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The purpose of this study is to assess the extent to which each of the three types of instruction (authentic, where, differentiated) engages 9th grade high school students in achieving language proficiency. The paper examines the features of these models of instructions and teachers’ opinion about them. It includes a descriptive research in survey model. The sample in research consists of 291 students and 95 teachers selected from 9th grades of 5 different high schools selected randomly in central province of Ankara. Questionnaires, attitude scales and assessment tests are used as data collection instruments, in eliciting opinion of 9th grade students and their teachers on types of instructions. The data obtained were later analyzed with SPSS. The results of the study revealed that 9th grade students’ success levels in relation to models of instruction are in general higher. It was also discovered in the research that students with less interest in Turkish Literature course could construct knowledge by application of these models of instruction. It can be said that the teachers who used the methods dealing with ‘authentic’, ‘where’ and ‘differentiated’ instructions were able to construct knowledge to engage students in language course.
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INTRODUCTION

Teaching is based on three aspects: curriculum, assessment and instruction. To meet the specified purposes of teaching, curriculum standards should be identified to decide what assessment methods will be used. Then, instruction should be determined. These three elements are called “backward design that makes teachers’ goals or standards operational in terms of assessment evidence as they begin to plan a unit or course” (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998: 8). Wiggins and McTighe suggest three stages in backward design process.

In the first stage, teachers consider their goals based on standards. The second stage encourages the teachers to think about the assessment methods before they design the lesson or unit. The last stage, which is the subject of this study, is based on essential knowledge and skills that are needed to promote understanding and interest of the students. In Turkish Language and Literature curriculum prepared by the Ministry of National Education (MEB, 2005), these issues are mentioned as general objectives; however, the guidance of students’
achievement and implementation of concepts are not sufficient enough for teachers. For this reason, authentic, differentiated and where instructions are developed to organize instruction systematically with the purpose of improving students' performance in learning Turkish Literature as a transition from traditional approaches to effective ones.

**Authentic Instruction**

Authentic instruction is an approach based on “authentic achievement” which requires students to develop in-depth understanding and to apply academic learning to important realistic problems (Newmann, 1996). Many teachers look for the information that reflects the complexity of individual students instead of standardized information. According to Newmann et al. (Newmann et al., 1995) authentic achievement is based on construction of knowledge, disciplined inquiry, and value beyond schools. People construct new knowledge “through reflection upon their interactions with objects and ideas” (Brooks and Brooks, 1993: 4).

Authentic instruction requires students to engage in more complex thinking skills, so teachers must pay attention to the “nature” of students’ understanding (Jackson and Davis, 2000). Disciplined inquiry requires students to use their prior knowledge and to develop their understanding and conclusions. The communication is also important for authentic instruction. It requires students to engage in conversations with their teacher and friends (Newmann et al., 1995). Students need to express their own ideas and feelings. Therefore, teachers should improve students’ oral and written language by asking open-ended questions in Turkish literature teaching.

The last criterion requires cognitive work that has value beyond the classroom. To support this, students should see the world beyond the classroom. Experience outside the classroom strengthens and increases the amount of knowledge they learn, understand and retain. The examples taken from real life when explaining new subjects should make sense to students because the examples may match with students’ own experiences. For example, Tanzimât period could be explained comparing Imperial Edict of Reorganization to European Union to make connections between past and present. Despite the fact that positive effects of authentic pedagogy were clearly demonstrated, the qualities of instruction and assessment have not been increased.

**WHERE Instruction**

WHERE is a group of guidelines and self assessment criterion assuring high quality in design of curricular activities which evoke and develop student understanding. “WHERE represents a way of testing lessons and units rather than a recipe for building them” (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998: 116).

As an acronym WHERE stands for the following five main components: Where are we headed, Hook the student, Explore & Enable/Equip, Rethink and Exhibit & Evaluate. The authors place a special importance to “userfriendliness” of the design. Accordingly, teachers should understand the needs of the students as the end user, and develop designs that will be used by them to accomplish learning tasks. Parts of this group of guidelines can be briefly described as follows:

1. **Where are we headed**: This element is about determining the purpose of the instruction. The attributes related to the instruction should be clarified.
2. **Hook**: This group of guidelines relates to catching the students’ attention. Concentration is the key to success of the teaching activity and issues, ideas, problems and challenges are presented in a way to involve students in the process.
3. **Explore and enable/equip**: This part is concerned with the applications of the learning experience. Students are led towards researching and testing.
4. **Reflect and rethink**: Understanding is a never ending process. The students can better make use of their research if only they can look at the issues from different perspectives. The research findings and test results should be questioned. In that context, feedback with regard to the initial inquiries, results and discussions are very important.
5. **Exhibit and Evaluate**: This guideline ensures that teacher and students assess the performances and products to identify the level of success. They set goals for future learning.

