoticed at the moment in school contexts.

Hence, this study can serve as a basis for developing ways to promote critical reading skills in Turkish high school contexts and as a basis for further research on this area, in different school contexts, i.e. not only Anatolian high schools like those in which this study was conducted.
7.2.3.2 YDS and Critical Reading

The students involved in this study demonstrated a high degree of alienation from school education, and an awareness and acceptance of this alienation, because of the role of YDS as a gateway to higher education and in their lives in the long term. Thus, this study shows that there is an immediate need for the Turkish educational system, governed by the Ministry of National Education, to negotiate its position, aims, goals, and objectives with ÖSYM, the exam board for YDS, to appropriate both the educational system and the exam so that school education can meet the needs of the students and can achieve its aims at the same time.

Thus, this study provides a basis for further research to mitigate the alienation, once the conditions that actively provoke such alienation are eliminated.
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSION

Based on the assumptions and principles of CLA (Chapters 1 and 2), this study investigates the impact of a critical reading course in Turkish Anatolian High School context on students' approach to reading and to reading lessons. To this end, a seventeen-week course was given to two Anatolian High School Grade 10 foreign language branch students (Chapter 4). Students' approach to reading and reading lessons was investigated throughout the course through questionnaires, interviews, and repeated reading activity (Chapter 3).

The first research question, “what is the impact of a critical reading course on students’ approach to reading” was discussed on the basis of students’ self-reports and responses to a repeated reading activity (Chapter 5), while self-report data was discussed to answer the second research question “what is the impact of critical reading course on students’ approach to reading lessons?” (Chapter 6). The findings are further discussed in Chapter 7 in relation to the appropriacy of the critical reading methodology adopted by this study and the two research questions.

It is argued in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 that both students’ self reports and students' responses to the repeated reading activity point out that the students adopted a more critical approach to written texts by the end of the course. It is also argued that the critical reading course can provide features to increase intrinsic motivation. Indeed, the students who participated in this study reported increased motivation for reading lessons. On the other hand, the critical reading course also encountered resistance stemming from the exam system in the context of this study.

In this final chapter, I would like to conclude by discussing the limitations of the study and implications for further research.

8.1 Limitations of the Study

Some main limitations of this study result from its having had to be pre-planned and applied top-down due to the context being an EFL context and the requirements of the policies of the Ministry of National Education of the Turkish Republic. As discussed
in Chapter 4, the students did not have easy access to written texts. Therefore, I had to bring various texts to the schools with me. In this respect, the power relations in the classroom were still top-down and highly asymmetrical. Although I offered the students different texts to choose from at times, it was still the teacher who decided on the texts to be analysed, as discussed in 7.1.1 above. Secondly, due to the policies of the Ministry of National Education, I had to follow the course plan I presented with the proposal, which led to limited flexibility in the classroom.

Additionally, I did not have a broad understanding of the classroom dynamics of the classes that participated in this study, due to the limited time of the course. Although seventeen weeks were enough to be able to observe these dynamics, and to become an insider in the classroom, I was still not a member of the permanent staff and my position was limited to being an outsider researcher. For example, as this was a research project, the course did not have a formal assessment, and all the findings are based on students’ voluntary contributions.

The time of the research, as remarked above, was right after the Iraq War started. Therefore, the findings are affected by students’ exposure to news elsewhere. However, this can also considered to be a strength as it is a claim of this study that there will be changes in the social reality which can have an impact on a critical reading classroom.

8.2 Implications for Further Research

This study was conducted with Anatolian High School, foreign language branch, 10th grade students. To be able to build on the literature on CLA in various contexts, and to build an understanding of developing a critical reading approach with Turkish High School students, further research is required with Turkish high school students from a different educational background.

Secondly, this study was conducted on the basis of students’ voluntary contributions, as discussed in 7.1.5. Further research with formal assessments and/or assignments will provide further enlightenment regarding the impact of critical reading course as part of school settings.

Although materials and activities of the critical reading course, together with its pedagogical practices, helped to increase the students’ motivation for reading practices at school, they can be adopted and adapted for traditional reading lessons.
Further research on traditional reading lessons adapting these principles will help build not only the literature on motivation and reading but also that on critical reading, in the context of this study.

Next, although the students expressed that the critical reading course is beneficial for YDS, i.e. it helps them to answer paragraph questions (Chapter 6) further research is required in this area as it was not the aim of this research to explore this relationship.

Another point that emerged from the data analysis is the problem of adapting SFG instruction, and the duration of the course. Further research is needed to find ways of adapting SFG instruction into the course.

It was not the aim of this research to explore the impact of the critical reading course on students’ reading in the long term. Further research on this would provide invaluable insights into the impact of a critical reading course on students’ reading habits.

And finally, it was not the aim of this research to find out whether or not the students transfer their critical reading approach to their L1. Further research on this would provide data not only on the students’ critical approach to reading but also on the issues of emancipation and empowerment.
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Appendix 1  Questionnaires

QUESTIONNAIRE 1

Name: 
Age: 

SECTION A: ABOUT YOU

1. Please tick ✓ the appropriate box

Male □  Female □

2. How long have you been studying English? Please tick ✓ the appropriate box

1-3 years □  4-6 years □  7-10 years □  more □

3. How many hours do you spend studying English out of class (i.e. extra-tuition)?
   Daily ___________________________ hours
   Weekly ___________________________ hours

4. Please tick the appropriate box(es)
I’m learning English because:

- I want to get a good job. □
- I want to attend university. □
- I enjoy learning a foreign language. □
- I want to study abroad. □
- I’m interested in British/ American culture. □
- I’m interested in English literature. □
- I want to travel and see other countries. □
- I want to pursue my career in future. □
- I want to be able to communicate with people from other countries. □
- I like the culture and people of the English speaking countries. □
- I want to live abroad. □
- I want to use Internet more efficiently □
- I need English to follow the technological developments. □
- Other.
   Please specify ____________________________
   ____________________________

5. Why did you choose to study in a foreign language focused branch? Please write below.
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
6. Please mark the appropriate box according to how often you read the following items (in English and/or in Turkish), state your reasons and name your favourite one(s) from each category, if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>daily</th>
<th>weekly</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>Name your favourite(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspapers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poems</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: ABOUT THE ENGLISH LESSONS

1. Which of the following areas of English, i.e. speaking, listening, writing, grammar, do you find enjoyable? Please tick the appropriate box(es)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I enjoy very much</th>
<th>I enjoy much</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
<th>I don't enjoy very much</th>
<th>I don't enjoy at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How many hours do you spend studying in each of the following areas of English weekly (e.g. homework or extra-tuition)? Please write in the relevant box

speak______ hours  listening______ hours  reading______ hours

writing______ hours  grammar______ hours

3. Which of the following areas of English, i.e. speaking, listening, writing, grammar, do you find beneficial? Please tick the appropriate box(es)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very beneficial</th>
<th>beneficial</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
<th>Not very beneficial</th>
<th>Not beneficial at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Please explain what you find enjoyable and/or beneficial about each of the following?