There are not many research studies on the effectiveness of WHERE in the classroom. However, there are many examples of applications and workshops carried out. Frank Lyma is a good example of an educator who “uses weird facts to provoke interest in the topic” (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998: 119). Wiggins and McTighe present the example of a history course in which teacher used “false disreputable material” (1998: 120) so as to make students cross-check references. In a workshop, Wiggins and McTighe showed that instant immersions, thought provocations, experiential shocks and multiple perspectives are factors that draw intellectual interest. On the other hand, effectiveness depends on focus, clarity of goals, existence of models and feedbacks.

**Differentiated instruction**

Differentiated instruction is a model in which teachers
apply differentiated materials, processes and products when necessary. Teachers keep students together with diverse characteristics in the same class under the same instruction; “Teachers strive to do whatever it takes to ensure that struggling and advanced learners” (Tomlinson, 1999: 2).

The first characteristic of the **Differentiated Instruction** is that it has a general applicability. It is not meant for exceptions for struggling students or students at risk. It “offers guidance for educators who want to facilitate consistent, robust plans in anticipation of and in response to students’ learning differences” (Tomlinson, 1999: 2). However, as Jackson and Davis indicate, no single formula works for all situations (2000).

Students have varying degrees of capabilities and limits. Under Differentiated Instruction, teacher pulls the different interests of students with different backgrounds together by limiting the instruction with the essential concepts, principles, and skills. Despite these differences, students share common goals and the trick for the teacher is to use these differences in different areas, under different time tables and through different paths.

Assessment is the third important element of the differentiated instruction, but in a different way than its traditional use. Tomlinson (2000) asserts that today’s assessment is a means to modify tomorrow’s instruction. At this stage, assessment helps to realize who understands the key ideas and who can perform the targeted skills. Modification of the content, process and products will follow the assessments. While making the modifications, teachers will take into account the readiness, interests and learning profiles of the students.

Balancing individual and group values is another very important element in differentiated classroom. Balance requires flexibility, both in terms of the materials being used and in terms of pace of the class. Students are different in terms of their levels of understanding and capabilities. These differences must be balanced while instructing, assessing and grading. According to studies (Archambault, 1993; Wetsberg, 1993), there is evidence that teachers do not modify instruction in their classes in response to the achievement or learning potential of their ablest students. Tomlinson (2000) underlines the fact that an important reason for this is the lack of teachers’ preparation.

A qualitative case study by Tomlinson (1995) shows that one-size-fits-all classes do not satisfy the students with diverse interests such as gifted and struggling students. There are important barriers, administrative and those resulting from paradigm shift, in establishing differentiated classrooms. Moreover, because of the lack of information and clear definitions, many teachers think that occasional minor modifications in lessons are enough to address the academic diversity.

In this paper, the primary concern is authentic, **WHERE** and differentiated instructions provide better understanding to achieve detailed information. These instructions also provide deep learning. Hence, this paper examines the effects of three models of instruction on students’ success and teachers’ opinion about these instructions.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the study is to explain the relationship between the students’ test scores of the instruction assessments and gender, reading habits, parents’ education level, computer ownership at home. The aim of the research is to specify the advantages of authentic, **WHERE** and differentiated instructions rather than direct instruction by assessing students’ comprehension of the subject taught with these instruction models.

**METHOD**

**Research model**

The “field study” described here is designed to address two approaches (Balci, 2009). First, teachers’ treatment and quality related to using models of instruction have an impact on students’ success in the Turkish literature course. Second, addition of new models of instruction substantially changes the students’ success and holds their interest in the subject. To assess these approaches, descriptive survey model was used. To obtain students’ and teachers’ personal information, small-scale research is preferred because it identifies effective classroom practices that are associated with students’ performance whereas “large-scale research does not provide much information on classroom effects.” (Wenglinsky, 2003: 2). Students were assessed after each model of instruction by questions about the subject and the relationship between students’ test scores and independent variables were found out. Therefore, questionnaires, attitude scales on instruction, and assessment tests are used to gain data in this research.