a) speaking
   enjoyable because
   beneficial because

b) listening
   enjoyable because
   beneficial because

c) reading
   enjoyable because
   beneficial because

d) writing
   enjoyable because
   beneficial because

e) grammar
   enjoyable because
   beneficial because
### SECTION C: ABOUT THE READING LESSONS

1. What do you think the purpose of the reading lessons is? How do you find them beneficial?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. What kinds of texts do you read in your reading lessons?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

3. Which ones do you enjoy?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

4. Think of a good reading lesson you have had recently. Why was it good?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

5. What kinds of texts would you like to read? / What would you like to read?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
SECTION D: ABOUT THE GRAMMAR LESSONS

1. What do you think the purpose of the grammar lessons is? How do you find them beneficial?

2. Think of a good grammar lesson you have had recently. Why was it good?

Please use this space for any additional comments

THANK YOU!
QUESTIONNAIRE 2

**Name:**
**Age:**

SECTION A: ABOUT YOU

1. How many hours do you spend studying English out of class (e.g. homework, extra-tuition)?
   Daily _____________________ hours
   Weekly _____________________ hours

SECTION B: ABOUT THE ENGLISH LESSONS

1. Which of the following areas of English, i.e. speaking, listening, writing, grammar, do you find enjoyable? Please tick the appropriate box(es)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I enjoy very much</th>
<th>I enjoy</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
<th>I don't enjoy very much</th>
<th>I don't enjoy at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How many hours do you spend studying in each of the following areas of English weekly (e.g. homework or extra-tuition)? Please write in the relevant box

   speaking _____ hours   listening _____ hours   reading _____ hours
   writing _____ hours    grammar _____ hours
3. Which of the following areas of English, i.e. speaking, listening, writing, grammar, do you find beneficial? Please tick the appropriate box(es)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very beneficial</th>
<th>beneficial</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
<th>Not very beneficial</th>
<th>Not beneficial at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please explain what you find enjoyable and/or beneficial about each of the following?

a) speaking

b) listening

c) reading

d) writing

e) grammar
SECTION C: ABOUT THE READING LESSONS

1. What do you think the purpose of the reading lessons is? How do you find them beneficial?


2. What do you think of the texts we read in the class? E.g. do you enjoy them, do you find them beneficial, etc.?


3. What kinds of texts would you like to read? / What would you like to read?


4. Think of a good reading lesson you have had recently. Why was it good?


5. Is there any difference in the way you approach reading lessons? If yes, please explain in what way(s).


6. Are our reading lessons in any way different from the previous reading lessons you had? If yes, please explain in what way(s)?


7. If you find our reading lessons different than your previous reading lessons, please state if this difference is positive or negative and explain WHY.


8. Is there a difference in your approach to written texts in any way? If yes, please explain in what way.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

9. Please circle the appropriate answer and state the reason for your response to each statement in the space provided below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I enjoy the texts we read in the reading lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I enjoy the activities we have in the reading lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I like / don’t like is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I enjoy the reading lessons overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I enjoy / don’t enjoy is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I find the lessons confusing sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I find confusing is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SECTION D: ABOUT THE GRAMMAR LESSONS

2. What do you think the purpose of the grammar lessons is? How do you find it beneficial?

______________________________________________________________________________

2. Think of a good grammar lesson you have had recently. Why was it good?

______________________________________________________________________________

Please use this space for any additional comments

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
**SECTION A: ABOUT THE ENGLISH LESSONS**

1. Which of the following areas of English, i.e. speaking, listening, writing, grammar, do you find enjoyable? Please tick the appropriate box(es)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I enjoy very much</th>
<th>I enjoy</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
<th>I don't enjoy very much</th>
<th>I don't enjoy at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How many hours do you spend studying in each of the following areas of English weekly (e.g. homework or extra-tuition)? Please write in the relevant box

- Speaking _____ hours
- Listening _____ hours
- Reading _____ hours
- Writing _____ hours
- Grammar _____ hours
3. Which of the following areas of English, i.e. speaking, listening, writing, grammar, do you find beneficial? Please tick the appropriate box(es).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very beneficial</th>
<th>beneficial</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
<th>Not very beneficial</th>
<th>Not beneficial at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please explain what you find enjoyable and/or beneficial about each of the following?

a) speaking

b) listening

c) reading

d) writing

e) grammar
1. What do you think the purpose of the reading lessons is? How do you find them beneficial?
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e) I feel that I have benefited from this course as a reader  YES  NO
   Because
   
   
   
   
   f) I prefer to have a reading course focusing on the university entrance exam
   YES  NO
   Because
   
   
   
   
   6. Is there any change in your attitude towards extra-tuition reading, i.e.
   either in English or Turkish? If yes, please state below the nature of the
   change
   
   
   
   
   
   7. Is there any change in your attitude towards the reading lessons? If yes,
   please state below the nature of the change.
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**SECTION D: ABOUT THE GRAMMAR LESSONS**

1. What do you think the purpose of the grammar lessons is? How do you find it beneficial?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Is there any change in your attitude towards the grammar? If yes, please state below the nature of the change.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

**SECTION E: ABOUT THE COURSE**

1. What did you learn from the reading course? Please write what you believe to be the most important ones.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2. Please write two things you liked and two things you didn’t like about the course.

- What I liked:
  a) _____________________________________________________________________
  b) _____________________________________________________________________

- What I didn’t like:
  a) _____________________________________________________________________
  b) _____________________________________________________________________

Please use this space for any additional comments

THANK YOU!

😊 😄 😁 😂 😆 😍 😍 😄 😊
### Appendix 2

#### WEEK 1

**1. Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to the course and to the research. Explain the aims of the</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>introduction of the course</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research, the content of the course, what they will be expected to do,</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. read some texts at home first, prepare assignments, answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaires, participate in interviews, that they will have a pre-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>test and post-test, and that the group and class discussions will be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recorded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give questionnaire 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Understanding students’ attitude towards reading, grammar, reading.</td>
<td>Questionnaire 1</td>
<td>Questionnaire 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WEEK 2

#### 1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Repeated reading activity 1</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>Collecting data on students' level of critical reading before the course</td>
<td>Repeated Reading Activity 1</td>
<td>Repeated Reading Activity 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### WEEK 2

#### 2. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ---  | Introduction and greeting.  
- Give students certain situations, i.e. greeting their parents, greeting their teacher at school, greeting their friends, greeting their neighbours and ask them to consider how they would greet in these situations. Pair work, | 15 minutes | Raising students' awareness in the way the context is effective in the use of language and in the roles of the production | Week 2 worksheet 1 | |
students act the situations. (5min.)
- Students report back the differences in the way they have greeted in each situation. (5 min.)
- Class discussion on the most common ways of greeting in each situation and why. (5min.)
- Take a set of newspapers, novels, poems, magazines, etc. to the class. Make groups of 4 and give each group a set. Ask them to group the texts in the set in terms of their similarities and differences. (5 min.)
- Each group reports back (5min.) While they report back, I will write the results on the board.
- Students discuss in groups of four:
  1. Who is it written for/Who reads these texts? Why?
  2. Who wrote it? Why?
  3. Do you read similar things in Turkish? (10min.)
- Students report back. Give feedback, introduce terms as production, audience (10 min.)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students act the situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students report back the differences in the way they have greeted in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussion on the most common ways of greeting in each situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and why.                   (5min.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a set of newspapers, novels, poems, magazines, etc. to the class.</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make groups of 4 and give each group a set. Ask them to group the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texts in the set in terms of their similarities and differences. (5 min.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each group reports back (5min.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While they report back, I will write the results on the board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students discuss in groups of four:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is it written for/Who reads these texts? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who wrote it? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you read similar things in Turkish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students report back. Give feedback, introduce terms as production,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience (10 min.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To draw attention to different genres, different audiences, processes of production and interpretation, students' own identities as individuals and on different cultures.

---

the set of texts including newspaper articles, novels, poems, magazine articles, blackboard
### WEEK 3
### 1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rapunzel   | • Ask students what they remember about the story, what the story is about and who the characters are.  
             • Read the story                                                                 | 5 minutes | the text     |           |                                  |
|            | • Introduction of the unfamiliar words                                   | 10 minutes|              |           |                                  |
|            | • Ask while reading questions for the students to answer while reading the story (students read the story twice): | 5 minutes |              |           |                                  |
|            |   1. Why did the husband enter into the witch’s garden?                    | 15 minutes|              |           |                                  |
|            |   2. What happened to the baby?                                           |           |              |           |                                  |
|            |   3. Where did the witch keep Rapunzel?                                   |           |              |           |                                  |
|            |   4. How did the witch get into the tower?                                |           |              |           |                                  |
|            |   5. Why couldn’t Rapunzel leave her room in the tower?                   |           |              |           |                                  |
|            |   6. How did the prince get into the tower?                               |           |              |           |                                  |
|            |   7. What did the witch do when she                                        |           |              |           |                                  |
8. Did Rapunzel and the prince get together again?
Students read once, then give the questions, they read for the second time answering the questions
- Students report back.
- Ask students to tell the story in their own words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students fill in the worksheet in groups of six</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students report back</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask: is there any difference between what you remember and what you think now?</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group discussion: what other ways of writing about this topic are there?</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class discussion: what other ways of writing about this topic are there?</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Week 3
2. Hour

Research instruments to be used
WEEK 4
1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reminding the story “Rapunzel”: Ask what the story was about, what they thought about the story, who were the characters, what they thought of the characters. Class discussion using the week 3 worksheet.</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Building on Week 3 about reading as a social process.</td>
<td>week 3 worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Check the homework</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Practical</td>
<td>• Ask what “The practical princess” might be about, what the story might be about, who the characters might be, and who might have produced this article for whom? Give as a worksheet. Class discussion.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>week 4 worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td>• Read the story</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of the unfamiliar words</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ask while reading questions for the students to answer while reading the story (students read the story twice):</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What does the dragon want?
2. What does Princess Bedelia do?
3. Who is Lord Garp? What does he want?
4. What does Princess Bedelia do?
5. Why does Lord Garp put Bedelia in tower?
6. Can Princess Bedelia get out of her room?
7. Who is the man in the tower?
8. Why does he sleep?
9. How do they get out of the tower?

Students read once, then give the questions, they read for the second time answering the questions

- Students report back

- Give the feedback sheet for the students to answer in groups of six

- Students report back

- Class discussion (if there is enough time, followed by a group discussion first): Compare the two stories according to the worksheets. What are the similarities? What are the differences? Why is Rapunzel re-written? Which story appeals to you more? Why? Which story sounds

10 minutes
5 minutes
5 minutes
5 minutes?
WEEK 5
1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Ask students preferences in reading. Who likes to read poems? Which poets and what kinds of poems they like. What is their favourite theme? Ask if they read English literature. If yes, which writers/poets</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Building on the previous two weeks and developing a model for reading as a social process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read the poem twice</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of the vocabulary</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While-reading: While you are reading consider what this poem is about. Students read the poem</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After reading, they discuss and fill in the worksheets in-groups of six.</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students report back</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mention that this poem was written during World War I. Ask how the people then might have answered the question</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
questions in the worksheet. Ask the students to read the poem again.

- Ask how people might have answered these questions then. Students discuss the worksheet in groups of six again
- Students report back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>10 minutes</th>
<th>5 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America the unbeautiful</td>
<td>• Put visuals on the greenhouse effect on the board and ask students what they think of the pictures</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Students discuss in groups of 4: what they know about the cause, impact and possible solutions to the greenhouse effect? 5 minutes
• Students report back and while they report back, I will write on the board 2 minutes
• Mention Kyoto protocol and ask what they know about it. 2 minutes
• Mention that this is a text about Kyoto protocol. Ask the students to read it and that there are unfamiliar words but do not worry at this stage, we will discuss about them later. 5 minutes
• Introduce the vocabulary 5 minutes
• Read the first six paragraphs once 5 minutes
• Students read again. 5 minutes
• Ask the students to read the article one more time and answer the following questions: 5 minutes
  1. Why does the writer say that Bush has abdicated the leadership role of America? 5 minutes
  2. Why is the support of Japan, Australia, and Canada important?
3. What does Bush question?
4. Why, according to the article, doesn’t Bush want the Kyoto Protocol?
   • Get the answers
   
   • Students discuss in groups of six: What is this text about? Who/What is mentioned? What is the writer’s attitude towards the Kyoto protocol and to those involved? Who produced this article? For whom is it produced? Give it as a handout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Hot Air on Kyoto</td>
<td>• Give the handouts to the students’ answers that were on the board the previous lesson. Ask students what the text “America the unbeautiful” was about.</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Building on the understanding of written discourse as a social process. Raising awareness on the ideal audience,</td>
<td>handouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
processes of production and interpretation, raising awareness on possible different ways of writing about the same topic.

- What other ways of writing about the same topic are there? Check homework (Collect the homework after this activity or at the end of the lesson).

- Ask what “more hot air on Kyoto” might be about, what/who might be mentioned, who might have produced this article, for whom, and what the writer’s attitude towards Kyoto and those mentioned in the article might be. Give as a worksheet. Class discussion.

- Ask students to read the article telling them not to worry about the vocabulary at this stage

- Introduce the vocabulary

- Read the article

- Students read the article answering

2 minutes

3 minutes

3 minutes

5 minutes

3 minutes

7 minutes

week 3 worksheet
while-reading questions:  minutes
1. What did Mr Bush say about the Kyoto Protocol?
2. What was EAP’s message?
3. What does professor Bjorn Lomborg say?
4. Why is his view important?
5. Are there any advantages of global warming? If yes, what?