**Universe and sampling**

The universe of this study is composed of 5 different high schools selected randomly in central province of Ankara and the sampling is composed of 291 9th grade high school students and 95 Turkish literature teachers.

**Data gathering tools**

The data of the study are collected with the attitude scale, questionnaire and assessment tests which were developed by the researcher. “The Attitude Scale” is applied to teachers to understand their opinions and treatment about the models of instruction. This scale is equally spaced between grade 1 (I never do it) and grade 5 (I always do it) ranges and composed of 15 questions. The grading of the scale is between the ranges 1 which is the lowest and 5 which is the highest. Student questionnaire is composed of personal questions about gender, reading habit, computer ownership at home, parents’ educational status. Assessment tests are applied to 291 9th grade students to assess how the instruction
models help understanding the subject and to analyze which instruction is better for learning the subject after each lesson taught by authentic, WHERE, and differentiated instruction. Each test is composed of 20 different questions about the subject.

Limitations

This study is limited with 291 students and 95 teachers in 5 schools in central Ankara during 2011-2012.

The validity and reliability of data gathering tools

The multiple reliability of the scale KR-20 is found as 0.88. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found as 0.67. This result shows that this is a reliable scale. Coefficient of 0.65 and above is enough to submit as reliable (Cronbach, 1997). The questionnaire and assessment tests were evaluated by 3 professors who teach in Turkish Language and Literature Education Department. The tests were also applied to 50 students in a high school different from sampling. It was seen that the questions are understandable and appropriate to their level.

Data analyses

The data were analyzed and evaluated by using factor analysis. “Assessments Related to Models of Instruction” and “Personal Information Form” were applied as the main research tools. Descriptive Statistics (frequencies, percentages, and mean values), t-test and Mann Whitney U tests were used for analyzing the data. To measure the ideas and attitudes of teachers towards Turkish Literature course, Likert type “Attitude Scale on Instruction in Turkish Literature”, which contains 15 items, was developed.

RESULTS

The current study estimated the indications and assessments related to students’ personal information and the attitude of teachers’ related to models of instruction in Turkish Literature course. The findings of students’ demographic features were gained from the questionnaire.

The survey is applied to 291 9th grade students. 50.5% of students are males and 49.5 % of them are females. It is seen that number of students is almost equal in terms of gender. This enables one to assess the results from both gender’s point of view. In questionnaire, students were also asked about their health status, computer ownership, reading regularity and parents’ education level. Students’ health status is a significant issue in their academic success. 76.6% of students stated that they do not have health problem whereas 23.4% of them do have health problem.

Reading regularly affects students’ success at school. Students who read regularly can comprehend and analyze with high motivation. 97.3% of the students said that they read regularly (at least half an hour every day) while 2.7% do not. The other issue which affects students’ success is computer games. Technology is useful when it is used correctly; however it makes students not to study because of time wasting by playing games or chatting with friends. 56.4% of the students who participated in this study have a personal computer at home, whereas 43.6% do not have.

The education level of students’ parents are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

As the results related to the parents’ education level are examined, it is seen that 13.1% of the students’ mothers are primary school graduate, 19.9% of the students’ mothers are secondary school graduate, 33.3% are high school graduate, 22% are university graduate and finally 11.7% of mothers have graduate degree. High school graduates have the highest share among the mothers.

The education level of fathers is similar to that of mothers. As shown in Table 2, the share of high school graduates is highest. This is followed by undergraduate whose share is 25.4 %. The percentage of primary school graduates is lower among fathers than the mothers. In general, the education level of parents is high.

As it is seen in Table 3, the biggest proportion of students (25.4%) think that the different methods of teachers affect their interest in Turkish Literature course. 8.6% of students think that it has no effect on their attitude towards the lesson. The distribution of the total tests scores which were done after each lesson taught by authentic, WHERE and differentiated instruction are shown in Table 4.

The total points gained by students from the tests were between 10-100 points. The score range is divided into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. The education level of students’ mothers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. The education level of students’ fathers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can infer that having a computer at home does not affect students’ success in a negative way.

Table 8 shows the results of test scores of three models of instruction and gender. As it is seen in the table, there is a significant difference between the results of tests according to gender (Authentic t=4.071, p < 0.05; where t=3.615, p < 0.05; differentiated t=2.472, p < 0.05; direct t=4.031, p < 0.05). The female students’ test scores are higher than male students.

When the test results in Table 9 are analyzed according to reading habits, it is seen that there is a significant difference between authentic and WHERE instruction, but there is not a significant difference between differentiated and direct instruction.