- Students report back  5 minutes
- Students discuss the worksheet in groups of six  10 minutes

WEEK 6
2. Hour

Activity  Time  Aim  Materials  Research instruments to be used

- Comparison of the two texts. Ask what are the differences in terms of the questions on the worksheet between two articles? What do you think? Do you agree? Which of the aspects in the worksheet do you think are influential in the way these texts are different? What other ways of writing about the same topic are

blackboard, and notes on the board to prepare a handout
there? Can we say one interpretation is better than the other? Is it possible to read/interpret texts differently? Can a text be read in more than one way? What are the factors influencing reading?

- Group work, groups of four. Prepare a poster on reading having discussed the following points: what are the possibilities of multiple readings? What are the features in determining possible readings? What would you say affects interpretations of a text? What would you say affects the writing process of a text? Which genres do you find easier to identify other possible perspectives? Do you think a text could and/or should be challenged?
- Put the posters on the walls.
- Classroom discussion on posters
- Mention classical reading model and Fairclough’s model of reading as a social process

15 minutes

A3 papers, markers and blu-tac.

10 minutes

10 minutes
### WEEK 7

1. & 2. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to interpersonal meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEK 8

1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>take advertisements, magazine articles, newspaper articles, a story, textbook instructions, etc. to the classroom. Ask which mood they expect to see in which type of text more commonly? why?</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Developing on mood and exploring the relationship between the reader and the text further.</td>
<td>Set of texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups of 4: give each student a text to analyse and after they finish they discuss the results with the group members. Students report back. Write on the board.</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group discussion, groups of 4: why certain mood types are more common in different genres? What kind of an effect does this create on you as a reader? students report back, class discussion

minutes
10

minutes
10

2. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glory of Woman</td>
<td>Set the scene in which the poem was written, i.e. 1918, during World War I. Ask which countries were fighting? Why? Brainstorming on the title. What can it be about? Who has written it? To whom is it addressed?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Building on modality. Exploring the use of personal pronouns in with regard to the relationship between the reader and the text, the reader and the writer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read the poem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students read the poem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class discussion: What is the poem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about? Who is narrating? What/ who can he/ she be talking about?
Underline all the personal pronouns in the poem and discuss in groups of four what is associated with women and what is associated with men?
Students report back
Class discussion: Where does the writer put himself? What effect does the use of personal pronouns on you as a reader? Do you agree with the poem? Why/ why not?

WEEK 9
1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join our asylum campaign</td>
<td>Explain the debate on asylum seekers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read the text</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students read the article

ask students to form groups of four and underline the personal pronouns in the article and discuss what we and they stand for in each part.
students report back

ask students to consider the use of modality in groups of four together with the results of personal pronouns ask students to discuss what this might mean in terms of the newspaper's perspective to the issue of the asylum seekers in groups of four.
students report back. Class discussion

Ask students to analyse individually the way the people are introduced. What kind of information is given? Is all the information given in introducing all the people? Why/Why not? What effect does it have you as a reader? Class discussion
Give the feedback sheet

2. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Last Resort

What is it about? Who has written it? To whom is it written? Class discussion 5 min.

Read the article

Students read the article

students analyse the article using appraisal systems and answer what is it about, why is it written, who produced it, for whom, what other ways of writing are there,

Students report back, class discussion 10 minutes

instruments to be used

developing on interpersonal meanings, appraisal systems to explore writer's attitude towards the subject and the expected position of the reader

WEEK 10

1. & 2. Hour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to experiential meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEEK 11**

**1. Hour**

**Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>Develop on interpersonal and experiential meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asylum seekers**

1. Reminding the text. What is it about?  
2. Who are the participants?

3. Read the article
4. Students read the article
5. Students analyse the article in pairs
6. Students report back. Class discussion:  
   What are the processes used most commonly? What is the distribution of processes among the participants? What is the effect of these choices?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glory of</td>
<td>Recalling the poem. What is it about?</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Developing on experiential meanings, exploring the way the topic is dealt with, the way the participants are represented and raising awareness on the writer's choices' effects on the reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask if the students remember the kind of processes and participants used in the poem. Note the answers on the board students read the poem</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students analyse the poem in pairs</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students report back</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups of four: discussion on what kind of an effect the choices of the writer creates</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class discussion 10 minutes

**WEEK 12**

1. **Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapunzel</td>
<td>Students re-read the story</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
<td>Developing on the previous two weeks</td>
<td>Research instruments to be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get students answers on the analysis</td>
<td>23 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss the distribution of the processes to the participants and its impacts.</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Practical Princess</td>
<td>Students re-read the story</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research instruments to be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get the results of the analysis from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student
Discussion on the distribution of the processes to participants
What impact does this have? Why is it re-written?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>1. Hour 2. Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to the textual meanings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>2. Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to textual meanings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Headlines: Discuss what these articles might be about in groups of four

Enlarging EU 'risks additional corruption'

Turkey must be kept out of the union Giscard says

Proposals unacceptable, says firefighters' union

Two killed in hit-and-run crash

Firefighter strike looms as talks end with no pay offer

Ask students to re-write the headlines in full form and then discuss if there is any difference in the meaning in groups of four

10 minutes
The effect of the textual organisation and the effect of the choice of theme and rheme, the use of nominalisations and passivisations

15 minutes
Students report back and class discussion 15 minutes

Firefighter strike looms as talks end with no pay offer

Mention the strike briefly 5 minutes

WEEK 15

1. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem page(^1)</td>
<td>Tell that it is a passage from agony column. Mention the problem. Brainstorming on possible solutions to that problem. Note what students suggest on the board. Read the article</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Developing on Textual meanings, cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students read the article</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students analyse the text using textual meanings in pairs</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) we have changed this text in both classes as the students wanted to bring their own texts. Class A brought a text on SARS and Class B wanted a text on Matrix Reloaded.
2. Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students report back</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class discussion on the writer’s choices.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What it is about?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is it written by?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is the ideal reader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is it written?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What other ways of writing about the topic are there?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEEK 16

1. & 2. Hours
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEEK 17**

2. & 2. Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Research instruments to be used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was once a man and his wife, and for a long time they had been longing for a child, but in vain. At last, the woman was in hope that heaven would grant her wish. At the back of their house there was a little window overlooking a magnificent garden full of the most beautiful flowers and herbs. However, a high wall surrounded the garden, and no one dared to enter it, for it belonged to a witch who was very powerful and of whom the whole world stood in awe.

One day the woman was standing at this window looking down into the garden, when she noticed a bed which was planted with the finest rampion. It looked so fresh and green that it made her mouth water and she was possessed by the desire to eat some. This craving grew from day to day, but she knew she never could get any. So she began to pine away and looked pale and miserable. Her husband, in great alarm, asked her, 'What ails you, my dear?'

'Alas,' she replied. 'If I can't eat some of the rampion from the garden behind our house, I shall die.'

The husband, who loved her, thought, 'Rather than let your wife die, you shall fetch her some of the rampion, cost what may.' So when dusk came, he climbed over the wall into the witch's garden, hurriedly cut a handful of rampion, and took it to his wife. She at once made it into a salad and ate it up with great lust. She found it so tasty, so very tasty, that her desire grew three times as strong the next day. If it was to be stilled, her husband once more had to climb over into the garden. So at dusk, he let himself down again but just as he had clambered over the wall, his heart stood still, for there was the witch confronting him.

'How dare you come into my garden like a common thief and steal my rampion?' she said eyeing him angrily. 'This shall cost you dear.'

'Alas,' he answered, 'temper justice with mercy, it was from dire necessity that I resolved to come. My wife has seen your rampion from her window and her longing is so strong that she will die if she does not get some to eat.'

Thereupon the witch's wrath abated, and she said to him, 'If it is as you say, I will let you take home as much rampion as you like. Only I make one condition. You must give me the child that your wife is going to give birth to. It will be well off and I will care for it like a mother.'

In his anguish the man agreed to everything, and the moment the wife gave birth the witch appeared, christened the child Rapunzel (rampion), and took her away with her.

Rapunzel grew up to be the most beautiful girl under the sun. When she was twelve years old, the witch shut her up in a tower in a forest. It had no stairs or doors, only a little window quite high up at the top. When the witch wanted to get in, she stood down below and called, 'Rapunzel, Rapunzel, let down your hair.'

Rapunzel had magnificent long hair, as fine as spun gold. When she heard the witch call, she loosened her tresses and wound them round a hook by the window. She let them fall down, and the witch climbed up by Rapunzel's braids.

It came to pass a few years later that the King's son, riding through the forest, came close to the tower. Suddenly, he heard someone singing. The voice was so charming that he stopped to listen. It was Rapunzel who in her loneliness amused herself by letting her sweet voice resound. The Prince wanted to climb up and join her and sought for the tower door but there was none to be found.
He rode home, but the singing had touched his heart so deeply that he went out into the forest every day and listened. Once, as he was standing behind a tree, he saw the witch come near and heard her call, 'Rapunzel, Rapunzel, let down your hair.'

Then Rapunzel let her braided hair fall down and the witch climbed up. 'If this is the ladder by which to come up,' he thought, 'I will try my luck once myself.' The very next day, when dusk began to fall, he went up to the tower and cried, 'Rapunzel, Rapunzel, let down your hair.'

Presently the plaits came down and the King's son climbed up by them. At first, Rapunzel was terribly frightened when a man came into her room, for she had never set eyes on a man in her life. But the Prince talked to her most kindly telling her that his heart had been so deeply moved by her singing that he knew no peace and had to come and see her. Then Rapunzel lost her fear, and when he asked her if she would take him for her husband, and she saw that he was young and handsome, she thought, 'He will love me better than old Mother Gothel,' and she said, 'Yes,' and laid her hand in his.

She said, 'I would be glad to go with you, but I do not know how to get down. Will you bring a skein of silk every time you come? I shall weave it into a ladder, and when it is ready, I will come down, and you will take me on your horse.'

They arranged that meanwhile he could always come to see her in the evening, for the old woman came by day. Nor did the witch discover anything until Rapunzel broached her one day and said to her, 'Please tell me, Dame Gothel, how is it that you are much heavier to pull up than the young Prince who will be here before long?'

'Oh, you wicked child,' yelled the witch, 'what do I have to hear from you? I had thought I cut you off from the world, and yet you have deceived me!' In her rage she clutched Rapunzel's lovely hair, wound it several times round her left hand, picked up a pair of scissors with her right hand, and snip, snap the lovely tresses lay on the ground. She was merciless and took poor Rapunzel into a wilderness, where she was forced to live in greatest wretchedness and sorrow.

Yet on the very day she had cast Rapunzel away, the witch fastened the plaits she had cut off to the window hook. When the Prince came again he cried, 'Rapunzel, Rapunzel, let down your hair.' Then the witch lowered the hair. The Prince climbed up, but above he found not his beloved Rapunzel but the witch, who looked at him with evil and venomous eyes. 'Oh ho,' she cried mockingly, 'you have come to fetch your dearly beloved, but the pretty bird sits no longer in her nest, and she can sing no more, for the cat has snatched her away, and it will scratch your eye out for you, too. Rapunzel is lost to you, you shall never set eyes on her again.'

The Prince was beside himself with grief and, in his despair flung himself down from the tower. He escaped with his life, but had his eyes scratched out by thorns among which he fell. He wandered about in the forest blind and feeding on nothing but roots and berries. He could do nothing but lament and weep over the loss of his most beloved Rapunzel. Thus he roamed about in utter misery for some years and, at last, found himself in the wilderness where Rapunzel had been living in dire poverty with the twins that had been born to her, a boy and a girl.

He heard a voice and it seemed to him familiar, so he went on in its direction. When he got there, Rapunzel recognized him and fell on his neck in tears. Two of them wetted his eyes and, at once, his eyes grew quite clear and he could see as well as ever.

He took her and their twins to his kingdom, where he was joyfully received, and they lived long in happiness and contentment together.
Nato 'bad blood' rocks alliance

By Jonathan Marcus
BBC defence correspondent

Nato's future role is looking more and more uncertain. In the past, Nato has often taken difficult decisions with remarkable speed. The alliance has been rocked by disputes many times before.

But the context of this crisis is remarkably different, and its ramifications could be significant.

In Depth At stake is not actually despatching forces to Turkey, but just the preliminary planning - so as to be ready to do so if war threatens.

These forces - mainly air defence units - would not be involved in a war against Iraq, but would protect Turkish territory and airspace against any retaliatory Iraqi threat.

French and German opposition to Washington's Iraq policy is clear. But the fact that - along with Belgium - they have chosen to force this
More Hot Air on Kyoto

Wall Street Journal, New York, N.Y.; Jun 5, 2002;

Abstract:
The good news in all this is that the Administration truly appears determined to stay out of Kyoto. "The Kyoto treaty would severely damage the United States economy, and I don't accept that," Mr. [Bush] said yesterday. Though you'd never know it from the media reports, the most important part of the EPA tome was that it dared to say the great unsaid: Even if you do believe in global warming, there's only so much that can be done. In other words, Kyoto won't help.

He has been making the rounds with the nearby graph, which shows changes in the world's temperature -- both with Kyoto and without -- over the next 100 years. The graph, the work of a noted global-warming researcher, shows that if nations religiously follow the treaty, we will see an expected increase of temperature of 1.92 degrees Celsius by 2100. If we don't follow Kyoto, we will get hit by the same increase by 2094. In other words, Kyoto saves us six whole years.