As the results in Table 10 are diagnosed, there is significant difference between the total scores of authentic (U=6768,000, p < 0,05), WHERE (U=8368,500, p < 0,05), differentiated (U=8533,000, p<0,5), direct instruction (U=8203000, p<0,05) in terms of computer ownership at home.

The population of this study consists of 95 Turkish Language teachers who are teaching in central Ankara. The education status of these teachers is shown in Table 11.

Schools from which teachers are graduated are shown in Table 11. 28 teachers are graduates of Faculty of Education, 15 teachers from Faculty of Arts and Science and 11 teachers from Institute of Education. 9 of them are graduates of other schools. The number of teachers who graduated from Faculty of Education and Institute of Education are higher than the others.

When the attitude scale points are analyzed according to gender variable, it is seen that there is not a significant difference between male and female teachers. However, according to standard deviation and mean values, there is a difference between male and female teachers. Male teachers have higher points than females (Table 12).

Statements in the questionnaire are made up in accordance with the features of instructions. The first five statements refer to authentic instruction, the second five statements refer to WHERE instruction, and the last five statements refer to differentiated instruction. Teachers were asked to mark the option which is appropriate for their teaching approach. When the teachers mark the option “always” they are given 1 point, and 0 point for the other options (often, sometimes, rarely, never).

As it is seen in Table 13, 84.2% of the teachers agreed to the statement that “I give students pre-specified knowledge ranging from simple facts to more complex concepts.” This is a significant feature of authentic instruction. The share of the teachers who agreed to the statement that “I group students according to their interest” is 83 %. Not all students are alike, so while instructing, assessing and grading teacher would be aware of the group and individual norms. Group study and participation in class will demonstrate the students’

| Table 3. The effect of teachers’ different methods to students’ attitude. |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| F       | %       |
| Highly   | 74  | 25.4 |
| Partial  | 65  | 22.3 |
| Rarely   | 25  | 8.6  |
| total    | 164 | 56.4 |

| Table 4. Distribution of students’ success towards teachers’ instruction. |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| F       | %       |
| Low (10-40) | 8  | 2.8 |
| Mediocre (41-70) | 63 | 21.6 |
| High (71-100) | 220 | 75.6 |
| total    | 291 | 100.0 |

three, and the students were grouped according to these ranges. The students who got points between 10-40 were classified in low level, the students who got points between 41-70 were classified in mediocre level, and the students who got points between 71-100 were classified in high level. 75.6% of the students are in high level whereas 21.6% of the students are in mediocre level, and 2.8% are in low level. According to these results, it can be stated that students understand the subject when it is taught with different models of instruction.

T-Test, and Mann Whitney U-Test are applied to independent groups in order to understand whether there is a meaningful difference between the total points received from tests and their answers to personal questions. There is no significant difference between test results in terms of students’ health status, parents’ education level, and effects of teachers’ different methods to students’ attitude.

As it is seen in Table 5, the total points of students received from the questionnaire are changeable according to gender. There is a significant difference between male and female students’ points (U=7633, p<0.05) according to the Mann Whitney U-Test result. It can be further concluded that female students are more successful than male students in assessments which were done at the end of the instructions.

The sum of students’ test scores are changing according to reading habit (U= 631.00, p < 0.05). The sum of ranks shows that the students’ total scores are higher for those who read regularly than those who do not. According to the results in Table 6, it can be inferred that reading habit affects students’ success.

As it is shown in Table 7, the total scores of students who have computer at home is higher than the total scores of students who do not have (U=6960.0, p < 0.05).
Table 5. Tests results according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of ranks</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>166.07</td>
<td>24413.00</td>
<td>7633.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>125.51</td>
<td>18073.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Test results according to reading habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of ranks</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>147.77</td>
<td>41819.00</td>
<td>631.00</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.38</td>
<td>667.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. U-test results of assessments according to computer ownership at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of ranks</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>167.06</td>
<td>27398.00</td>
<td>6960.0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>118.80</td>
<td>15088.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. T-test results of assessments according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25.0694</td>
<td>5.48699</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>27.6122</td>
<td>5.16634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>10.7847</td>
<td>3.08881</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12.0340</td>
<td>2.60268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33.5694</td>
<td>6.90764</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35.4150</td>
<td>5.78951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>24.0583</td>
<td>5.37588</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>26.5011</td>
<td>5.05533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

understanding of individual instruction and how they can combine that knowledge with other areas.

83% of the teachers agreed to the statement that “I believe instant immersions, experiential shocks and multiple perspectives are factors that draw intellectual interest.” This indicates that teachers consider students’ interest in engaging them in learning. The teacher will be an instrument in uncovering the facts, letting the students see beyond obvious. Passive learning should be avoided; key ideas and questions must be explored in an active inquiry where the important challenge is to make an abstract idea real by designing learning experiences around inquiries, research, discussions, debates, role-play, and shifts of perspective.

85.3% of the teachers have marked the “agree” for the statement that “I encourage students to question the ideas and rethink the concepts. In connection with guidelines of Reflect and Rethink, students should always use and rethink the concepts so that their understanding can get more sophisticated. The ideas are not final truths. Therefore, they should be questioned. Teacher helps the students to uncover the ideas to be able to understand “related but dissimilar experiences; shifts in perspective (different people’s views, books, theories, and events); weird facts, anomalies, or surprises” (Wiggins and McTighe, 1999: 126).
Table 9. U-test results of assessments according to reading habit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Regular reading</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of ranks</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>147.89</td>
<td>41851.50</td>
<td>598.500</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.31</td>
<td>634.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>147.77</td>
<td>41818.50</td>
<td>631.500</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td>667.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>147.36</td>
<td>41702.00</td>
<td>748.000</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>784.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>147.02</td>
<td>41606.50</td>
<td>843.500</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109.94</td>
<td>879.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. U-test results of assessments according to computer ownership at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of ranks</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168.23</td>
<td>27590.00</td>
<td>6768.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>117.29</td>
<td>14896.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>158.47</td>
<td>25989.50</td>
<td>8368.500</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>129.89</td>
<td>16496.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>157.47</td>
<td>25825.00</td>
<td>8533.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>131.19</td>
<td>16661.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>159.48</td>
<td>26155.00</td>
<td>8203.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128.59</td>
<td>16331.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Education status of teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute of education</th>
<th>Faculty of Education</th>
<th>Faculty of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Other faculties</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages of teachers who do not agree to the statements are as follows: “I make clear explanations, develop arguments and solve problems” (27.4%), “I leave some issues unanswered to provoking thought” (36.8%), “I spell out the specifics of the final performance to make the goals clear for students” (17.9%), “I instruct all students, including those who struggle and need academic and behavior supports” (23.1%), “I provide opportunities for students to converge them” (33.7%), “I spend extra time for struggling students” (36.8%). These results indicate that teachers have difficulty in developing students’ thought and providing opportunity for each of them.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

There are similarities and differences between authentic, WHERE, and differentiated instruction. They are developed to organize instruction systematically with the purpose of improving students’ performance. While organizing the instruction, all of the models, to a certain
extent, cover key connectors: curriculum, assessment and students. By curriculum, educators determine what students should know and be able to do. Assessment methods help them to identify evidence as to the existence of the knowledge and skills. Finally, by instruction students are prepared to meet those standards.

The aim of this study was to interpret the data obtained from the research and to specify the implications for teachers about the models of instructions discussed in this study. When the findings are analyzed, it is seen that distribution of students’ test scores is mostly high. This means, students learn better with different instruction models rather than direct instruction. As it is seen above, the guidance of students’ achievement and implementation of concepts which are written in Turkish Language and Literature curriculum are not sufficient enough for teachers. For this reason, authentic, differentiated and WHERE instruction models are developed to organize instruction systematically with the purpose of improving students’ performance in learning Turkish Literature as a transition from traditional approaches to effective ones.

Each of the three instruction models places emphasis on a different connection point. In each model, there are also other additional elements. For the authentic instruction model, curriculum is the focus point. Authentic instruction requires students engage in more complex thinking skills, so teachers should improve students’ oral and written language by asking open-ended questions and paying attention to the nature of students’ understanding in Turkish literature lesson. This model emphasizes the quality of the material learned by the students, while WHERE puts emphasis on assessment.

On the other hand, differentiated instruction is a student-centred model and this model should be in Turkish Literature curriculum as it is not satisfactory for students who are gifted or struggling and for those with diverse interests. Assessment is used as a tool to realize who understands the key ideas and who can perform the targeted skills, so teachers may take into account the readiness and learning profiles of the students with differentiated instruction.