Full Text:
Copyright Dow Jones & Company Inc Jun 5, 2002

"I read the report put out by the bureaucracy," said a dismissive President Bush yesterday, taking the opportunity to reiterate his opposition to the Kyoto treaty on global warming. Too bad the bureaucracy didn't show its report to Mr. Bush before it released it to everyone else.

The President was doing damage control on a report on climate change that his Environmental Protection Agency sent to the United Nations Friday. In what was widely hyped as a reversal of the Administration's policy, the report warned that global warming was in fact occurring and admitted that recent temperature changes were "likely due mostly to human activities." Aha, said the greens, "Gotcha."

Having plowed our way through some of the 268 pages, we can see how, without too much squinting, the report
Whether it was sloppy language, a runaway EPA, or truly a change in position, you'd think the Administration would know better than to hand the green lobby such an easy target. In February, when Mr. Bush laid out a voluntary plan for reducing greenhouse emissions, environmentalists wrote it off as "window dressing." They have now seized on the EPA report as an "admission" and are renewing calls for Kyoto.

The good news in all this is that the Administration truly appears determined to stay out of Kyoto. "The Kyoto treaty would severely damage the United States economy, and I don't accept that," Mr. Bush said yesterday. Though you'd never know it from the media reports, the most important part of the EPA tome was that it dared to say the great unsaid: Even if you do believe in global warming, there's only so much that can be done. In other words, Kyoto won't help.

Kyoto's ineffectiveness remains the great dirty secret of the treaty, one its creators have been eager to hide under piles of statistics. Only a few brave souls have been willing to root through the numbers, including Professor Bjorn Lomborg, author of "The Skeptical Environmentalist." Mr. Lomborg's opinion carries special credibility since he is a former Greenpeace member and a devoted environmentalist.

He has been making the rounds with the nearby graph, which shows changes in the world's temperature -- both with Kyoto and without -- over the next 100 years. The graph, the work of a noted global-warming researcher, shows that if nations religiously follow the treaty, we will see an expected increase of temperature of 1.92 degrees Celsius by 2100. If we don't follow Kyoto, we will get hit by the same increase by 2094. In other words, Kyoto saves us six whole years.

That the whole world is in a huff over six piddling years might be funny, if it weren't for the very serious costs of the piddling. Starting in 2010, the world will pay up to $350 billion a year to comply with Kyoto. By 2050, as the treaty targets become harder to reach, the cost will skyrocket to 2% of OECD countries' GDP, or $900 billion a year. As it turns out, $900 billion is also about what the effects of global warming are estimated to cost nations by 2100. In other words, as Mr. Lomborg puts it, the world will pay for global warming twice.

To put all this in perspective, Mr. Lomborg has noted that for a one-time cost of $200 billion (the approximate cost of complying with Kyoto in 2010 alone), developed nations could today provide clean drinking water and sanitation for every single human on Earth -- saving two million lives a year.

As the EPA report notes, not all global warming is bad. Warmer weather will result in fewer cold-related deaths, longer agricultural growing seasons and even increased precipitation. Chances are that new forms of energy will replace fossil fuels long before Kyoto really kicks in.

All of this is further reason why Mr. Bush would be smart to stick with his current voluntary program. Whatever hot air rises from the EPA report, what really matters is the Administration's actions. So far, those actions have been the right ones.

(See related letters: "Letters to the Editor: The Uncertain Science of Climate Predictions" -- WSJ June 10, 2002)
## Appendix 4  Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal meanings</th>
<th>Experiential Meanings</th>
<th>Textual Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the writer indicate his/her attitudes?</td>
<td>How does the writer describe what is going on?</td>
<td>How is the content of the text organised?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of the writer's choices?  
Effect of the writer's choices?  
Effect of the writer's choices?
Appendix 5

What is this text about?
Group A Table 5.1.3.a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Onur</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Outside</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey’s being defended against Iraqi threat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey’s enemies and friends</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War that USA wants against Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO alliance’s dispute over war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War between some countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War between America and Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis in NATO about sending patriot anti-missiles to Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement in NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some countries’ attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending patriot anti-missiles to Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America-Iraq war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is about protecting Turkey against Iraqi threat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Turkey should join the war or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most NATO countries don’t want Turkey to join but USA and England do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship and crisis among NATO countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO’s stance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATO and Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether to send patriot anti-missiles or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement among NATO countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ s.c.</td>
<td>+ s.c.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ s.c.</td>
<td>+ d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: affect  
s.c: social context  
d: detailed  
p: perspective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Ayşegül</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Mirac</th>
<th>Şeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Önder</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Güray</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is news and information about the world and the war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The disagreement in NATO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War between Iraq and USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey wants to defend itself and wants weapons; Belgium, France, and Germany disagree. Netherlands agrees with Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement between Germany, France, and Belgium and other NATO members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The help for defence which Turkey required from NATO during the war in Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is about the war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement in NATO about the defence of Turkey in case of war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO’s decisions and alliance between USA and Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The French and German opposition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO’s role in war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO’s attitude</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement on dispatching patriot (anti-missiles) to Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The war between Iraq and USA for petrol (oil)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2</td>
<td>Disagreement in NATO about Iraq war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq crisis and France’s, Germany’s Belgium’s and Netherlands’s opinion about the crisis and Turkey’s situation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement on Turkey’s patriot anti-missile requests from NATO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The war in Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attitude of USA and other countries towards Turkey’s getting involved</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to Turkey in case of war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America's and other countries' attitude towards war in NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France and Germany's policies and Washington's policy for Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO's position in the war</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq and American war</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NATO) Countries' opinions and attitudes towards this war</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey's place in war</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement between members of NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements and disagreements of USA about the war in Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement between NATO countries about Turkey's defence problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement between Turkey and NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td></td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ a</td>
<td>+ a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: affect  
d: detailed  
p: perspective
### Who is/ are talked about?

**Group A Table 5.1.3.c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers to Repeated Reading Activity 1</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Onur</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush Administration, French and German opposition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Ankara Government</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO's president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US, Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands, and Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US, Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey, and Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America, Iraq, France, Germany, Belgium, and NATO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two groups: first, Belgium, France, Germany, and second, US and Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Answers to Repeated Reading Activity 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers to Repeated Reading Activity 2</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Onur</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Turkey, then France, Germany, Netherlands, America</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, France, Germany, Netherlands, America</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Republic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO, Turkey, France, Germany, Belgium, Iraq, Bush Administration, Ankara Government, Netherlands. But NATO countries’ and Turkey’s situation is superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO countries talk about Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, Gerard Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table contains filled-out responses for each name with either an 'X' or '0'. The 'X' indicates a positive response, and '0' indicates no response. The last row includes changes for the repeated reading activity, marked with 'd' for 'different' or 'same'.
### Who is/ are talked about?

**Group B Table 5.1.3.d**

#### ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Aységul</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Mirac</th>
<th>Şeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Önder</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Güray</th>
<th>Can</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, Germany, US, France, Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO countries, Belgium, France, Germany, Turkey, Netherlands, Iraq and USA administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, France, Belgium, USA, Netherlands, Turkey and Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, Germany, US, France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey and countries that disagree with Turkey's desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America and Iraq and other members of NATO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, America, France, Belgium, Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, France, Netherlands, Bush administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Netherlands, France, Turkey, USA, England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America and Iraq, The NATO's members which are going to help America during the war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Aységul</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Mirac</th>
<th>Şeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Önder</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Güray</th>
<th>Can</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATO countries, America, France, Germany, Turkey, Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America, Iraq, Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Turkey, Belgium, USA, Netherlands, France, Bush administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America, Turkey and NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, USA, Iraq, Belgium, Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America, Turkey, Iraq and some countries opposing the war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, Germany, Iraq, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>+d</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How are they talked about?

**Group A Table 5.1.3.e**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers to Repeated Reading Activity 1</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Öznur</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Memleket</th>
<th>Čevir</th>
<th>Flores</th>
<th>Flores</th>
<th>España</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush administration has given its commitment that Ankara will get whatever it needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is (asked) “is the war really needed?” and about NATO countries’ disagreement. Some (of them) don’t want to send missiles but Turkey wants to be ready if war really starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish territory and air space against any retaliatory Iraqi threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending patriot anti-missiles or not</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq’s policy is clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a mature way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and German are talked about their opposition to war, Turkey is talked about whether it will attend the war or not</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the countries don’t want war and some of them want war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Answers to Repeated Reading Activity 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers to Repeated Reading Activity 2</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey is only subject which is being talked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America and Iraq are parts of war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq is assumed as a terrorist country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They talk about what Turkey is supposed to do</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are talked in the events of which are probable. They are talked not in a certain way. Probabilities are more</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative and positive things of the countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing their (NATO members’) ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This text is almost negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey is the object other countries are subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ d</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Aysegul</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Mirac</th>
<th>Seyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Ayge</th>
<th>Onder</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Guray</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French, Germans, and Belgians are against the war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The war would protect Turkish territory and airspace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey wants to defend its territory and airspace, wants weapons, Belgium, France, Germany are against this. Netherlands helps finally</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are talked objective. I mean BBC is not on the side of anyone, they are neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer is worried about the disputes between the NATO countries and shows this by saying that the context of this crisis is remarkably different. Still, he seems to be on no side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is shown that NATO has “bad blood” and some countries don’t approve the protection of Turkey (like France, Germany and Belgium). But in spite of this disagreement, Turkey will still be defended, it says. Because Bush administration has given the … that they will help Turkey in case of an Iraqi threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance between NATO countries. For example Turkish and USA alliance, but France and Germany opposition to Washington’s Iraq policy cause disputes. Because they want to prevent war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium, France, and Germany disagree with the other members of NATO. Turkey wants patriot (anti-missiles) Netherlands helps Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the writer is against France and Germany’s opinions and he thinks that these decisions are really important and can get serious results and problems if they aren’t solved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey is still defended by America, Iraq policy is clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is objective but his mind is mixed up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Belgium, and France disagree with protecting Turkish territory. Turkey is talked about the help of the airspaces, airports, and soldiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America and Netherlands said that they could send patriot batteries but France and Germany refused at first and agreed later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turkey is a small country but for America, it is a big difficulty. America does whatever it needs to make Turkey join the war.

**ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2**

Before the Iraq war, there had been a crisis in NATO among war supporter and non-supporter countries. Turkey wanted some help from NATO in case Iraq attacked Turkey. So everything started then

"if the war starts, Turkey will be defended" America says

Germany and France are talked negative because they oppose what USA wants, and Dutch are talked positive [because they are preparing to send patriot anti-missile batteries]

Turkey is the problem country and the goal, France, Germany, Belgium are the negative countries and USA and Netherlands, the positive

America says if war breaks out in Iraq, Turkey will be defended

America wanted (to send) batteries to Turkey for the Iraq war. But Germany and France oppose the war and if batteries is used for the Iraq war, the war will happen. So NATO is in confusion

Germany and France are talked negative because they oppose what USA wants. Belgium and Netherlands are positive-polarity

The writer supports the decision of NATO (in general) but because France and Germany oppose the decision the writer doesn’t mention them in a good way

Countries which are against the war are shown in a negative way

They are talked negative about NATO. The goal is Turkey

Mostly in a negative mood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the writer’s attitudes towards the disagreement? How are they expressed?

**Group A Table 5.1.3.g**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Onur</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Mikhal</th>
<th>Gazi</th>
<th>Feyza</th>
<th>Selma</th>
<th>Fatih &amp;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush administration and Netherlands agreed to defend Turkey. France and Germany don’t want to go to a war. In fact in my opinion they don’t want to defend Turkey’s airspace and territory so that Turkey will loose the war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, France and Belgium don’t want a war. But USA is sure that it has a right to attack Iraq. Some countries don’t agree with USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some (NATO) countries want to send weapons to Turkey but some don’t want war and don’t want to send weapons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three countries oppose sending anti-missiles to Turkey, other countries support it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France, Germany and Belgium alliance disagree sending patriot anti-missiles to Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France and Germany don’t want war and they oppose America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands and US oppose this but France, Germany and Belgium support the disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2 | X     | X     | X      | X     | X       |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| He thinks that the disagreement will suggest serious consequences so he is against the disagreement | X     |       |        |       |         |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| It is positive | X     |       |        |       |         |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| The writer wants to express the struggle how the countries are irresponsible. They always think about their own and their own future. This disagreement is a proof of this |       | X     |        |       |         |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| He opposes the disagreement |       |       | X      |       |         |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| His attitude is certain. He uses certain expressions | X     |       |        |       |         |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| It is negative “will have serious consequences” |       |       |        |       |         |      |       |        |        |       |       |      |       |       |        |
| Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2 | - a   | + sfg | + p    | 0     | - p    | + sfg | 0     | + sfg  | + p    | + sfg  | + p    | + sfg  | + sfg  | + sfg  |        |
What are the writer's attitudes towards the disagreement? How are they expressed?