This study indicates that students who read regularly are more successful than those who do not. Both in Authentic Instruction and WHERE, intellectual quality is very important. In this context Newman and his associates talk about authentic achievement while Wiggins and

---

**Table 12.** T-test according to gender of teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13.** The results of questionnaire.

| I give students pre-specified knowledge ranging from simple facts to more complex concepts. | 80 | 84.2 |
| I make clear explanations, develop arguments and solve problems. | 26 | 27.4 |
| I work on a problem or issue that students see as connected to their personal experiences or contemporary public situations. | 55 | 57.9 |
| The dialogues during the lesson build coherently on participants’ ideas to promote improved collective understanding of a theme or topic. | 47 | 49   |
| I encourage my students take risks and try hard to master challenging academic work as a social support. | 75 | 79   |
| I believe instant immersions, experiential shocks and multiple perspectives are factors that draw intellectual interest. | 79 | 83   |
| I encourage students question the ideas and rethink the concepts. | 81 | 85.3 |
| I engage my students in role-play to solve a real world problem. | 62 | 65.2 |
| I leave some issues unanswered to provoking thought. | 35 | 36.8 |
| I spell out the specifics of the final performance to make the goals clear for students. | 17 | 17.9 |
| I instruct all students, including those who struggle and need academic and behavior supports. | 22 | 23.1 |
| I provide opportunities for students to converge them. | 32 | 33.7 |
| When students work in groups or individually, I take notes about students’ advancement. | 65 | 68.4 |
| I spend extra time for struggling students. | 35 | 36.8 |
| I group students according to their interest. | 79 | 83   |
McTighe use the six facets of understanding as in-depth understanding. In differentiated instruction the quality of the curriculum is defined in relation to its appropriateness for the students at different levels of readiness with learning styles and interests.

Authentic and WHERE instructions are considered as tools for planning and reflection. Of all the three methods, differentiated instruction has more specific elements directed towards classroom application. Therefore, with regard to the applicability, it requires a lot of energy, resources and support than other two methods. For countries with limited financial resources, the application of the differentiated model could be difficult. Under the circumstances of over-crowded classrooms, it is hard to spend extra time to struggling students or to provide opportunities equally. Therefore, teachers should be well-prepared at managing time and instruction.

The conditions of and needs for the three connectors of instruction change from place to place and in the same place from time to time. This makes instruction even a more complex process requiring the use of tools, strategies, lessons and activities that correspond to such a variance. From this perspective, a teacher can use the strong points of all three models. Indeed, the teacher should be aware of the ever changing nature of the conditions in classroom and view instruction as a system. A change in one of the components of the system is going to affect other components and will lead to and require changes in other components. In that context, teachers should determine the priorities and take into account the fact that any change is part of a long term improvement.

Newmann (1996) believe when schools focus on structural issues of policy, the changes become more visible. According to them, restructured school program includes curriculum instruction, assessment, scheduling and staff development in order to be effective. First, schools conditions must be addressed. In order to reach a successful school-restructuring program, teachers should pursue a clear purpose for all students’ learning about the curriculum instruction, assessment, scheduling and staff development.

The material at hand should touch upon the objectives and methods of learning, so they have to have clear goals, engage in collaborative activity to achieve that purpose, and take collective responsibility for students’ learning (Dofour, 1997). According to results of this study, the parents’ education level has no effect on students’ success. There is not a significant difference between the students’ scores and parents’ education level. For this reason, teachers should be well educated and open-minded to new approaches.

In this study, the students got high scores from the tests after the Turkish Literature course taught by using authentic, where and differentiated instruction, and it was seen that female students are more successful than the male students. According to the results of the questionnaire, the teachers are conscious about different models of instructions. The purpose of teaching is to increase the students’ understanding level. Therefore, the teachers have to take needs of students into consideration while designing the curriculum. First of all, as designers, they must make the goals clear to the students. Students must be aware of the conditions under which they will be considered as successful.

Secondly, studying and learning should be made exciting for students. By using the knowledge of the students and the subject, certain elements should be used to engage students in learning. Awakening and sustaining interests in ideas can be maintained by provoking thoughts by organizing work around questions and ideas, immersing students in puzzles and challenging them to solve a real world problem and engaging them in role-play. An element of mystery is central to provoking thought. Teachers may leave some issues unspoken and unanswered, inviting them to help make sense.

In addition to that, the effectiveness of the material is also important. The material at hand should touch upon the main issues while engaging the students. In that context, when focused on clear and worthy goals, and provided with models and feedback, students understand the purpose of the work. In conclusion, educative activities should make ideas concrete and real by linking to students’ experiences and world beyond classroom.
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