Group B Table 5.1.3.h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Ayşegül</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Mirac</th>
<th>Şeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Güray</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Önder</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Ali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some countries agree with Turkey and some disagree. But &quot;Turkey will get whatever it needs says Bush administration&quot;. Turkey wants to defend itself…</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, France, Belgium don't want to send missiles because they think it will be start of a war. They expressed that they will be willing to do so if it is certain that the war will start</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is worried about the disagreement. He thinks that this is the worst ever. He expresses this by saying that this disagreement is different from many others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, France, and Belgium have doubts about sending missiles to Turkey. But NATO has given the decision Turkey will still be defended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the writer is neutral/objective. He expresses that Turkey should be defended in the war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer says that whatever happens, Turkey will be defended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the writer doesn't want any problems or serious events, so he is against France and Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is worried about the disagreement and he expresses it in the third paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement between the countries caused an opposition between the NATO countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush said about the problem sharply so Netherlands sailed the batteries (anti-missiles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2 | He made polarity between war supporters and non-supporters | X |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| He criticizes other countries' attitudes &quot;These forces-mainly air defence units- would not be involved in a war against Iraq, but would protect Turkish territory and airspace against any retaliatory Iraqi threat&quot; | X |
| The attitude towards USA and supporters are positive but to others it is negative | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer seems to be agreeing with the USA and shows other countries as negative and even says that no matter what they say this war will be and Turkey will be involved. They are expressed by definite sentences</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general the writer is not on the side of anyone. Not America or Turkey but it can be understood that the writer approves of America and insists on defence of Turkey</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is more understanding for USA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch support USA, Germany and France oppose (realtatory Force)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer supports the decision of NATO but because France and Germany oppose the decision the writer doesn’t mention them in a good way</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The theme is mostly America or others but Turkey is the theme. The attitude to America is positive</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect/realtatory+ clear, but, force -</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a severe way and clearly</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France and Germany are opposing</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a + p</td>
<td>+sfg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Why is it written?
**Group A Table 5.1.3.i**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Onur</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Madaniye</th>
<th>Gazi</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Yugoslavia</th>
<th>Argentina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To inform us about the latest news on NATO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To let us see who is standing by Turkey and who is not</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give news</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform people on the war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform people on the disagreement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2 | To inform us about the news | X |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To show countries’ positions in relation to war | X |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To inform us about war |       |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | The writer cannot change the officials’ minds by writing this text he/she wants to express his/her opinions | X |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To express NATO’s attitudes’ about war |       |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To comment about this situation (to provide a comment/yorum) | X |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To provide information on the NATO disagreement |       |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To make people know about these “serious consequences” |       |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |
|                                          | To get more reaction to the disagreement |       |       |       |       |         |        |       |         |        | X    |          |      |        |         |            |            |

| Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2 | - a + p + d | + p + p + d | + p | 0 | 0 | + p | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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### Why is it written?

**Group B Table 5.1.3.j**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Ayşeylan</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Șeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Önder</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Güray</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Abo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To give information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give news</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because a war is going to happen and this affects everyone. People must now what happens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because there is a war in the world and it is important</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it involves all NATO countries so it is important</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is written to tell the truth and BBC’s ideas about this problem in NATO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain people who wants war and who doesn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2</th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Ayşeylan</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Șeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Önder</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Güray</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Abo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To give information</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show countries’ attitudes/opinion/ideas about this crisis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the disagreement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform people on the conflict between European countries</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain disagreement between the members of NATO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About other countries’ oppositions and agreements about Washington’s Iraq policy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show people countries’ policies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- p</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What other ways of writing about the same topic are there?

**Group A Table 5.1.3.k**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Koray</th>
<th>Betül</th>
<th>Özlem</th>
<th>Yağmur</th>
<th>Volkan</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Onur</th>
<th>Mustafa</th>
<th>Gökhan</th>
<th>Semih</th>
<th>Maki</th>
<th>Hatun</th>
<th>Mehmet</th>
<th>Esma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Truth of War</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Turkey be Defended or not</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More details can be included such as Turkey’s borders, Turkey’s and America’s discussion on this matter, Turkish and American armies, air units, etc. as Turkey is strategically important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An interview can be done with the politicians so that we can be more informed about this subject</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They could write people’s ideas about the war</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct speech can be used (interviewing people)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is very political, and very upsetting and not very humane. If I were the writer, I would write about people that will die in Iraq or people who will loose their jobs in Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were the writer of this text, I would give more information about the political problems between the countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Against US’ or ‘Old friends’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think this is a very effective way and easy to understand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe it could be written from the eyes of NATO, if it were, NATO would be in a more positive position</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An interview can be done with the politicians</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking people’s ideas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey can be more active and it could be more certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ p</td>
<td>+ sfg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What other ways of writing about the same topic are there?

Group B Table 5.1.3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 1</th>
<th>Ayşegül</th>
<th>Soner</th>
<th>Cüritina</th>
<th>Mirac</th>
<th>Şeyda</th>
<th>Gamze</th>
<th>Fulya</th>
<th>Merve</th>
<th>Umut</th>
<th>Giray</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Önde r</th>
<th>Ezgi</th>
<th>Ayşe</th>
<th>Ceren</th>
<th>Anl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be more objective but it is OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is written in the way it should be</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer could have gone straight to the topic instead of talking about the past, and could have given more details on Turkey’s position in the conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is written in a clear way, it is easy to read. The writer could have involved more details but then it would be boring to read details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can add more pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In form of a dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWERS TO REPEATED READING ACTIVITY 2</th>
<th>More objectively</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More impartial</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More certain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less certain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Turkey in the agent position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer is objective so the text is objective, the writer maybe writes with his/her opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like a French or a Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By someone from those countries mentioned in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Repeated Reading Activity 1 to 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+p</td>
<td>+p</td>
<td>sfg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 6.1.a Why did you choose to study in a foreign language branch? Class A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like studying English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bar chart]
Chart 6.1.b Why did you choose to study in a foreign language branch?

Class B

I like English | Job | I believe I am successful/talented in English | I like learning a foreign language(s) | I am not good at science and maths | I find English enjoyable | I find English easier | I don't like science and maths | Cultures and communication | Suitable for me | University programmes | It is important to learn English | It is an unusual subject to study

0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10

Questionnaire 1
Chart 6.1.c I am learning English because...

Questionnaire 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Class A</th>
<th>Class B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy learning a foreign</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Communicate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend the university</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future career</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to study abroad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To follow the technological</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live abroad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British / American Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and people of English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use internet more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English literature</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 6.3.1.a Is there any difference between our lessons and your previous reading lessons? If there is, please state if you find the change to be negative or positive and explain the nature of the change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes (+)</th>
<th>Yes (-)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>NA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA*: Non-Attendant
Chart 6.3.2. Is there any difference in your approach to reading lessons? If yes, please explain in what way.

Class A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Questionnaire</th>
<th>3rd Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Positive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 6.3.2.b Is there any difference in your approach to reading lessons? If yes, please explain in what way.

Class B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Questionnaire</th>
<th>3rd Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Positive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 6.3.2.1.a I find/ I don't find the activities we do enjoyable because...

Questionnaire 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class A</th>
<th>Class B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the lesson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the text</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 6.3.2.1.b I find/ I don't find the activities we do enjoyable because...

Questionnaire 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class A</th>
<th>Class B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the text</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 6.3.2.2.1 find / don't find the texts we read enjoyable because...

Class B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Questionnaire</th>
<th>3rd Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Grammar analysis is boring: 1 (1, 0)
- No Answer: 2 (1, 2)
- Depends on the text: 3 (2, 2)
- Yes: 8 (9, 9)
- No: 3 (1, 2)
- NA: 6 (0, 6)